

A close-up, slightly draped American flag is visible on the left side of the cover, showing the stars and stripes. The background is a dark, textured brown.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

*"The voice of the watchmen
on the walls of Zion..."*

YEAR
1886
VOL. 1, Nos. 1-12

© 2018 ADVENTIST PIONEER LIBRARY

37457 Jasper Lowell Rd
Jasper, OR, 97438, USA
+1 (877) 585-1111
www.APLib.org

Facsimile reprint of the *American Sentinel* issues originally published in 1886 by *The Pacific Press Publishing Company*.

Published in the USA

November, 2018

ISBN: 978-1-61455-067-9

Due to the long age of the original documents from which these pages were scanned, there may be occasional black marks over the text on some pages. We look forward to finding original documents in a better state of preservation in order to replace the damaged pages. But, until then, we firmly believe that, though occasional issues may appear on some pages, the content of the *American Sentinel* is so important as to overshadow these minor issues.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE *AMERICAN SENTINEL*

“What is the *Sentinel* for, but to be the voice of the watchmen on the walls of Zion, to sound the danger signal.”

Ellen G. White, *Manuscript 16*, 1890.

“The *Sentinel* is like a trumpet giving a certain sound; and all our people should read it carefully, and then send it to some relative or friend, thus putting to the best use the light that God has given them...

“The *Sentinel* has been, in God’s order, one of the voices sounding the alarm, that the people might hear, and realize their danger, and do the work required at the present time....

“Let every worker for God comprehend the situation, and place the *Sentinel* before our churches, explaining its contents, and urging home the warnings and facts it contains. May the Lord help all to redeem the time.”

Ellen G. White, *Review and Herald*, December 18, 1888.

Contents

Volume 1, Number 1 (January, 1886).....	1
Volume 1, Number 2 (February, 1886).....	9
Volume 1, Number 3 (March, 1886).....	17
Volume 1, Number 4 (April, 1886).....	25
Volume 1, Number 5 (May, 1886).....	33
Volume 1, Number 6 (June, 1886).....	41
Volume 1, Number 7 (July, 1886).....	49
Volume 1, Number 8 (August, 1886).....	57
Volume 1, Number 9 (September, 1886).....	65
Volume 1, Number 10 (October, 1886).....	73
Volume 1, Number 11 (November, 1886).....	81
Volume 1, Number 12 (December, 1886).....	89

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1886.

NUMBER 1.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

"A Christian Nation."

THE idea which is advocated by some, that this may be made a Christian nation by simply making a change in the Constitution, was thus pertinently commented upon by the *Janesville, Wis., Gazette*:—

"But independent of the question as to what extent we are a Christian nation, it may well be doubted whether, if the gentlemen who are agitating this question should succeed, they would not do society a very great injury. Such measures are but the initiatory steps which ultimately lead to *restrictions of religious freedom*, and to committing the Government to measures which are as foreign to its powers and purposes as would be its action if it should undertake to determine a disputed question of theology."

An Unprofitable Alliance.

IN regard to the supposed benefit of the church by State patronage, or an alliance between the Church and the State, Lord Macaulay speaks as follows. These words are worthy of careful consideration:—

"The ark of God was never taken till it was surrounded by the arms of earthly defenders. In captivity, its sanctity was sufficient to vindicate it from insult, and to lay the hostile fiend prostrate on the threshold of his own temple. The real security of Christianity is to be found in its benevolent morality, in its exquisite adaptation to the human heart, in the facility with which its scheme accommodates itself to the capacity of every human intellect, in the consolation which it bears to the house of mourning, in the light with which it brightens the great mystery of the grave. To such a system it can bring no addition of dignity or of strength, that it is part and parcel of the common law. * * *

"The whole history of Christianity shows, that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by the alliance of power, than of being crushed by its opposition. Those who thrust temporal sovereignty upon her treat her as their prototypes treated her author. They bow the knee, and spit upon her; they cry, 'Hail!' and smite her on the cheek; they put a scepter in her hand, but it is a fragile reed; they crown her, but it is with thorns; they cover with purple the wounds which their own hands have inflicted on her; and inscribe magnificent titles over the cross on which they have fixed her to perish in ignominy and pain".—*Essay on Southey's Colloquies.*

The American Sentinel.

IT is well known that there is a large and influential association in the United States, bearing the name of the "National Reform Association." It is popularly known as the "Religious Amendment Party," because it is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As stated by the world, its object is "to put God in the Constitution." According to its own avowed aim is to procure—

"Such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (or its preamble) as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence, and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its Ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages, on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

The president of this association is Hon. Felix R. Brunot, who has held that position almost from its origin. Its present list of vice-presidents, to the number of two hundred, embraces bishops of churches, judges in the highest courts in the land, governors, and representative men in various secular positions, presidents of colleges, doctors of divinity, and professors of theology in large numbers. In fact there is no other association in the land which can boast such an array of names of eminent and influential men. It employs its agents and lecturers, who are presenting their cause to the churches and to the people, and who almost everywhere report unbounded success in their efforts. It has also a paper, the *Christian Statesman*, as its organ to advocate its cause.

While there are many people in the land who are opposed to, or look with suspicion upon, the movements of this party, there is no paper published in the United States, which has for its distinct object the vindication of the rights of American citizens, which, we solemnly believe, are threatened by the actions and aims of this association. That light may be disseminated on this subject, we have commenced the publication of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. That such a paper as this is needed, we think we can make apparent to every individual who will read our paper, who will hold prejudice in abeyance, and examine our reasons with candor.

While so many really think they are doing God service in their efforts to change the form of our Government, and we are willing to give them credit for thinking so, we are aware that they will look with disfavor upon our work; and some, who do not understand our motives

or our reasons, will be ready to class us, and all who indorse our positions, with the base of the earth, assuming that we are striking at the foundations of morality and religion. But they are much mistaken in their estimate. We promise to do or say nothing against the plainest principles of morality and religion. So far from that, we shall try to set before our readers the true relation of morality and religion, and show that this relation is not correctly presented by this "amendment party."

But the objector will say: "There can be no harm in recognizing Jesus Christ as the Ruler of the nation, and his laws as the rule of our lives." We know that this plea is plausible—we may say it is *taking* with nearly all religious people. Yet it is specious; plausible in the eyes of those only who have not examined the subject in its bearings, or have not traced the end to which it necessarily leads. Let us notice some of the things which must attend the success of their efforts, and some principles bearing on the subject:—

1. The Constitution of the United States must be so amended as to permit laws to be made which shall legalize the laws and institutions of Christianity, or of that which they may claim is Christianity. They ask that these laws, institutions, and usages shall be "put on a legal basis." Of course to be put on a legal basis they must be made matters of legal enforcement. That this is the object of that association, real and avowed, we promise to clearly show.

2. To carry this amendment into effect, any person who refuses to obey the laws and usages of Christianity must be subjected to penalties for his neglect or disobedience. As no law can exist without a penalty, no institutions or usages can be placed on a legal basis without authorizing penalties for their enforcement. This is undeniable.

3. A person can be convicted of a misdemeanor only before a court of justice, on the text of the law and the hearing of evidence.

4. The court is necessarily constituted the judge and exponent of the law; and, therefore, if disagreement arises as to the meaning of the law, or as to what constitutes a misdemeanor in the premises, the court is the authority, and the sole authority, to which appeal must be made.

5. And, therefore, if a question arises as to what is or what is not Christian law, usage, or institution, it must be determined by a court of justice! Or, if it be said that it need not be left to the decision of a civil court, but such questions may be referred to an ecclesiastical court,

we then reply: No matter what is the nature of the court by which such questions shall be decided, the fact remains that the subject of Christian faith and practice will be removed from the domain of individual conscience, and placed in the hands of a legal tribunal, which shall decide what is and what is not Christian faith and practice,—what we may and what we may not believe and practice as professed Christians!

6. There are many different churches and religions, or forms of religion, in the land, and no constitutional provision or judicial decision can declare that *all these* are conformable to Christian faith and practice. To so decide would be equivalent to making a law that every one should do as he pleased, in reference to Christian usages, which would amount to no law at all. And that is just the opposite of that for which the amendment party is striving.

7. It needs no extended argument to show that if the avowed object of that association is carried into effect, *somebody's religious rights* and privileges will be trampled down. It would then, of necessity, be decided that nobody has any right to hold to a religious usage contrary to the decisions of the court, and *dissenters* must abide the consequences. And it would make no difference how small were the minority whose consciences were held in restraint by a legal tribunal, it would still be *religious oppression*, a thing so odious in the eyes of every *true American citizen*.

8. And inasmuch as all creeds and faiths cannot possibly be embraced in such an amendment to our Constitution,—cannot possibly be alike upheld by the decisions of the courts, said decisions being based upon one and the same law,—if the object of that association is ever carried out it will be only by an *established religion* in our beloved land, wherein we have hitherto rejoiced over the despotisms of the Old World, in that our Government has protected the liberty of conscience of all her citizens, in all her borders. Now we do not care what the "reform" may be called which seeks this object, or under what specious pretense it may be carried into effect, it will be nothing less than a complete union of civil and ecclesiastical power in one and the same State or in the same court; a union of "Church and State" in all the odiousness of such a combination; for it ever has and ever will be only odious and oppressive. And the tribunal which decides what may and what may not be held as Christian usage or institution, and enforces its decisions by requisite penalties, can be no less than *the Inquisition revived*.

That we do not misapprehend, and have not misstated, the aims and objects of this association, can be abundantly proved by their own language. In the Fifth National Convention of the association, held in Pittsburg, Pa., in February, 1874, Prof. C. A. Blanchard delivered an address on "The Conflict of Law," which was enthusiastically received by the convention, in which occurred the following words:—

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measure, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion."

But this can only be accomplished by an en-

tire change in our Government; by a complete "union of Church and State." And, in addition to the points stated *seriatim* in this article, we bring the following most decisive objection to the movement.

9. If Christian institutions be put on a legal basis, not only will the rights and consciences of dissenting denominations be trampled under foot, but those having no Christian faith will be compelled to conform to these institutions without having any religious convictions. They readily concede that you cannot compel a man into Christian belief, or make a man a Christian by law; and they say they have no intention to make the effort. No; they only wish to compel them by law to *act as if they were Christians*. However deeply it may be regretted that we cannot by law compel people to be Christians, it is but slight relief to pursue a course which will compel them to be hypocrites!

10. To accomplish all this—to establish a legal standard of religion—it will be an unavoidable necessity that the Government shall be administered by professed Christians only. And it needs no great insight into politics and human nature to foresee that every political hack and office-seeking demagogue in the land will *join the church* as a means to elevation to office. If the churches were not already corrupted by worldly influences they would not seek this alliance with the State. But what must be the corruption in religious bodies when union with a church becomes a prerequisite to office under the Government?

This will give the reader some idea of the course of argument which we shall pursue in the SENTINEL, and of our reasons for entering our decided and solemn protest against this proposed change in the structure of our Government.

And now, if any yet ask why we publish a paper with the object of opposing this proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States, we return the inquiry, "Is there not a cause?"

J. H. W.

The Mormon Question.

WE are quite well aware that the objector to our position will refer to the case of the Mormons, and aver that our doctrine would uphold all the abominations of the Utah polygamists. Having viewed our ground carefully, we do not fear to meet the issue on that question, firmly believing that the "Amendment party" are utterly at fault in their pretended arguments on this subject.

"They who have the truth can afford to be fair." Wherever we find men or parties resorting to concealments or evasions, we may be assured that they are serving the cause of error. There are two ways of deceiving: One is by telling that which is false; the other by concealing or perverting that which is true. The latter is the most difficult to detect and correct, and therefore it is really the most dangerous.

It is cause for wonder that the Mormon question, in its relation to religion and morality, is not better understood. It must be accounted for, we think, by the fact that the subject of

morality itself is not understood. And nobody in the land is more greatly responsible for the confusion that exists on the subject of religion and morality, in their distinctions and relations, than the "National Reform Association." They say that the amendment to our Constitution, which they seek, is imperatively demanded in order that the evil of Mormon polygamy may be repressed. To show that we are not speaking at random in this matter, we will further quote from the speech of Prof. C. A. Blanchard, made in the Fifth National Convention of the National Reform Association, held in Pittsburg, Pa., February 4, 5, 1874:—

"The Constitution declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and also that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. These statements are very general. No law may be made prohibiting the free exercise of religion. But who is to decide what is religion? The citizens, of course, for Congress may make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Every man may choose his religion or make a new one, and Congress may not prohibit its free exercise. Tartar, Confucian, and Hindoo, may bring their gods many and lords many. The Moslem minaret may shine in the setting sun from every hill. Every graveyard becomes a temple for celestial worshippers of the dead. . . . We cannot say, as a nation, that they do not have good religions, for we must pass no act respecting the establishment of religion. We cannot forbid their practices, for we must not prohibit its free exercise.

"It answers no good purpose to say that wife-burning, man sacrificing, and babe killing are not religious practices. These things are done by millions of people in the name of religion. When we say they are not religious acts, we make a law respecting the establishment of religion. When we prohibit them, we prohibit its free exercise. The Greek may bring his god of debauchery. He may commit all the nameless crimes which darken the fair name and fame of Attica. We must not say a word. He may worship his own god in his own way.

"The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country, or the exclusion of such practices as we have named is prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and hence unconstitutional. This is the constitution which the infidel likes, and to which he wants our laws adapted."

But the framers of our Constitution were not infidels; they understood the true objects of civil Government, and wisely ordained that it should not undertake to settle questions in theology or create religious tests as qualifications for office. But let us further hear Mr. Blanchard before we attempt to point out the falsity of his reasoning:—

"But," says the Christian objector, "the laws of the States do not permit wife-burning and man-eating religions. Bigamy is punished by law, in every State of the Union, and the mother found tossing her babe to a hungry shark would be locked up in the prison or the mad house. Sabbath laws, chaplains, and chapels in every part of the public service attest the national regard for religion." True again. But what right has Government to tax me to sustain a chapel or chaplain, when it has nothing to do with religion, and I don't believe in any God? What right to interfere with the suttee, when my religion commands it? What right to imprison for bigamy, if my religion teaches it and I am free to practice any religion I choose?

The answer is plain. Just no right at all. No law which forbids the free exercise of religions which call for human sacrifice, adultery, or blasphemy, can stand a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States."

We have quoted at this length (we might quote more to the same intent) in order that we shall not be accused of not properly presenting the speaker. The reader will see that the whole force of his logic and eloquence was brought to bear against the Sixth Article and the First Amendment of the Constitution. Compare with these utterances the words of President Brunot on taking the chair in the same convention. He said:—

"The Sixth Article of the Constitution declares that, 'No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,' and the First Amendment in the Constitution provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' We have not proposed to change these. We deem them essential, in connection with the amendment we ask, to the preservation of religious liberty, and with it, an effective guard against 'a union of Church and State.'"

No man can possibly harmonize the words of the President with those of the Professor. Had the two speeches been framed for the purpose of deception they could not have better suited the purpose. Mr. Blanchard's speech was made after that of the President, and, as the reporter said, "was frequently greeted with enthusiastic applause." Mr. Brunot confessed that the First Amendment is essential "as an effective guard against a union of church and State." So we believe. But listen once more to Professor Blanchard on that point:—

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion, as it already has the Oneida Community in New York, the Mormons in Utah, and the Joss House in California."

This is frank; its intent cannot be misunderstood. If the words of Mr. Brunot are true,—if the First Amendment is essential as a guard against the union of Church and State,—how can the association deny that its indorsement of Mr. Blanchard's demand that Congress shall make laws to establish a standard of religion, is a direct demand for a union of Church and State? Congress can make no such law while the First Amendment is in force; but such a law is just what this self-styled "Reform Association" demand, and without such a law their object can never be accomplished.

But our special purpose in making these quotations is to point out the errors into which they blindly run on the subjects of religion and morality. The distinction between the two is almost universally acknowledged. We should say it is universally acknowledged if we had not the writings and speeches of these ardent "National Reformers" before us. Professor Blanchard entirely ignored this distinction in the speech from which we have so liberally quoted; and we listened to a speech of Rev. Dr. Milligan in the same convention, in which he cited numerous instances of State interference in personal action, to justify their demand,

But not a single instance of the many to which he referred had any relation whatever to religion or to religious practices! It was a persistent "begging of the question" from beginning to end, by reason of his totally disregarding the difference between morality and religion, and even disregarding the difference between common secular and ecclesiastical matters. They speak and act as if there were no distinction between civil and ecclesiastical government; as if the union of Church and State were the normal state of things, to be accepted as a matter of course.

THE LETTER OF MR. BLAINE.

On this question Hon. J. G. Blaine struck the keynote in his letter of acceptance of the nomination for the presidency. He said:—

"Religious liberty is the right of every citizen in the republic. Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to make any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. For a century under this guarantee, Protestant and Catholic, Jew and Gentile, have worshiped God according to the dictates of conscience. But religious liberty must not be perverted to the justification of offenses against the law. A religious sect, strongly entrenched in one of the Territories of the Union and spreading rapidly into four other Territories, claims the right to destroy the great safeguard and monument of social order and to practice as a religious privilege a crime punished with a severe penalty in every State in the Union. The sacredness and unity of the family must be preserved, as the foundation of all civil governments, as the source of orderly administration, as the surest guarantee of moral purity."

Mr. Blaine makes a just distinction between "a religious privilege" and "a crime." Let the reader turn again to the words of Professor Blanchard and he will see that the Professor leaves no room whatever for a distinction between religion and crime! Now if the First Amendment of the Constitution read thus: "Congress shall make no law for the suppression of crime, or restraining from the free indulgence therein," then the remarks of Professor Blanchard would contain a pertinent argument. According to the strange method of reasoning adopted by these "reformers," that section of the Constitution of the United States which forbids restraints upon religion, may be turned against every sentence in that instrument which refers to the punishment of crime. This is a discovery which no jurist would ever have made; and one which no jurist will ever recognize with respect.

It was a just remark of Dr. Watts in saying: "In a proper sense, virtue signifies duty toward man, and religion duty toward God." *Virtue* is here used as the synonym of morality, which is thus defined by Worcester: "Moral goodness; . . . uprightness; morality;—the opposite of vice." If this be true—and who can deny it—then vice may be restrained or punished, and religion be left free.

But there was one sentence in Mr. Blaine's letter which was not properly guarded. It is as follows: "Like others, the Mormons must learn that the liberty of the individual ceases where the rights of society begin." Rights never come in conflict. Governments are for the preservation—not for the deprivation—of

rights, as our "immortal Declaration" affirms. It truthfully says that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are unalienable rights; unalienable except by crime, for *crime has no rights*. A criminal may deprive himself of all rights, even of the right to life itself, in which all other rights are couched. The rights of society do not conflict with the liberty of the individual, or, the liberty of the individual does not cease where the rights of society begin. The liberty of the individual only ceases when the rights of society are invaded.

And in this we refer only to civil rights, for religious rights are not alienated even by crime, except with the alienation of life itself. By what we have already said our readers will understand that we here refer to rights which are truly religious; not to the practices of immorality or vice under the guise of religion, for no such right exists. It cannot exist unless crime has rights, which we again affirm it has not. But even criminals have religious rights with which man may not interfere. As long as God offers pardon to the penitent, so long has the penitent a right to the privileges of religion, without regard to his condition or his attitude toward society. We believe it is quite possible for a man to "sin away his day of grace;" to so sin as to forfeit the privilege or blessing of forgiveness. We find this in the teachings of Christ and of Paul. But it is not the prerogative of man to determine when the grace of God is withdrawn from the incorrigible. As long as any one desires to call upon God, and to seek his favor through those means which he has provided, no man, no class, no multitude of men, may restrain him or deprive him of the privilege. Nor shall they dictate to him how or in what manner he shall worship God, or seek his grace. The right to the free exercise of religion is beyond human control. It is a matter exclusively between the individual and his Maker—just where our Constitution has properly placed it in our favored nation.

But this is not all. As religion is not rightfully subject to human restraint or control, so it is not a matter of compulsion. Man has no right to say that his fellow-man shall or shall not be religious. If he chooses to be religious he may be, in spite of man or of circumstances. If he does not choose to be religious, no man may say he shall. Again, if he chooses to be religious, no man or class of men shall say what religion he shall practice; whether Catholic or Protestant, Christian or Mohammedan; it is by right a matter solely of his own choice, not of dictation.

These are all undeniable truths; undeniable except as human rights are denied and trampled under foot. And yet, every truth which we have herein presented is actually denied by the "Religious Amendment Party;" for if these truths, and the rights to which they refer, were properly regarded, no Religious Amendment would be asked for or desired. It is to control these rights, and confine them within a certain channel, that the Amendment is sought for. If they deny this, we have only to point to their own "platform"—to their public avowals—in which they declare that their intention is to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal

basis. And this is nothing but to make the Christian religion a matter of legal control. As far as they do deny their object to restrain the liberty of conscience in religious matters, so far they are guilty of evasion—of endeavoring to conceal their real intention. And this ought to put on his guard every American citizen, every lover of his country and its blood-bought privileges of civil and religious liberty.

The Amendment Association declared in the most positive terms that polygamy could not be dealt with unless our Constitution were amended. The Government is commendably proving that it can. They have said, and reiterated their saying, that no action against polygamy can stand before the Supreme Court under our Constitution. But events prove that it can. To be consistent, these Amendment seekers ought to join with the Mormons in declaring that the action of the Government is unconstitutional; that the polygamists are being illegally restrained of their liberty! For such is exactly their position in regard to the decisions of the courts in the cases of polygamists. And such are their views of Constitutional and religious rights! What a figure one of them would cut before the Supreme Court in expounding our Constitution! But, fortunately, crime is called crime, vice is regarded as vice, by our Courts, and their labored efforts sink into insignificance before judicial decisions.

It is the shame of America that the foul blot of polygamy has so long been suffered to exist, to prosper, and to bear undisputed sway over so large a portion of the public domain. Blood and treasure were expended without stint to rescue the colored people from their down-trodden condition. And yet our nation is so slow to learn wisdom. The public arm has scarcely been raised to rescue the women of a considerable portion of America from a degradation as vile, as abhorrent as ever cursed any people or any race. It is the greatest abomination of the age. It was a prominent part of the indictment found against slavery; that it made possible the subjection of a certain class—mark, only a certain class—of woman-kind in a part of the country, to the shame of prostitution, or to a denial of the rights of marriage. But Mormonism not only makes possible, but it makes obligatory the prostitution, or the subversion of the marriage rights, not of a certain class but of all classes of women within the reach of its power. And this not by lax civil legislation, but by the most stringent compulsion of church laws, to refuse obedience to which is made the highest crime, which subjects the refuser to the severest civil penalties, and to social and religious disabilities. American slavery was never so pernicious as a perverter of the public conscience and a destroyer of general morality, as American polygamy. We say "American polygamy," for we have strong doubts whether such an abomination would be permitted to flourish in any other civilized nation, as it has flourished here.

We think we have fully exposed the fallacy of the "Amendment Party's" argument in which they, in the face of all authority, confound crime with religion. Now the question will arise, What will you do with the Mormon

claim that the Bible teaches them to practice polygamy? First we must say that that question does not come between us and the Religious Reform Association. If the Bible were declared the supreme law of the land, the Bible argument on polygamy would have yet to be settled, just as it has now. If this Association has not foreseen this, they are blind indeed. If they have seen it, we have never learned it from any of their utterances. But, secondly, we deny the claim of the Mormons in this respect. But as this paper is already longer than we intended, we must reserve that subject for another number. The importance of the question must be our excuse for making this article so long; and much yet remains to be said.

J. H. W.

Proposed Union of Church and State.

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that the so-called National Reform Association repeatedly disclaims any desire to bring about a union of Church and State, and is professedly opposed to such a thing, it is not very difficult to show that, although its supporters reject the name, the thing itself is that for which they are most earnestly striving. This is shown plainly enough by that article of their constitution, which states that the object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall place all Christian institutions and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. Men do not seriously work for the enactment of laws which they have no intention of enforcing; therefore we may be sure that when they shall have accomplished their purpose, "Christian institutions and usages" will be enforced by law. Now when we consider that the term "the church" refers not to any single denomination, but to all professed believers in the Christian religion, it is plain that the carrying out of the design of the National Reform Party, will be nothing less than a union of Church and State.

But we are not now obliged to draw conclusions as to the intent of this Association. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and in one of the issues of March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster expressed its design in so clear a manner as to leave no room for doubt. The first proposition was that, "According to the Scriptures, Church and State are mutually separate and independent divine institutions." This proposition, which may mean anything or nothing, was doubtless intended to prepare the mind for the strong statements that follow, just as the infamous Jeffries used to raise the hopes of his victims to the highest pitch before he pronounced upon them an outrageous and cruel sentence. The second proposition is explicit enough to satisfy the dullest mind. It is this:—

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church." But the learned writer, and the ingenuous party for which he speaks, would not have any one imagine that this means a union of Church and State. Oh, no! Both are "mutually independent;" nevertheless the church is to be master, and the State

to exist simply "to serve the interests of the church." The lion and the lamb are "mutually independent and separate" animals; there can be no equal union between them; but they may lie down together, the lamb taking its position inside the lion, the better to serve his lordship's interest.

This was just the condition of things during the middle ages, when the pope had gained supreme control of affairs. There was no more union of Church and State then than there would be now if the *Statesman's* ideas were carried out. Then the State was allowed to exist solely for the purpose of serving the interests of the church, and when any secular ruler, as in the case of Henry IV., presumed to act in a way to serve the interests of his Government, he was deposed and excommunicated, and all his dominion was placed under interdict, until he submitted. Human nature has not changed a particle since the eleventh century. Let the body of professed Christians once become thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that the State exists solely to serve the interests of the church, and, with the power in their hands, the horrors of the inquisition will be revived, unless all shall allow the claim.

Again Mr. Foster says: "The true State will have a wise reference to the church's interests, in all her legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings. Public vice and crime, immorality and licentiousness, the wild boar from the forest, that devours the garden of the Lord, it destroys; and morality, virtue, and good order, the handmaids to religion, it promotes and encourages." Every Government tends to promote morality, virtue, and good order; it is for this purpose that Governments exist, and unless this is done there is no Government, for government means restraint, and Governments exist for the sole purpose of affording equal rights to all, by restraining the outward manifestation of those passions which would endanger human rights. But this promotion of good order is solely for the sake of good order, and not for the sake of religion. The State promotes virtue and good order, not because they are handmaids of religion, but because without them there will be anarchy and no government. It cannot make men moral, because morality has to do with the heart, and not simply with outward acts, of which alone the State can take cognizance. A man may be vicious at heart, and yet do nothing of which the State can take notice; nay, even his most intimate friends may be ignorant of his immoral tendencies. Religion alone can change a man's heart and make him truly virtuous; and this it can do with the individual, even if there be no State.

But Mr. Foster goes further. He says of the true State: "*The expenses of the church in carrying on her public aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury.*" It is but just to the *Statesman* to say that it enters a gentle protest to this statement, saying that the National Reform Association "does not hold that the State should contribute directly to the financial support of the church." It does, however, indorse the statement that "the church will recognize the good offices of the Christian State; and the true State will formally acknowl-

edge its obligation to serve the church;" and there is an approval of the claim that it is "the duty of the State, *as such*, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, *defend*, and *maintain* the true religion."

Is not this a union of Church and State? If it is not, then such a thing is impossible. Equality is not necessary to a union. An alliance may be formed between superior and inferior, as well as between equals. And this is the alliance proposed,—an alliance as between mistress and servant, in which the church is to act as mistress, and the State as a dutiful and obedient servant. If it is *not* a union of Church and State; it is at any rate a thing most earnestly to be shunned.

It may be wondered why we, as Christians, should object to such a union. We object to it simply because we are Christians. We know that such a union is not in accordance with the spirit of Christianity. The life and practice of our Lord was an example for all Christians. He did not ask the rulers to support him; on the contrary he recognized the right of earthly governors to exact support from him and his followers. He did not desire forced service; he asks *not now for anything but willing obedience*. He taught his followers that in this world they were to expect tribulation as pilgrims and sojourners, and not that they should exact obedience as kings in their own land; that their time for reigning would come when he himself should come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him. Matt. 25:31-34. Therefore when the church proposes, not simply to unite with the State, but to be served by the State, it is departing from the precepts of the Master, and is becoming unchristian. It is for this reason that we oppose such a step. For ourselves, we have no desire to depart from any true Christian institutions and usages; we acknowledge the divine law that enforces them, and hence have no need that they should be enforced by the law of the land; and we deem it neither just nor wise to force those who do not believe in them to conform to them. The injustice must be apparent to all, and who will say that it is a wise policy to force men to act the hypocrite?

The *Statesman* indignantly repels any accusation that its proposed amendment would infringe upon the rights of any one, much less take them away. From its own standpoint it would not interfere with the rights of any; because when that amendment should be carried, it would at once appear that all of its opposers were possessed of no rights,—a distinction without enough difference to satisfy the minority. A movement whose obvious result would be to deprive even a single individual of his inalienable rights of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, should be vigorously opposed by all true men, and most of all by Christians.

E. J. W.

No Christianity by Law.

THE following sensible remarks we find in the *Pacific*, the Congregational paper of San Francisco:—

"A circular of the 'National Reform Association' has fallen into our hands, and calls for a brief notice. We assent to its 'fundamentals,' viz.: '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.' We share in its regrets over the many 'persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our public schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, 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.' But we are not satisfied that it would be, on the whole, the best thing (even if it could be brought about with very little effort) to insert a clause in the United States Constitution, as an amendment, containing 'explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation.' We heartily desire 'to make this nation, consistently, and in the fullest sense, a Christian nation,' and all our labors are in that direction. But the nation will not be made such by any sort of an amendment to the Constitution; and when it has become such, there will be scarcely any need of such an amendment. If our spirit and conduct be Christian, any public declaration will not make the fact any more certain, will scarcely magnify it and will hardly make it more influential."

No Power but of God.

THIS is the declaration of the Apostle Paul concerning earthly Governments. Some have been troubled to reconcile what he says of the ruler, that "he beareth not the sword in vain," with the words of Christ concerning non-resistance, and also with his own words in another place in his letter to the Romans, that we shall not avenge ourselves, because vengeance belongs to the Lord, and he will repay. This latter declaration and the words of Christ in his "Sermon on the Mount" have been urged against inflicting penalties for crimes. A certain class of self-styled philanthropists assure us that he who commits a crime only proves himself an object of pity, and it is our duty to imitate the benevolence of God, who "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." The infliction of penalties (they say) is vindictive, and contrary to the spirit of Christ, who commanded to resist not evil.

But we think the trouble of those who cannot harmonize the scriptures noticed, is quite needless. And they entirely misapprehend the character of God and the nature of his Government, who seek to draw therefrom an argument against the infliction of penalties. The Apostle Peter indeed says that God is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But that does not destroy the fact that the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men will certainly come.

Blackstone well says that the strength of a law is in its penalty. Indeed, there can be no law without a penalty. It is the penalty which divides between *law* and *advice*, for a rule is only *enforced* by a penalty, and that counsel which cannot be enforced is only advisory—not peremptory. Hence to enact laws with no penalties would be only a farce; and to enact laws with penalties, and never execute them, would also be a farce. Practically the result would be the same—there would be no law.

And it is also true—evidently true—that in

the absence of law there can be no Government. Where no law is, sin cannot be imputed, and virtue cannot be defined; there can be no transgression, no obedience, no measurement of right and wrong. Every one is then left free to do that which is right in his own eyes, restrained only by the fear of him who may be stronger and more desperate than himself.

BUT the question is raised: Do you believe that wicked Governments are of God? We reply that God is the Author of Government, as he is the Creator of man. There is no man who cannot trace his origin to the hand of God; and there is no Government which has not its basis in the order which God has established. Man has "sought out many inventions," and lost his uprightness; but he is still to be regarded as the creature of God, endowed by his Creator with noble powers and great privileges. And so of Governments; they may abuse their power, and pervert justice—but that power originates in God and in his ordinance. And thus Jesus answered Pilate: "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above."

A Government that is measurably wicked is better than none at all. Rule, even when unnecessarily stern and severe, is better than disorder and confusion. While tyranny oppresses, anarchy destroys. Where Government exists, where order is enforced, some rights will be secured. But where anarchy and confusion reign, there no rights are secure. Society, in any proper sense, cannot exist. Therefore without Government, without a conservation of rights, whatever the aspirations of man may be, he cannot rise above a state of barbarism. But "God is not the author of confusion." Who would not thank and adore him that he has ordained Governments upon the earth, and that he upholds them by his providence and by the authority of his word?

Paul thus describes the power of the Governor: "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Many take the view that when Christ came he entirely changed the order which had theretofore existed, and in his Sermon on the Mount destroyed the power of civil Government. But the words of Paul here quoted disprove this. And his words here coincide with other expressions in the New Testament.

How, then, is the apparent discrepancy of the texts to be reconciled? In this manner: In the Sermon on the Mount Christ was speaking to his disciples—to his church. Paul, in Rom. 13, was speaking, not of the church, but of civil Government. If Matt. 5:38-40, Rom. 12:19, and 13:1-4 had been spoken to and of the same class, we cannot see how they could be harmonized; a contradiction would seem to be unavoidable.

And the conclusion is now unavoidable that in these scriptures the church and civil Government are separated, never to be united. The Government is to execute vengeance, wrath, or justice upon evil-doers; the church is not. The highest office borne by the apostles of Christ was that of ambassadors; 2 Cor. 5:19,

20. The civil Governor was an executive officer. The two were not united. In the Scriptures they are kept separate. But in the days of Constantine the two began to be united; the bishop of Rome was made a civil magistrate. And his power as a magistrate was increased because he was the bishop of the church. Soon he laid aside his commission as an ambassador of reconciliation, and history attests that he did not bear the sword in vain! And when the sword of power was united with the office of a Christian bishop, then began the "dark ages" of the church. Thenceforth the church, presided over by bishops holding the sword of civil power, became a harlot "drunken with the blood of the saints."

Look to all history and see the effect of uniting the civil and Christian elements in Governments. Look at Rome; look at Constantinople, now the Greek Church; look at Spain, at Austria, at Mexico, at South America, where the civil authority is subordinated to or amalgamated with the ecclesiastical. England stands highest in the list of "Established Churches," but behold the traffic in sacred orders; the "livings" possessed by profligate clergymen, sold to men in no manner qualified to fill the office. Such abuses could not exist were not the nation made a professedly "Christian nation" by uniting religion with the secular power. And, to come nearer to our homes, yes, to our very homes, look at Utah! This foul blot in our favored nation shows what is *possible*, and nearly what has always been actual, when the civil power is subordinated to the ecclesiastical; when the faith and practice of the church is enforced by civil authority.

For the sake of our national honor; for the sake of religion; for the sake of the liberty of conscience which we have hitherto enjoyed under our Constitution; for the sake of the purity of the churches, we hope and pray that our Government will not be turned into a *religious machine* to turn out machine-made Christians! We hope that the Christian religion will never be placed on a "legal basis" in the Constitution of the United States. And we hope the American people will be warned, and resolve to frustrate the purpose of those religious zealots who demand that "*Congress shall establish a standard of religion.*" And we promise to do our utmost to sound the alarm—to warn the people of the danger which is coming to our homes. If "pure religion and undefiled" could be advanced by civil legislation; if men could be made Christians by vote, we would gladly join the "Religious Amendment Party;" but when the opposite is certain to be the effect of such action, we cannot refrain from raising our voices in an earnest protest against the union of the churches with the civil power. J. H. W.

If the struggle be between Christianity and infidelity, we take the side of Christianity. If between a Christian and an infidel, we stop and inquire into the cause. If the Christian is endeavoring to deprive the infidel of his rights, we will ignore his profession and defend the infidel. *True* Christianity robs no one of his rights, but its followers do to others as they would that others should do to them. w.

Macaulay on Gladstone.

"The State in its relations with the Church. By W. E. Gladstone, Esq., Student of Christ Church, and M. P. for Newark. 8vo. Second Edition. London, 1839."

SUCH is the title of a work which Macaulay reviewed in the year of its issue. The matter of the book and the review is now nearly half a century old, but in one sense it will never grow old. The reviewer certainly shows himself master of the situation, and we take great pleasure in giving some extracts from his argument. If the reader will drop the name, "Mr. Gladstone," and read "Religious Amendment Party" in its place, it will read just as well, and be timely in its application. We hope to give more from this essay in the future:—

"When we pass from individuals to systems, we by no means find that the aptitude of Governments for propagating religious truth is proportioned to their aptitude for secular functions. Without being blind admirers either of the French or of the American institutions, we think it clear that the persons and property of citizens are better protected in France and in New England than in almost any society that now exists, or that has ever existed; very much better, certainly, than in the Roman empire under the orthodox rule of Constantine and Theodosius. But neither the Government of France, nor that of New England, is so organized as to be fit for the propagation of theological doctrines. Nor do we think it improbable that the most serious religious errors might prevail in a State which, considered merely with reference to temporal objects, might approach far nearer than any that has ever been known, to the idea of what a State should be.

"But we shall leave this abstract question, and look at the world as we find it. Does, then, the way in which Governments generally obtain their power make it at all probable that they will be more favorable to orthodoxy than to heterodoxy? A nation of barbarians pours down on a rich and unwarlike empire, enslaves the people, portions out the land, and blends the institutions which it finds in the cities with those which it has brought from the woods. A handful of daring adventurers from a civilized nation wander to some savage country, and reduce the aboriginal race to bondage. A successful general turns his arms against the State which he serves. A society, made brutal by oppression, rises madly on its masters, sweeps away all old laws and usages, and, when its first paroxysm of rage is over, sinks down passively under any form of polity which may spring out of the chaos. A chief of a party, as at Florence, becomes imperceptibly a sovereign, and the founder of a dynasty. A captain of mercenaries, as at Milan, seizes on a city, and by the sword makes himself its ruler. An elective Senate, as at Venice, usurps permanent and hereditary power. It is in events such as these that Governments have generally originated; and we can see nothing in such events to warrant us in believing that the Governments thus called into existence will be peculiarly well fitted to distinguish between religious truth and heresy.

"When, again, we look at the constitutions of Governments which have become settled, we find no great security for the orthodoxy of

rulers. One magistrate holds power because his name was drawn out of a purse; another, because his father held it before him. There are representative systems of all sorts, large constituent bodies, small constituent bodies, universal suffrage, high pecuniary qualifications. We see that, for the temporal ends of government, some of these constitutions are very skillfully constructed, and that the very worst of them is preferable to anarchy. We see some sort of connection between the very worst of them and the temporal well-being of society. But it passes our understanding to comprehend what connection any one of them has with theological truth.

"And how stands the fact? Have not almost all the Governments in the world always been in the wrong on religious subjects? Mr. Gladstone, we imagine, would say that, except in the time of Constantine, of Jovian, and of a very few of their successors, and occasionally in England since the Reformation, no Government has ever been sincerely friendly to the pure and apostolical Church of Christ. If, therefore, it be true that every ruler is bound in conscience to use his power for the propagation of his own religion, it will follow that, for one ruler who has been bound in conscience to use his power for the propagation of truth, a thousand have been bound in conscience to use their power for the propagation of falsehood. Surely this is a conclusion from which common sense recoils. Surely, if experience shows that a certain machine, when used to produce a certain effect, does not produce that effect once in a thousand times, but produces, in the vast majority of cases, an effect directly contrary, we cannot be wrong in saying that it is not a machine of which the principal end is to be so used.

"If, indeed, the magistrate would content himself with laying his opinions and reasons before the people, and would leave the people, uncorrupted by hope or fear, to judge for themselves, we should see little reason to apprehend that his interference in favor of error would be seriously prejudicial to the interests of truth. Nor do we, as will hereafter be seen, object to his taking this course, when it is compatible with the efficient discharge of his more especial duties. But this will not satisfy Mr. Gladstone. He would have the magistrate resort to means which have a great tendency to make malcontents, to make hypocrites, to make careless nominal conformists, but no tendency whatever to produce honest and rational conviction. It seems to us quite clear that an inquirer who has no wish except to know the truth is more likely to arrive at the truth than an inquirer who knows that, if he decides one way, he shall be rewarded, and that, if he decides the other way, he shall be punished. Now, Mr. Gladstone would have Governments propagate their opinions by excluding all dissenters from all civil office. That is to say, he would have Governments propagate their opinions by a process which has no reference whatever to the truth or falsehood of those opinions, by arbitrarily uniting certain worldly advantages with one set of doctrines, and certain worldly inconveniences with another set. It is of the very nature of argument to serve the interests of truth; but if rewards and punishments serve the interests of truth, it is by

mere accident. It is very much easier to find arguments for the divine authority of the Gospel than for the divine authority of the Koran. But it is just as easy to bribe or rack a Jew into Mohammedanism as into Christianity."

A Parallel.

THE following is from Froude's picture of Rome in the days of Cæsar. The reader will be dull indeed who cannot see in it a striking parallel to very many features of our own nation in our own time. All that is wanting to make our country equal to Rome in its darkest days and worst phases, is to closely unite the civil and religious interests of the nation, so as to make the State uphold the church and enforce her dogmas:—

"With such vividness, with such transparent clearness, the age stands before us of Cato and Pompey, of Cicero and Julius Cæsar; the more distinctly because it was an age in so many ways the counterpart of our own, the blossoming period of the old civilization, when the intellect was trained to the highest point which it could reach, and on the great subjects of human interest, on morals and politics, on poetry and art, even on religion itself and the speculative problems of life, men thought as we think, doubted where we doubt, argued as we argue, aspired and struggled after the same objects. It was an age of material progress and material civilization; an age of civil liberty and intellectual culture; an age of pamphlets and epigrams, of salons and of dinner parties, of senatorial majorities and electoral corruption. The highest offices of State were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined, in fact, to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged for distinctions of wealth. The struggles between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege were over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society. The free cultivators were disappearing from the soil. Italy was being absorbed into vast estates, held by a few favored families and cultivated by slaves, while the old agricultural population was driven off the land, and was crowded into towns. The rich were extravagant, for life had ceased to have practical interest, except for its material pleasures; the occupation of the higher classes was to obtain money without labor, and to spend it in idle enjoyment. Patriotism survived on the lips, but patriotism meant the ascendancy of the party which would maintain the existing order of things, or would overthrow it for a more equal distribution of the good things which alone were valued. Religion, once the foundation of the laws and rule of personal conduct, had subsided into opinion. The educated, in their hearts, disbelieved it. Temples were still built with increasing splendor; the established forms were scrupulously observed. Public men spoke conventionally of Providence; that they might throw on their opponents the odium of impiety; but of genuine belief that life had any serious meaning, there was none remaining beyond the circle of the

silent, patient, ignorant multitude. The whole spiritual atmosphere was saturated with cant—cant moral, cant political, cant religious; an affectation of high principle which had ceased to touch the conduct, and flowed on in an increasing volume of insincere and unreal speech. The truest thinkers were those who, like Lucretius, spoke frankly out their real convictions, declared that Providence was a dream, and that man and the world he lived in were material phenomena, generated by natural forces out of cosmic atoms, and into atoms to be again resolved.

"Tendencies now in operation may a few generations hence land modern society in similar conclusions, unless other convictions revive meanwhile and get the mastery of them; of which possibility no more need be said than this, that unless there be such a revival in some shape or other, the forces, whatever they be, which control the forms in which human things adjust themselves, will make an end again, as they made an end before, of what are called free institutions. Popular forms of government are possible only when individual men can govern their own lives on moral principles, and when duty is of more importance than pleasure, and justice than material expediency."

A Christian Nation.

THERE is no such thing as a Christian nation on earth. The queen of England is the head of the church, and the Government supports the church. But the recent revelations of iniquity in high places in London leads us to think it might appropriately be named "the great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt." Rev. 11:8. Only a very small proportion of any nation is truly Christian. The "National Reform Association" says that this is a Christian nation, and therefore we must have a religious amendment of the Constitution that we may properly represent ourselves to the world. They also say that nothing will make us a Christian nation but such an amendment. The N. Y. *Independent*, in January, 1875, thus pointedly exposed their inconsistency:—

"This being a Christian nation, we have a right to acknowledge God in the Constitution; because, as things are now, this is not a Christian nation, and needs such recognition to make it one.

"This having always been a Christian nation, we have a right to keep it such; and, therefore, we need this Amendment, since hitherto, without it, we have only been a heathen nation.

"In other words, we need to make this a Christian nation because we are already such; on the ground that if we do not make it such we are not a Christian nation.

"Because the people are substantially all Christians we have a right and have need to make the Constitution Christian, to check our powerful element of unbelievers.

"We mean to interfere with no man's rights, but only to get certain rights, now belonging to all, restricted to Christians.

"This Religious Amendment is to have no practical effect, its object being to check infidelity.

"It is to interfere with no man's rights, but

only to make the unbeliever concede to Christians the right to rule in their interest, and to give up like claims for himself.

"It is meant to have no practical effect; and therefore, will be of great use to us.

"We want to recognize God, and Christianity as our national duty to Deity; but intend to give no effect to such recognition—pleasing God by judicially voting ourselves pious and doing nothing more.

"We shall leave all religions in equality before the law, and make Christianity the adopted religion of the nation.

"Christianity, being justice, requires us to put down infidelity by taking advantage of our numbers to secure rights which we do not allow to others.

"Justice to Christians is one thing, and to infidels another.

"We being a Christian people, the Jewish and unbelieving portion of our people are not, of right, part of the people.

"And so, having no rights which we, as Christians, are bound to respect, we must adopt this Amendment in our interest.

"Passing this act will not make any to be Christians who are not Christians, but it is needed to make this a more Christian nation.

"The people are not to be made more Christian by it; but, since the nation cannot be Christian unless the people are, it is meant to make the nation Christian without affecting the people.

"That is, the object of this Amendment is to make the nation Christian without making the people Christians.

"By putting God in the Constitution he will be recognized by nobody else than those who already recognize him; and, therefore, we need the amendment for a fuller recognition of him.

"If we say we believe in God and Christ in the Constitution, it is true of those believing in him and a lie as to the rest; and, as the first class already recognize him, we want this Amendment as a recognition by the latter class, so that our whole people shall recognize him.

"Whether we have an acknowledgment of God in the Constitution or not, we are a Christian nation; and, therefore, it is this recognition of God that is to make us a Christian nation."

DR. A. M. MILLIGAN was one of the main spokes in the National Reform wheel. He died not long since, and, in writing of him afterward, Mr. M. A. Gault, a secretary and one of the chief speakers of the National Reform Party, said:—

"I heard him once remark that he was mainly indebted to his theological professor, Dr. James R. Wilson, for his inspiration on National Reform. I can say that I received my inspiration on that subject from Dr. A. M. Milligan."

We think that this is just the correct statement of the scheme of National Reform inspiration. We are satisfied that that is the exact size of the channel along which the stream of National Reform inspiration flows. And we are sure that the religio-political aspirations of ambitious clerics is the highest point to which the source of National Reform inspiration can ever be traced.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., JANUARY, 1886.

TO ALL our readers we recommend the selection on another page from Macaulay's review of Gladstone on "Church and State." In justice to Gladstone we add that he repudiated his former position after reading the review. The Religious Amendment Party is advised to make a note of this fact.

THE *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the Religious Amendment Party, is now in the midst of its 18th volume, and has never had an opponent to expose its fallacies, or to advocate the rights of conscience in our land. We hope to keep them close company the rest of the race.

THERE is in the land no paper as large as the SENTINEL, published monthly, the contents of which is got up with so great care, which is offered at so small a price. The publishers will not make money in the enterprise, but they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they are doing good service to the cause of our country, and of our common humanity. We expect that all, without respect to party or beliefs, who love "justice, liberty, and equality," will give us their support, and aid in extending the circulation of the SENTINEL. We intend that every article shall be carefully prepared, and nothing be admitted to its columns to which anyone can reasonably take exceptions. Wherever we find error, in whatever company it may be, we shall pay heed to the words of the prophet—"Cry aloud, spare not."

A "Non Sequitur."

IN the address of Dr. Hays, in the Pittsburg Convention, speaking of the State Constitutional Convention, he said:—

"Would it have been out of place for them to have said, The Bible is for this State the standard of morality, and on all subjects concerning which the State takes action, it is to be the guide?"

But Dr. Hays knew perfectly well that a *moral amendment* is not what they ask. Their declaration is for a *religious amendment*. They avow their intention to put the usages, institutions, and laws of *Christianity* on a legal basis. Is it possible that there are Doctors of Divinity in our land who are so ignorant of principles as to confound *Christian* institutions with *moral* laws? And if the Bible is to be the standard of civil legislation, whose construction of the Bible shall be adopted? Would not such a declaration as Dr. Hays suggested, and such an amendment as this Association seeks, lead to endless religious disputes in our legislatures and in Congress? And will this increase general respect for the Bible, and tend to purify the religious atmosphere of our country? Just the reverse, we firmly believe. When a candidate's religious position is to be canvassed in party caucuses, and political demagogues, because they have *wired* themselves into office, have to settle questions on the Bible, then we may write "Ichabod" on our churches and on the *popular* religion. Heaven save us from that day!

The Never-Falling Result.

M'CLINTOCK AND STRONG'S "Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedia" thus speaks of the result of Constantine's taking the church under the patronage of the Government:—

"All impediments to an open profession of Christianity were removed, and it became the established religion of the empire. Numerous, however, in various points of view, as were the advantages accruing to it from this change, it soon began to suffer from being brought into close contact with the fostering influence of secular power. The simplicity of the gospel was corrupted; pompous rites and ceremonies were introduced; worldly honors and emoluments were conferred on the teachers of Christianity; and the kingdom of Christ in a great measure was converted into a kingdom of this world."

If they who advocate the union of civil and ecclesiastical power in the United States could show that the result above specified has not been the unfailing effect of such a union, or if they could give a reason why we should not expect the same result of such a union here, then they could make a more plausible appeal in behalf of their movement. But we can give good reasons for looking for the same effect from the same cause, everywhere and every time.

Too Plain to Be Denied.

IN the National Convention of the Reform Party, in 1874, President Brunot said they had no intention to disturb that provision of our Constitution which forbids any religious test as a qualification for office. Yet in 1875, the *Christian Statesman*, speaking of certain congressmen who traveled on Sunday on their way to Washington, said:—

"Not one of those men who thus violated the Sabbath is fit to hold official position in a Christian nation. . . . Give us in the National Constitution, the simple acknowledgment of the law of God as the supreme law of nations, and all the results indicated in this note will ultimately be secured."

Waiving the "quantum of the sin" involved, we would like to know how a "Christian nation" can make a person ineligible to office on such a ground, and yet not disturb the aforesaid provision of the Constitution? The truth is, that such a Religious Amendment as that for which they call would require the entire remodeling of our Government, to make it conform to the demands of the churches. And this that party knows, and their efforts are put forth with a full knowledge of that fact in view. Are the American people prepared for this? Can they be persuaded to it?

A Good Confession.

It is an old saying, that an open confession is good for the soul. In the *Christian Statesman* of Jan. 8, 1885, we find one that is most excellent. Rev. J. M. Armour, a zealous National Reformer, after telling how a certain man had expressed to him the hope that the National Reform movement may succeed, utters the following sentence, which we quote *verbatim et literatim*, italics and all:—

"As I left him, I felt deeply that our movement was literally following in the footsteps of that monarch of old, of whom it is so often said that he '*sinned and made Israel to sin.*'"

That is good. Indeed it would be impossible to more fitly describe the nature of the National Reform movement. And yet we cannot help thinking it a queer confession to come from one who is so wedded to that movement as is Mr. Armour. We rather incline to the opinion that he intended to pay a compliment to National Reform. But be that as it may, he states the exact truth.

Is It Blindness?

GEORGE P. HAYS, D. D., president of a college in Pennsylvania, delivered an address at the National Convention of the Religious Amendment Association in Pittsburg, in February, 1874. The reporter said his speech "was received with frequent marks of approbation, and his witty points drew forth shouts of laughter." We can testify that this was the case. We shall have use for some of his points hereafter. For the present we only notice his argument against neutrality in regard to the subject of the Amendment. He said:—

"To attempt neutrality by a nation that has crimes to punish, and rights of property to decide, is equally impossible and can only issue in practical but utter atheism."

That there is any relation between laws for the punishment of crime and the protection of property, and a Religious Amendment to our Constitution which would unite religion and the State, it will take more than a *witty man* to show. If this was not the intention of the argument, then we would like to know why these ideas were thus coupled together in the address. And can anybody be saved from atheism by an amendment of our National Constitution? If we could only have an amendment of the Constitution which would secure some people against imbecility, it would be well worth striving for.

WELL PUT.—The *Champlain Journal*, speaking of the proposed Religious Amendment of the Constitution, made the following just remarks:

"However slight, it is the first move for a union of Church and State. If we may cut off ever so few persons from the right of citizenship on account of difference of religious belief, then with equal justice and propriety may a majority at any time dictate the adoption of still further articles of belief, until our Constitution is but the text-book of a sect beneath whose tyrannical sway *all liberty of religious opinion will be crushed.*"

At first it appeared "slight," because its advocates so stoutly denied their object of erecting in the Constitution "a standard of religion" to which all must conform. But from their later avowals Church and State stand out in bold relief in their intentions.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1886.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

Effect of National Religion.

THE *Examiner and Chronicle* is the leading Baptist paper of this country. When the National Reform Association was formed, and the object announced, to procure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States, this paper said:—

"This agitation for a national religion, officially professed, has, for its logical outcome, persecution—that, and nothing more nor less. It is a movement backward to the era of Constantine; as far below the spirituality of the New Testament as it is below the freedom of republican America."

The State and the Church.

IN 1848 Baptist W. Noel (England), a writer of acknowledged ability, published a work on the subject of Church and State, in which he reviewed some of the positions taken by Mr. Gladstone on this subject. His work was not a review of Gladstone, as was Macaulay's essay, but his points are equally well made. Unlike Macaulay, he is "a dissenter" and a minister. The following extract is from Mr. Noel's book, page 29:—

"How many members of Parliament profess to trust wholly in Christ for their salvation from hell, and therefore make his word their exclusive rule of conduct? If the majority are without this faith, they are unchristian and ungodly; and the union between the church and the State, is the union between the churches of Christ and a body of unconverted men—it is the union of the church with the world. And since all who are not with Christ are against him, it is the union of his friends with his enemies. The effect of the union does not depend upon what the State ought to be, but upon what it is; and to advocate the union because the State is bound to be evangelical, is the same thing as to say that a thief should be made the trustee of a property because he is bound to be honest; or that the Lord's supper should be administered to a drunken profligate because he is bound to be virtuous and sober. The advocates of the union constantly argue, not from what the State is, but from what it ought to be; and infer most erroneously the effect of the union of the churches with the actual State from what they suppose would be the effect of their union with the Utopian State. The actual State is irreligious, and the churches are bound to dissolve their union with it."

Secularized Christianity.

IN the first number of the *SENTINEL*, we pointed out some of the unavoidable consequences of legalizing Christianity in our Government. The points there set forth are so clear and undeniable that we do not fear contradiction on any one of them. To place the laws and usages of Christianity on a "legal basis," as the "National Reform Association" demands, is to so relate them to the Government that they may be enforced by law. But as to what is Christian law, usage, or institution, or as to the intention and manner of observance of these laws and institutions, there is a world-wide difference of opinion in the United States. How shall these differences be reconciled, or by what authority shall these conflicts of faith and practice be adjusted? On this point we affirmed as follows:—

"The court is necessarily constituted the judge and exponent of the law; and therefore if disagreement arises as to the meaning of the law, or as to what constitutes a misdemeanor in the premises, the court is the authority, and the sole authority; to which appeal must be made."

That is to say, that the court shall decide what is and what is not a Christian law or institution, and how Christian laws and institutions shall or shall not be observed, and what is and what is not a violation of the laws of Christianity. This cannot be denied. And it would be no relief from this sad state of things to refer questions of Christian law to a body of ecclesiastics for decision; for (1) No body of ecclesiastics can reconcile all conflicting views; they would simply express their own views of the questions; (2) The court would have to enforce their decision; and (3) It would still remain true that Christian faith and practice would be removed from the domain of individual conscience, where they properly belong, and placed in the hands of a legal tribunal. It would be a long step backward toward "the Dark Ages," for which we trust the American people are not prepared.

It is a matter of surprise that any intelligent person can suppose that the cause of Christianity would be benefited by a formal declaration in our Constitution that the Bible is the supreme rule of the conduct of the nation. If such a declaration were incorporated into our Constitution to-day, it would not in the least change the attitude of the people toward the principles which the Bible inculcates. It is pertinent to inquire, What is the actual attitude of the people toward the Bible? And what effect would such a declaration have upon the Christianity of the nation?

Dividing the whole nation into two classes, we shall find that they who profess to love and reverence the Bible are greatly in the minority. A small fraction of the people of the United States habitually attend those services where the Bible is taught as the word of God. The great majority are altogether indifferent to the Bible. Many of this class may profess respect for it; but it is such respect as they would profess for a citizen who was somewhat popular with some of their neighbors, but for whom they personally cared nothing. Christian society may hold them somewhat under restraint; otherwise they live very much as if there were no Bible in existence.

And of those who habitually attend places of public worship, only a part—and we think the smaller part—have real love for the Bible, and earnestly strive to make it the rule of their conduct. Many go to the churches under the impulse of various selfish and worldly motives. The real lovers of the Bible and of Bible truth, who are willing to sacrifice self and the world to conform to its teachings, are literally a "little flock." In this judgment we are not unmindful or ignorant of the real standing of Christianity in the world. We only recognize facts, and pay respect to the words of our Saviour, who declared that the way to life is a narrow way wherein few are found, and that the broad way, where the multitude go, is the way to destruction.

Of those who profess faith in the Bible, and are members of churches, we have no need to make divisions; they have saved us that trouble. They are scattered in some hundreds of denominations, with every conceivable faith concerning the teachings and intentions of the Scriptures. How far they are right, and how far they are wrong, it is not our province to inquire. That each and all of them have some truth, no one will dispute. That any one of them has all the truth, scarcely any one would claim. Amid all these conflicting theological opinions, on what basis would the Bible be enforced as the supreme law of the land?

It would be impossible for any court to so construe the Bible as to make it uphold and give warrant to all the conflicting creeds and faiths of the churches. And it is not to be supposed that the judges of our numerous courts would be able to come to an agreement concerning the intention and meaning of the Scriptures, seeing that the most eminent and learned ministers and Doctors of Divinity and Professors of Theology cannot. It is said that minor issues may be dropped, and only those points of faith and doctrine be enforced upon

which all denominations are agreed. But that is impossible; for it is a fact that they are not all agreed upon any point of faith or practice. We repeat the query, On what basis, then, shall the doctrines of the Bible be enforced? Whose faith and practice shall be accepted as the true, and whose shall be condemned as false?

We have no doubt that an attempt will be made to act upon the plan suggested; to drop the questions and doctrines considered "non-essential" by the larger denominations, and insist upon and enforce those which are popularly accepted. It was remarked by a learned D. D., in the time of the slavery agitation, that he did not care if the devil wrote the Constitution; he was only interested to know what was the intention of those who adopted it. And this would finally be the standard by which the usages and institutions of Christianity would be enforced by the courts. The Bible would nominally be the rule of the nation's conduct, while the intentions and wishes of those who were instrumental in procuring the religious amendment to the Constitution would be the actual rule to be enforced. Very few (if any) judges could be found who would literally construe the Bible in the face of public opinion; and no one would long retain his seat who would presume to do so. The courts would naturally become the instruments to enforce, not the Bible itself, but *the most popular construction of the Bible*. Let any one examine this subject, weigh the contingencies, and come to a different conclusion if he can.

But popularity and true Christianity never went hand in hand. Popular religion—the only religion that the masses would tolerate—is a worldly religion. It may be "Christian" in name, but is never in fact. We repeat our wonder that any intelligent person can think that Christianity will be benefited by being allied to the secular power. Lord Macaulay well said: "The whole history of Christianity shows that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by the alliance of power, than of being crushed by its opposition."

It is needless to inquire what would be the effect on those denominations who were so unfortunate as to be on the unpopular side. First a premium would be held out to them to become hypocrites; but if they maintained their integrity, their rights would not be respected by the popular majority, and of course not in the courts. Such a state of things would be greatly to be deplored, and we shall honestly and conscientiously put forth every effort in our power to prevent such a calamity befalling our nation and the Christian religion.

J. H. W.

An officer of the National Reform Association said: "They [infidels] demand that all Christian usages and institutions be abrogated to conform to the Constitution. We propose to amend it to conform to the actual character of the nation." If, in a family of ten, three were professed Christians and seven were infidels, could that family be called a Christian family? If these professed reformers would call things by their right names, they would not utter so many fallacies. This is not a Christian nation, and an amendment of the Constitution would neither increase nor elevate its religion.

The Mormon Question.

THE "National Reform Association" has not shown wisdom in its method of opposing Mormonism. We have exposed the fallacy of the reasoning of its speakers in confounding religion with crime. Utah presents the nearest approach to their ideal of a true State to be found in the country, because in Utah the civil power is subordinated to the ecclesiastical. There the State exists to serve the church. Religion is placed "on an undeniable legal basis" in Mormondom. The state of things now existing in Utah could not exist—could never have existed—had not a close alliance been formed between the church and the State. Recently on our calling at the office of the *Tribune* in Salt Lake City, the editor made a remark which we think is worthy of the consideration of all in the "Religious Amendment Party." He said: "Before they effect a union of church and State throughout the land, they would better come to Salt Lake, and see how it works. Here we have it in its full strength."

Suppose the Bible were legally declared to be the supreme law of the land, what influence would that have on the Mormons? How far would such a declaration go towards settling the dispute between the Mormons and other churches and the nation? The Mormons have never denied that proposition; professedly they make the Bible the basis of their institutions. How, then, would such a declaration uproot the evils of Mormonism? We can imagine but one answer which the Amendmentists can make. They may say: "Give us the power to enforce Christianity by law, and we will compel the Mormons to abstain from polygamy."

But this answer, which is, indeed, embodied in their declarations, is not creditable to those who make it. What they ask is the power to enforce *their construction* of the Bible, without regard to the construction which others may put upon it. Allowing that their construction is correct, as far as polygamy is concerned, if it is to be merely the arbitrary exercise of power, what assurance can we have that they may not exercise that power in matters whereon their construction may be wrong? And what could they do in that direction more than the Government is doing without their help? We approve the action of the Government in its efforts to exterminate polygamy, because polygamy is not a religious institution. But these professed reformers confess that polygamy is a part of religion, and say that the Government has no right to suppress it under our present Constitution! On this we gave proof direct in our first number. But behold again their inconsistency. They promise to suppress this part of the religion of the Mormons if the Constitution shall be amended, and they over and over again assure us that the amendment is only intended to recognize God as the author of the nation's existence, without at all interfering with anybody's religion.

We deny that polygamy is a religious institution in any proper sense of the word "religion." The Mormons profess to be Christians, and therefore we use the word religion as it is used in Christian lands. The righteousness which God requires in his word is that of obedience,

"He that doeth righteousness is righteous." 1 John 3:7. "And it shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. 6:25. There is no righteousness, no obedience, in doing that which he has not commanded. That which is offered in worship which is outside of his requirements, is "will-worship," or "voluntary humility," and is displeasing to him. Col. 2:18-23. Of such as offer will-worship it may well be asked: "Who hath required this at your hand?" Isa. 1:12.

We deny in the most positive terms that God ever instituted polygamy, or ever required its practice. He tolerated or permitted it, as he did many other things which never met his approval. We ask the reader to examine into the origin of polygamy, confident that he will recognize the reason and force of our denial.

Tracing the descendants of Adam through his two sons, Seth and Cain, to the seventh generation, we come to Enoch and Lamech. Enoch, descended from Seth, was a most godly man, and was counted worthy of translation. He did not die, for "God took him." Lamech, the seventh from Adam, was also a remarkable man. Up to this time in every instance where the marriage relation is mentioned, a single wife is recognized. But the record says: "And Lamech took unto him two wives." He was the first polygamist. According to Mormon ethics, he, too, was a very godly man—the first to observe this very important relation. But, to the contrary, he was a murderer; a self-convicted criminal, according to his own confession sevenfold more worthy of punishment than Cain. Surely, polygamy has a bad parentage!

Although no direct proof of the practice of polygamy is found in the Scriptures for a long time after Lamech, there is reason to believe that the children of Cain did practice it.

Speaking of the sons of Seth, the record says: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." Margin, "to call themselves by the name of the Lord."

But after the lapse of some eight hundred years after Enoch, all classes had corrupted their way before God. The children of Seth joined affinity with the children of Cain. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." This strongly implies that the marriage institution was abused; and it is there recorded that their wickedness was so great that God determined to destroy them all.

Noah and his three sons and their wives were saved from the destruction which came upon the world. Each had but one wife, for only eight were in the ark. 1. Peter 3:20. Only one century passed after the flood, when men became so arrogant and ambitious—so Heaven-defying—that God confounded their language, and scattered them abroad. And in something over five centuries they again became exceedingly wicked, as instance the people of Sodom. And their wickedness was specially manifested in the abuse of the marriage relation—in the gratification of vile lusts. Raised amid such surroundings, it is no marvel that the daughters of Lot had but a low sense of morality, as was manifested in their conduct after the destruction of Sodom.

The history of Genesis is very brief, generally speaking more of the better class of men than of the worst. Generations of wicked people are passed over without mention. But Abraham occupies a large place in the history, and polygamists are wont to point with great satisfaction to his unfortunate departure from the original rule of marriage. But the circumstances are anything but helpful to their cause. God had promised that Abraham and his seed should inherit the land. Abraham was childless, yet he believed the promise of God. Sarah had not the faith of Abraham, and fearing that the promise of God would fail, resorted to an expedient to effect its fulfillment! Abraham complaisantly listened to his wife, and took her Egyptian serving maid, by whom he had a son. But the Lord did not sanction the expedient; he refused to accept the son of the Egyptian maid as the heir of the promise, though Abraham earnestly besought him to do so. He refused to make him joint-heir with Sarah's son. And this abuse of the marriage relation by Abraham was the cause of long-continued trouble in his family. Hagar became scornful and disobedient to her mistress, and Sarah could not endure her conduct. Too late she confessed her wrong. See Gen. 16:5. Ishmael was "a wild man." His descendants have been a wild, roving, predatory race. Their hands have been against every man; they have been lawless from the beginning even unto this day.

Isaac was a godly man, having but one wife. And we have reason to believe that Jacob would have been a monogamist, had it not been for the wicked and cruel deception practiced upon him by his heathen father-in-law. The taking of Leah was not a matter of choice with him; but when he found that she had been imposed upon him, he submitted to the deception, and to the suggestion of Laban, and took Rachel also.

Now, we ask, where is the evidence that polygamy was an ordinance of God, a religious duty? Nothing of the kind can be found. The thought is shocking to every one who has studied the subject in its relations. That God permitted certain things without approving them is beyond denial. Paul said: "The times of this ignorance God suffered; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Acts 17:30. When the Pharisees questioned Jesus on the subject of divorce, he said: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." He removed the glosses which a hard-hearted people had thrown over the marriage institution, and gave his sanction to the arrangement which existed "from the beginning." And how was it in the beginning? God "made them male and female"—not male and females. He made a woman and gave her to Adam for a wife, not women for his wives. Jesus said: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife [not unto his wives], and they two shall be one flesh," not they three nor they five.

If polygamy were the proper marriage relation, pleasing to God, why is it that it was not instituted in "the beginning"? Why was not something said somewhere that it was pleasing

to God? Why was it not commanded? Why was it that the first man to practice polygamy was a self-convicted murderer? And why did not Jesus give some place for it in his comments on the marriage law, instead of using language which positively forbids it? It is admitted that many otherwise godly people offended in this respect, and Christ explained why it was permitted; but he corrected all false views of marriage, and restored it to its original relationship, of one man and one woman, or one wife. A union of two—not a union of many.

If it were proved to be an ordinance of God—if it were founded upon a commandment of God—we should deny the authority of the Government, and of any power on earth, to punish those who practice it. But it is a matter of choice, not a matter of religious obligation. It is an immorality, being contrary to the original marriage institution and law. It is an offense against society. It is a proper subject of Governmental action, and we earnestly hope that the Government will suppress it. But why should the structure of our Government be changed to suppress this more than any other crime? It should not. The demand for the change is based on the false reasoning of the "National Reform Association." True reasoning does not admit the demand.

J. H. W.

National Reform and the Rights of Conscience.

THE avowed purpose of the National Reform Party is to secure an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which every man will be compelled to acknowledge that God is Sovereign, that Christ is Ruler, and that the Bible is the supreme law. Whether a man believes it or not, is no difference, he must be compelled to acknowledge it because they profess to believe it. The *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 2, 1884, says:—

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation; and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . . Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality."

"Enforce," according to Webster, is "to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor." Therefore the proposition of these National Reformers is to force, to compel, all to keep the laws of Christian morality. To execute with vigor upon all, the laws of Christian morality.

And what is to be the penalty for dissent? Well, they pretend to be so kind that they will not whip anybody for it; they pretend to be so liberal that they will not impose a fine upon any one for it; they pretend to be so merciful that they will not imprison any one for it; but they are neither so kind, so liberal, nor so merciful but that they will disfranchise every one who will not acknowledge, and submit to, the provisions which they choose to embody in their Religious Amendment to the Constitution.

Thus, for a religious opinion, however conscientiously held, which may disagree with theirs, they deliberately propose to deprive men of their birthright to the most inestimable right of earth,—that for which thousands upon

thousands have laid down their lives; that for which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor,—the right to be a citizen amongst a free people, and in this instance a citizen of the best Government or the earth. Every honor to which he might otherwise aspire, every right to which he might otherwise be entitled, must be swept away at one stroke because, forsooth, he chooses to claim the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. That this is no fancy picture that we have drawn, that it is no fable that we have devised, in regard to what that party proposes to do, we have abundant proof, and that in their own words.

Mr. W. J. Coleman is one of the principal exponents of the National Reform religion. In the *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 1, 1883, Mr. Coleman replied to some questions that had been put by a correspondent who signed himself "Truth Seeker." We copy the following:—

"What effect would the adoption of the Christian Amendment, together with the proposed changes in the Constitution, have upon those who deny that God is the Sovereign, Christ the Ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once. . . . The classes who would object are, as 'Truth Seeker' has said, Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it, if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

There we have in plain words what they propose to do with dissenters under their "Christian Constitution." But let us look into this a little further. Notice, it is only the logically consistent dissenter that will be disfranchised. By the same token, then, the illogically inconsistent can all be citizens. That is, the man of honest intention, of firm conviction, and of real principle, who values his principles more than he does political preference, he must be disfranchised; while the time-servers, the political hacks, the men of no convictions and of no principle, they can all be acceptable citizens. In other words, the honest man, if he be a dissenter, cannot be a citizen; but every hypocrite can be a citizen. Therefore the inevitable logic of the National Reform position is to put a premium upon hypocrisy. And such will be the value of citizenship under their so-called Christian Constitution.

Such a result from such proceedings is not new. The Puritan Parliament "solemnly resolved that no person shall be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness." And as the natural consequence, the realm was filled with hypocritical piety.

Thus much merely in passing, as it is not so much our purpose in this article to notice the logic of their position, as it is to show their avowed purpose of outraging every principle of the rights of conscience. Mr. Coleman is not alone in thus defining the status of dissenters. In the *Statesman* of February 21, 1884, Mr. J. C. K. Milligan, in writing upon the same subject, expressed himself thus:—

"The worst result will be to disfranchise them."

But this is not the worst result which they

wish, nor which they intend shall be to such. Just read carefully the following extract from an address delivered by Rev. E. B. Graham at a National Reform Convention held at York, Neb., and reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885:—

"We might add, in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

Exactly; dissenters must not only be disfranchised, they must all be sent to the devil, and that too in some "wild and desolate land;" and even that is not enough, but they must "stay there till they die." And *that* is the National Reform idea of "justice." *That* is the kind of a Government that they propose under their Christian Constitution. *That* is the way in which they propose to convert men to the Christian religion. *That* is the way in which they propose to exemplify the sublime Christian principle of brotherly love, and the means which they will employ that brotherly love may *continue!* *That* is the way in which they are going to bring about the reign of universal peace, even, as *they* say, the millennium itself. *That* will be indeed the reign of the saints (!) By a like scheme of the Christian endeavor of the "Society of Jesus," there was peace once in the fair Waldensian Valleys. By like exertions Innocent III. succeeded in creating peace amidst the graceful scenery, the rich fields, and the splendid cities of Languedoc and Provence.

This, too, is all to be done in behalf of liberty of conscience,—*that is*, the conscience of the National Reformers. They give us clearly to understand that it is entirely out of respect to their own consciences that they propose to do all these things. Mr. Coleman says further, in the place before quoted:—

"If there be any Christian who objects to the proposed Amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in this matter."

So, then, in this National Reform Christianity, it is the perfection of conscientiousness to outrage some other man's conscience. And the *reverse* of the Golden Rule becomes, to them, the law and the prophets. Their chief complaint is that the present Constitution disfranchises *them* (which is false), and therefore they must have it changed so that it will disfranchise every one but them.

And so, All things whatsoever *ye would not* that men should do to you, *this do ye* even unto them; for this is the law of National Reform.

And who are they that propose to do these things? An Association of which the vice-presidents alone number *one hundred and twenty*, than whom we verily believe that there cannot be found in the United States an equal number of other men who could exert a more positive influence. In a complete list given in the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 2, 1883, we read the names of *thirteen* Bishops of such of the evangelical churches as have bishops, *fifteen* College Presidents, *thirteen* College Professors, *ten* Justices of Supreme Courts. As printed in the

Statesman of Dec. 24, 1885, we find *eleven* Bishops, *sixteen* College Presidents, *fifteen* College Professors, *three* ex-Governors, *seven* Justices of Supreme Courts, *five* Judges of Superior Courts, *two* Judges of the United States District Court, *one* Judge of the United States Circuit Court, with such a number of Hon.'s, Rev.'s, and D. D.'s, that we cannot attempt now to count them.

As for us, we are neither Jews, infidels, nor atheists. But as we dissent totally from the doctrines of the National Reform Party, we suppose, of course, and we are willing to confess, that we belong to that fourth class to which Mr. Coleman referred by the phrase, "and others." We do not deny that God is Sovereign, nor that Christ is Ruler, nor that the Bible is the Supreme law. We freely confess all these. But while we confess that God is Sovereign, we positively deny that he has delegated his sovereignty to the National Reform Party. While we confess that Christ is Ruler, we deny that he has chosen the National Reform Party as his confidential advisers in his rule, or that he has appointed that party as his vicegerent in the United States to rule this country in his absence. While we confess that the Bible is the Supreme standard of human actions, we deny *in toto* that the Author of the Bible has appointed the National Reform Party to be the infallible interpreters of that Book.

And because we distrust their movement, because we see the result of it when they shall have secured the power, they choose to think us possessed of a wonderful "compound of folly and fanaticism." (See editorial comment in *Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884.) But from their own words, fairly quoted in this article, we are justified in saying that the success of their movement will be the destruction of the dearly-bought principle of American liberty; the destruction of the inestimable treasure of American citizenship; and the destruction of every principle of the rights of conscience, under the Government of the United States. And because of this the AMERICAN SENTINEL is set for the defense of the genius of American institutions.

A. T. J.

Catholic and Protestant.

WHEN we endeavor to point out the danger which threatens our liberties by a change in the structure of our Government whereby *somebody's religion* may be legalized and enforced, we are told that our fears are groundless; that it is needless to point to the Inquisition, or to the persecutions of the Dark Ages, as they were carried on under quite different circumstances and by a quite different people; that we have nothing to fear from *Protestant Christians*.

But our fears are not allayed by any such assurances. We have a criterion by which we judge in all such cases, and, keeping this in sight, we shall not go far astray in our judgment. It is *our knowledge of human nature*.

We have no confidence at all in human nature, except as it is restrained and guided by divine grace. And human nature not restrained by grace, is the same in all ages and in all people. Catholics and Protestants are all human—neither more nor less. "Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are." Grace made him a "man of God." John and James so far

forgot their commission, and the teachings of their Master, as to desire to call down fire upon the people of a village of Samaria. Paul by grace was a most devoted servant of Christ; by nature, a murderer in action, and in spirit "breathing out threatenings and slaughter." The Pharisees and elders considered themselves exemplary and godly men while the world praised them; but they clamored for the blood of Him who reproveth their sins and exposed their hypocrisy.

If professed Christians of this age were not ambitious, they would not feel after the reins of secular power. It is no disparagement to any man to say that he does not know himself until he is tried. Hazael thought the deeds worthy of a dog which the prophet said he would commit; yet he obtained the power by murder, and committed the deeds without scruple when he had the power. It is a saying that "even a thief thinks himself honest when he has no chance to steal." By all this we mean that a person under certain circumstances does not know what he will do if placed under entirely different circumstances. We have no more confidence in an ambitious, worldly, bigoted Protestant, than we have in an ambitious, worldly, bigoted Catholic, if the two are placed under like circumstances.

Our motto says: "Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves." And we may say that perverted, corrupted religionists are the most dangerous of men. The question has often been asked, Why are religious wars the most sanguinary and cruel? The reason is obvious. Religion, whether true or false, intensifies the feelings. True religion refines as well as intensifies; but false religion intensifies without any refining influence or power. We have the testimony of those who were some time in the service of the Inquisition, that nothing could steel their hearts to the sufferings and cries of their dearest friends but their conviction of duty to "the Church," and through her to God.

This being the case, we declare that it is unsafe to place the reins of power in the hands of any religionists—of any church. Christianity, when secularized, is perverted; and perverted Christianity has not, and never had, any restraining influence over human nature. Its power, then, is to make zealots and bigots. It has a reactionary influence. Perverted religion perverts its possessor. How careful we should be to preserve the purity of Christianity, and to save it from contaminating alliances. And yet, when we would preserve it from alliance with the world, we are counted its enemies!

J. H. W.

UNQUESTIONABLY one of the most lamentable evils which afflict the rising generation flows from the early use of tobacco. Street boys who are not yet out of child's clothes snatch the discarded stumps of cigars of grown men, and smoke them in apish imitation of their elders. Lads at school acquire a taste for tobacco by surreptitiously smoking cigarettes—cigarettes which have done more to demoralize and vitiate youth than all the dram-shops in the land. Evil education has two corruptions—the corruption of the body and the corruption of the soul. The bodily mechanism of boys of sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen years of age can be as thoroughly injured by insidious poisons as the mind can be soiled by wicked teaching.—*The Catholic Standard*.

Morality and Religion.

In its broadest sense, religion is any system or method of worship, without regard to what the object of worship may be. In the world there are very many religions, and there are very many objects of worship. In this sense the angels are religious, for they worship God.

But in Christian lands the word is used in a more restricted sense. He is not counted religious who does not believe in God, his Son Jesus Christ as the only means of salvation, and the Bible as the revelation of the will of God to man. As the Mohammedan counts all as infidels who do not believe in Mohammed, so Christians esteem all as infidels who do not believe in Christ and the Bible.

The Christian religion is that system which accepts the Scriptures of the Old Testament as the revelation of God from the beginning of the world; accepts the fact of the fall of man, and of his subjection to death as a penalty for disobedience, and of his entire inability to recover himself from his lost condition. It accepts Christ as the Son of God, the sole means of salvation, who died as a sacrifice to redeem us, and lives a priest to make intercession for us, and to aid us by his Spirit.

Morality is obedience to the revealed will of God, whose law is a moral law, the only moral rule. Man lost his morality by disobedience of this rule. Had he retained his innocence, he would still have been a religious being, according to the primary sense of the word. He would have held communion with God, and worshiped him as the angels now do. But religion in the commonly-accepted sense would not have existed. There would have been no sin, no need of a Saviour; Christ would not have died, and Christianity would not have been.

Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Bishop Purcell, said the ten commandments are a synopsis of all religion and morality. Webster's Dictionary says the ten commandments are a summary of morality. Both statements are true, if we consider religion according to its primary signification. But the ten commandments do not contain within themselves the *Christian religion*; for this is remedial, and a law cannot be remedial. No system can recover from guilt and its consequences which does not contain pardon. Law cannot pardon, Christianity does. Therefore the law is not a *religious instrument* in this sense.

An able writer in the *Princeton Review* (Henry N. Day, D. D., of New Haven,) says: "In any comparison as to their relative authority and importance to man, the precedence must be given to religion." There is difficulty in marking lines where things are so intimately blended as are these two, as the same writer again says: "A piety divorced from morals is a contradiction or an impossibility." But we cannot accept his statement first quoted as strictly true when spoken of the Christian religion, which, he says, is the only true religion.

Briefly we will notice the law as the "synopsis of all religion and morality," and show the relation which Christianity sustains to it.

The ten commandments are divided into two parts, as based on the two great requirements

to love God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. Service done directly toward God is more strictly religious, while obligation rendered toward our fellow-men is more properly moral. But, as before remarked, these intimately blend in the ten commandments. In the first four precepts the religious element predominates; in the last six the moral element predominates. But though one element predominates in one, and the other element predominates in the other, the two elements cannot be separated in this law. No man can be a moral man and violate any one of the first four precepts, though they are strictly religious. And so also, no man can be truly religious and violate one of the last six precepts, though they are more strictly moral. No one is a moral man who is profane, an idolater, or a Sabbath-breaker; and no one can be truly religious who is covetous, who is a thief, an adulterer, or a murderer. These propositions need no argument; they are evident to all.

We call every precept of the ten commandments moral, and the whole ten, *the moral law*, because they are *original obligation*. By this we mean that they directly emanated from the will and mind of the Creator, and depended upon no contingency. The relations which they recognize, and upon which they rest, are those that inhere in the truths that God is our Creator, and man is our fellow-creature. Man could not originate these relations, nor cause these precepts to become duties. Hence they are essentially *primary*; no obligation of any nature can take precedence of them. The religious element in this law takes precedence, as our duty to God comes first, and to man secondarily. We must love God supremely, with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and our neighbor only as ourselves. And this order is not reversed or changed by the gospel; as the angels sang at the birth of the Redeemer: "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace, good will toward men." Glory to God is the first note in the song of the angels, as it should be the first object in the lives of men.

How does Christianity—"the only true religion"—stand related to this law? We have said that the law is *primary*, and as the nature and object of Christianity is essentially different from that of the law, they cannot stand on the same plane. The gospel, or the Christian religion, is *secondary*. Man could not originate, nor can he control, his relations to God as his Creator and to man as his fellow-creature. But Christianity does not grow out of these original or primary relations. It is wholly based upon the fact that *man is a sinner*; and this relation man himself originated. It was not so originally; it did not grow out of or emanate from the mind and will of God.

And in all the systems of ethics of all mankind, this priority or precedence is given to *the moral law*. Each and every one of the ten commandments is of obligation, and obedience to them is duty, at all times and under all circumstances. And the importance of this obedience is not lessened by any contingency. A failure in any other respect does not change the nature of obedience to this.

We all hold that, if the two may be separated, it is much more important that a man

obey the sixth or eighth commandment, that he abstain from murder and theft, than that he obey the requirement to be baptized or partake of the Lord's supper. And for this evident reason, that *obedience to the gospel is neutralized by disobedience to the moral law*. Obedience is and always was better than sacrifice. Of what account is baptism to a thief—to one who continues to steal? Of what value is the Lord's supper to a willful murderer? The law would have been forever binding if Christianity had never existed. Its relations antedate Christianity. But Christianity never would have existed if there had been no moral law, or if the moral law had never been violated. And Christianity even now is not and cannot be of any benefit to a man who willfully or negligently violates the law of God, the ten commandments.

Want of space in this paper compels us to waive an examination of the relation of civil Government to the two systems. We will notice that hereafter. J. H. W.

What Is the Harm?

THE Mendocino *Beacon* is one of the best of our California papers. We thank the editor for his kindly notice of the SENTINEL, but think he has overlooked *the main issue* which we make in our controversy with the "National Reform Association." We freely admit our belief that the movers in this Association think that they are doing God service, and that they really believe the ends they seek are necessary to the welfare of our nation. And our difference with them is one of conviction and fixed principle. We believe that their success would prove disastrous both to the Government and to Christianity in this country.

The *Beacon* quotes the setting forth of the object of the Association in its platform—"Suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence, and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its Ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," and asks what is the harm of saying so if it is the truth.

We, too, recognize the truth that all power is of God; but we do not believe that this is a Christian nation, and no amendment to our National Constitution will make it such. Christianity is an individual experience, and the nation is Christian to the degree that the individuals composing it are Christians. And individuals are made Christians, not by votes and political movements, but by the preaching of the gospel and by personal conversion.

But *the real issue* between us and the Association, and the one which the *Beacon* seems strangely to have overlooked, is that of placing the laws and institutions of Christianity "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." To this point our protest and arguments are all directed; and to this point the query of the *Beacon* will not apply. We invite it to carefully read our statements on this subject, and to say if it can find

any defect in our reasoning, and if there be not reason to fear the result of such an amendment as the Association is laboring to secure.

We will briefly state a few points made by the speakers and writers of the Association. In the National Convention held in 1874, in a speech which was loudly cheered by the officers and delegates, are the following words:—

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard of money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion, as it already has the Oneida Community in New York, the Mormons in Utah, and the Joss house in California."

This speech was "cheered to the echo," and it was very evident that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was as unpopular, in this convention, as the idea of the Religious Amendment was popular. The truth is, these amendments are antagonistic, and the Reform Association spoke as people who clearly recognize the fact.

Now we inquire if the *Beacon* can see no harm in Congress establishing a standard of religion,—if it approves of the idea of legalizing Christian laws and institutions in our National Government. If the editor is willing that Congress shall establish, and put in legal force, a standard of religion for him, then we greatly mistake his temper and spirit. We beg leave to dissent; our religion is not of that kind, to be measured out to us by Congress, or any other body of law-makers.

Consider for a moment the character of Congress in its relation to Christianity, or even to religion and morality, and then consider what kind of a "standard of religion" our Congress will establish. It will not be sufficient to say that the Bible is the law of the land; steps must be taken to enforce its precepts, its Christian features and usages; otherwise these institutions and usages will not be placed on a legal basis. But, as we have elsewhere argued, *everybody's* construction of the Bible cannot be enforced, and whose shall be selected to be put on a legal basis? Let not any think lightly of our purpose and our work in opposing the Religious Amendment until they have considered these questions in their bearings. Before we open the flood-gates, let us clearly settle how the waters are to be guided or kept under control.

As above intimated, the simple declaration that God is the source of power, and the Bible the supreme law of the nation's conduct, would have no practical effect. Legislation would be required to enforce religious usages, or, to "establish a standard of religion," or, to put Christianity on a legal basis. This is clearly recognized by the National Reform party. For proof of this we offer the following:—

In 1870, December 5, a Philadelphia paper announced that a number of Congressmen, Vice-president Colfax being one of them, arrived in Washington by railroad, on Sunday, December 4. The *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the Reform Association, spoke the feeling of its party on that subject. From its article we briefly quote. It said:—

"1. Not one of those men who thus violated the Sabbath is fit to hold any official position in a

Christian nation. . . . He who violates the Sabbath may not steal, because the judgment of society so strongly condemns theft, or because he believes that honesty is the best policy; but tempt him with the prospect of concealment or the prospect of advantage, and there can be no reason why he who robs God will not rob his neighbor also. For this reason, the Sabbath lies at the foundation of morality. Its observance is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God over us.

"2. The sin of these Congressmen is a national sin, because the nation hath not said to them in the Constitution, the supreme rule for our public servants, 'We charge you to serve us in accordance with the higher law of God.'

"3. Give us in the national Constitution the simple acknowledgment of the law of God as the supreme law of nations, and *all the results indicated in this note will be ultimately secured.* Let no one say that the movement does not contemplate sufficiently practical ends."

And thus, as the *ultimate* result of their demands, we are to have a reversal of that clause of the sixth article of the Constitution which forbids religious tests as qualifications for office, and of the first amendment, which declares that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. People may continue to inquire, "What is the harm?" In the eyes of those who are willing to see our Government entirely remodeled to suit the ideas of short-sighted religious zealots, there can appear to be no harm. But let them know that these *ultimate* objects will not be obtained without a struggle more disastrous than any that our nation has yet seen; and that when such political-religious machinery is set in motion, it cannot be controlled by the cool-headed men who put it in force. We promise that we shall do nothing to oppose its initiation or its action beyond lifting up our voices in warning, and pointing out the dangers which threaten both our civil and our religious liberty. But there are many tens of thousands in the land who will oppose it by other means.

And we expect that, as Elijah was accused of troubling Israel because he pointed out the cause of their troubles, so we shall be accused of creating the trouble against which we have uttered our warnings.

The *first Inquisition* was founded on a professed desire to advance the cause of God on the earth. The effort to establish a *second* is based on the same profession. But Christianity was not, and never will be, benefited by such means.

We hope that none will condemn our work without *carefully reading and considering* our reasons.

J. H. W.

Not a Christian Nation.

THE San Jose, Cal., *Mercury* makes the following sensible remarks upon the oft-repeated claim that this is a Christian country or nation:

"The framers of the Constitution not only omitted the establishment of a State religion, but made careful provision against its future establishment. That instrument is simply a political bond for securing the civil rights and establishing the limitation of those rights between citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs and practices. The fact that a large majority of the inhabitants of the United States

are nominally Christians does not make this a Christian country. A majority of the church members in Delaware are Methodists, but it is not, therefore, a Methodist State. The only attempt to identify religion with citizenship was made by the early Puritans of Massachusetts, and proved a failure. Rhode Island, which was settled by Baptists and in which that denomination probably predominates now, is not and never was styled a Baptist State, nor was Maryland, which was settled by Catholics, made thereby a Catholic commonwealth. So much for the nominal or technical Christianity of this country. When it comes to absolute practical Christianity, there is no country, nation, despotism, monarchy, or republic on the face of the earth that ought to have the hardihood to term itself Christian.

"The political institutions of the United States, while they do not give any form of the Christian religion, or the religion itself, predominance or peculiar rights, do yet afford all forms of it a fair and unlimited field for moral action and moral influence. The Christian missionary is exposed to no restraining laws or personal perils, except, perhaps, those incident to the collection of his salary. But the Israelite, the Mahomedan, or the Buddhist has an equal right to preach, and, if he can, to make converts to his faith. None of them, however, can properly claim that his religious observances shall be engrafted upon the law of the land. The field for Christian effort and teaching in the United States is a magnificent one; but its limits are within the boundaries of argument, persuasion, and moral force. It has neither national recognition nor governmental power, and the claim that this is a Christian country, either theoretically or practically, is baseless."

Pity for Rum's Victims.

LADIES and gentlemen, I appeal to all of you—I appeal to every sensible and sensitive heart in England and America, to this divine feeling of pity. Do we not, must we not, feel pity when we think of the hundreds and thousands of men who become the victims of a dead product which is yet potent enough to destroy souls for whom Christ died? Must we not feel pity for the ravages which are caused by this deadliest of all human curses? Do we not feel pity for the men whom we have probably seen and known, who because of drink are living in its pollution and going to deaths of blasphemy, and are giving back to the God who made them nothing but the dust of their bodies and the shipwreck of their souls? Have we no pity for the thousands who are pouring poison into the ranks of youth until its root becomes as bitterness and its blasphemy comes up as fruit? Have we no pity for the families, the husbands and wives on whose hearthstones are burning, because of drink, the very fires of hell?

Have we no pity for the mothers whose hearts are rent with anguish at the fate of these their offspring? Do we not feel for the unmotherly mothers who well-nigh turn womanhood to laughter and motherhood to horror? Have we no pity for the poor miserable children? Is there no voice strong enough to plead "like angels, trumpet-tongued, against the deep dam-

nation of their taking off of these children?"—who, in the language of Southey, are not so much born into the world as damned into the world, damned and predestined, as it were, to live lives of disease and degradation because of the drink in the midst of which they are brought up, and of which they have the hereditary taint in their very veins? Must children year after year in these our Christian lands—in England at any rate, if not in America—pass through the fire to this Moloch, in numbers infinitely greater than were ever burned in the valley of Hinnom? [Applause.] I, for one, cannot but feel deep pity for all these, and I feel pity for England, which, for two centuries, has been writhing in the dark places of these licensed temptations—pity not only for England, but for the whole race of mankind, which is raising up the cry of anguish from every polluted continent, which yet cherishes and even fondles in its bosom this venomous and deadly asp. Alas! of every curse I have ever heard of, this is a curse in which the entail might be cut off in this very generation. And yet the race of man, bewildered by epigrams, baffled by sophistries, blinded by conceit, seduced by pleasure, and rendered callous by greed, goes on enjoying and even rewarding the production of this fatal cause of evil among themselves, until one is forced to cry, "Let the heavens burst and drown with deluge of rain the feeble vassals of lust and wine."—*Canon Farrar's Speech in New York.*

God in the Constitution.

THIS phrase, now of common occurrence, savors strongly of irreverence; but genuine reverence for the Supreme Being must be expected to greatly decline when his existence and attributes are made a political question, to be bandied about in stump speeches, and recognized on coercion. It is a growing question in the nation at large. The following is part of a brief speech of Mr. Broomall, of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, on the question of incorporating the proposed amendment into the Constitution of that State. It is worthy of attentive reading and careful consideration:

"First, the words reported by the committee have no use there, no proper function. To those who believe in a Supreme Being, and I trust we all do—there may be those who do not, but I confess that I have not met them—to those who believe in a Supreme Being, the phrase is useless, is unmeaning. To those who do not (and while I doubt whether there are those who do not, I am not prepared to deny the possibility of their existence),—to those who do not, it is untrue. To all of us it is a mere mockery; it is a pretense of something that I am afraid our proceedings too often show we do not always feel.

"Let us bear in mind that we are proposing, not to change the Constitution ourselves, but to submit certain propositions to the people for their adoption or rejection. Are gentlemen willing to submit to a majority of ballots the question of the existence and attributes of the Deity? I am not. What a question it is! The being and attributes of the Creator; the existence of a lawgiver above all legislators; of

a law above all human laws,—a law that sets aside all human laws when they conflict with it,—a law that binds the individual, not as a member of society, but as a man, and that commands him not to obey the civil law when it conflicts with this higher law! We propose to submit to a majority of ballots these great questions, whether there be a Ruler of the universe, and whether we are responsible for our conduct to that Ruler of the universe!

"To what tribunal do you propose to submit these great questions? We have heard that tribunal characterized here. Gentlemen have spoken of that tribunal in a way that would make us hesitate to submit any question to it, no matter what. How has the election mob of Philadelphia been characterized? In what language has it been spoken of here? Gentlemen have risen on this floor and denounced the decision of a Philadelphia election mob in language that would make one afraid for his country, lest self-government should prove a failure; and you propose to submit these great questions to the decision of that tribunal. You propose to let a Philadelphia election mob settle for all of us the question whether there is or is not a great Judge in whose court we are all responsible for our conduct. Just imagine such a question submitted to such a tribunal! In all of the grog shops of the city, this question is to be debated and talked about. It is to be settled there; it is to be decided there; and Christianity must submit to the decision, whatever it be!

"Who asks that this question should be decided in our organic law at all? Who asks those questions to be decided here? Who submits to us the question? Who authorizes us to settle it? How can any delegate dare decide for his constituents whether there be a God and whether they owe him responsibility for their conduct? Who asks this decision? Whom will it bind? Do gentlemen who advocate this proposition say that they have authority from the Being most interested in the question, if we are to believe their doctrine, to suffer that question to be raised here, and decided by an election mob? Do they pretend to say that that great Being has authorized them to submit his power and his existence to that kind of a tribunal?

"Sir, it is quite time, at this late day, that it were understood that Christianity asks no aid from human governments; that religion can stand a great deal of crushing out without being injured; but when it is taken to the arms of the civil power, it falls degraded and dishonored. It was for this reason, and after the experience of centuries, that our forefathers divorced forever all church and State, and suffered religion to stand where it should stand,—upon the consciences and convictions of men!

"Look at the history of the world, and see whether we dare propose to return to the old state of things! What was the condition of Christianity before the Roman emperors allied it to the Government? As pure an emanation from Heaven as ever blessed the earth. What was it after? A very demon of hell! And it is so always. Wherever religion rests where alone it was intended to rest, upon the consciences and convictions of men, there it is an angel of

purity; wherever it is joined with the civil arm and rests upon coercion, it is a curse to the country in which it is."

There is Danger in It.

THE *Christian Statesman* once published a quotation a column long from a sermon by Dr. Talmage, upon the subject of God in our politics and in our Government. To the supposed objection that there is somebody that does not believe in God, the preacher replies:—

"Well, my friends, there are a great many people who do not believe in chastity, a great many who do not believe in the sanctity of the marriage relation, a great many who do not believe in the rights of property, a great many people who do not believe in any style of government—people who would rob and steal and murder. Do you refuse to make laws against criminals because they are criminals? Will you refuse to recognize God in the Government affairs because there are men who do not believe in God?"

We yield to nobody in our love of the Bible and Christianity; in our reverence for God and regard for his authority. But we protest against that persecuting spirit, so foreign to true Christianity, which places an unbeliever, *because he is an unbeliever*, on a level with adulterers, thieves, and murderers. There was a time when "the church" declared that "heresy is the highest crime." Do we wish to return to such a state of things? We are fast drifting in that direction.

We believe in making "laws against criminals because they are criminals," but for no other reason. We do not believe that heresy, or unbelief, or infidelity, is a crime with which human laws have anything to do. To set up such a standard of crime is menacing to our liberties, both civil and religious. These people may succeed in thus subverting our liberties, but the effort will bring trouble on all and ruin to its promoters.

THE religious wars and persecutions of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were a training school for the political independence of the United States of America in the eighteenth century. Diverse and seemingly incongruous as were the nationalities represented in the colonies,—Dutch, French, German, Swedish, Scotch, Irish, English,—they had all imbibed, either by experience or by inheritance, something of the spirit of personal independence, and especially of religious liberty. Gustavus Adolphus designed his colony of Swedes for the benefit of "all oppressed Christendom." Penn, the Quaker, established Pennsylvania as "a free colony for all mankind," where the settlers "should be governed by laws of their own making." The first charter of the Jerseys—which were largely peopled by Quakers and Scotch and Irish Presbyterians—declared that "No person shall at any time, in any way, or on any pretense, be called in question, or in the least punished or hurt, for opinion in religion." And Oglethorpe's Colony of Georgia was founded to be a refuge for "the distressed people of Britain, and the persecuted Protestants of Europe;" then the German Moravian settled side by side with the French Huguenot and the Scotch Presbyterian, under the motto, "We toil not for ourselves, but for others."—*Townsend's Old World and New.*

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., FEBRUARY, 1886.

The "Christian Statesman" and the "American Sentinel."

THE *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the "Religious Amendment Party," gives a very respectful notice of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and at considerable length. It says their work has been languishing for lack of opposition, and that "the lack is now, in part at least, to be supplied." If fair and honorable, yet vigorous opposition will aid their cause, we shall certainly help to give it an impetus. But time will show what the SENTINEL will accomplish in that respect. If we cannot stay the popular tide, which seems to be setting so strongly in favor of a union of church and State, we shall certainly succeed in saving many from giving their aid and influence to that which, we verily believe, will prove a curse to our country and to the cause of Christianity.

The *Statesman* does not speak a word against the contents or methods of the SENTINEL. We do not think it can possibly pick a flaw in any argument we used, and we hope that the future may merit the favor which the first number has so generally received. The *Statesman* quotes at length from our leading article, for which it has our thanks.

But one thing we think was "off the base." It says, speaking of our reasons given for publishing the SENTINEL, that we gave them "in a somewhat apologetic tone." Not if we know our feelings and motives. It might as well say that Jefferson introduced the "immortal Declaration" with an apology; he certainly considered it just to give a reason for their action. But was it an apology? Not much. And we do not believe that any one who has read our first number thinks that we felt like apologizing or that our work needs an apology.

In contrast with the notice of the SENTINEL given by the *Christian Statesman*, another paper which prints "Christian" on its head, gives its opinion that the SENTINEL is working in the interest of the Liberal League and of infidelity. We think not. And we may at some future time give our opinion as to what interest it is serving in its position. We leave our work with all confidence to the judgment of candid readers.

Rights of Infidels.

HAVE infidels any rights? In the church, No; in the State, Yes. In our next number we shall examine these propositions, and show that the union of church and State either destroys the rights of the infidel, or permits him to exercise them under wrong relations.

In connection with this, we might further ask, Have dissenters any rights? Have minorities any rights? And is it our duty to understand these subjects, and to sacredly regard the rights of all classes? Reader, what do you think? If it were left to your decision, how would you vote upon it?

"Testing the Right to Observe the Seventh Day."

UNDER the above head we find the following in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, from a correspondent of that paper, writing from Fayetteville, Arkansas:—

"After a lengthy session of more than three weeks, Circuit Court has at last adjourned. Quite a full docket was disposed of, the principal interest being manifested in the test case of the Seventh-day Adventists under the new Sunday law of this State. This denomination, through the labors of several of their ministers, sent here as missionaries from the Northern States, have, within the past eighteen months, succeeded in gaining quite a foothold in Arkansas, having a fine church edifice and strong membership at Springdale, a few miles from here, as well as churches in other parts of the State. They have been from the first apparently an industrious and God-fearing people, the chief difference between them and other Christian bodies being that they observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, according to the commandment. But it seems that sectionalism cannot lay down its arms even when the sacred precincts of religion are entered, so among the first things performed by the Legislature at its session last winter, less than a year after these people had come into the State, was the repeal of the clause which gave them the liberty to keep the day of their choice. This may be a part of the 'reform' connected with the new machine; but if so, it seems to be directed by a very bigoted spirit.

"As the law now stands, all parties, irrespective of their religious belief, are compelled to observe the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, and under this law three indictments were found against members of the above denomination, one of the cases being against Elder Scoles, one of their ministers, whose case is to be made the test in the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of the recent act of the Legislature. It is a little singular that no one else has been troubled on account of the law, with perhaps one minor exception, while members of the above denomination are being arrested over the whole State. It savors just a trifle of the religious persecution which characterized the Dark Ages. A minister of the gospel pleading in a court of justice, with the open Bible in his hand, for the liberty to keep God's commands is a strange sight in this country; but, according to the rulings of the court in this case, a man has no rights of conscience outside of the dictation of the law. If this be the case, and if our lawmakers are to control the religious opinions of their constituents, there is no telling what we may yet see in the way of enforcing their peculiar creeds and dogmas. Much interest is manifested here over this matter, and a decision from the higher courts is anxiously looked for."

We find remarks of the same tenor of the above in the editorial columns of another secular paper in Missouri. If any think there is no danger of religious persecution in this land if the power be given to professed Christians,—if they think the days of religious bigotry and intolerance are past, and that the courts will not carry out the desires of zealots,—then we ask them to tell us why it is that railroads keep

their freight houses open, with a multitude of hands employed, and almost every kind of business is freely transacted, and people openly hunt and fish on Sunday, and none are prosecuted except those who conscientiously observe the seventh day, for which they undeniably have the letter of the commandment. These things are more than mere straws, to show what is coming. They show that we are correct in our expression, that the courts will be expected to carry out the popular will on religious questions, without any regard to the reading of the Bible, or to the religious rights of the minority. We warn the American people to look to what they do. "Don't unchain the tiger." See what he has always done in past ages before you let him loose.

A Christian Empire.

OUR zealous reformers are anxious to have these United States legalized into a "Christian Nation." We have read of the Roman Empire becoming Christian, and of Constantine, "the first Christian emperor." But we never read of the good that accrued to Christianity from the alliance. Willard's *Universal History* says:—

"Surely it was not in the spirit of Christ, who said, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' that Constantine made it the religion of the empire; and from henceforth we find its heavenly influence sullied by mingling with earthly things."

And so it will be in our own land, if Christianity shall be made the legal religion of the nation. Has the preaching of the cross become of no effect that civil law is required to compel men to conform to "Christian laws, usages, and institutions"? Dark will be the day to liberty and Christianity when this alliance is formed.

OUR COUNTRY,

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

By U. SMITH.

Author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and Other Popular Works.

This is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a

HISTORICAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a

CHAIN OF PROPHECY,

Of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the Prophet of God, hundreds of years ago. Other great nations of the world are subjects of prophecy, and why not our own? THE SUNDAY QUESTION, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND NATIONAL REFORM are prominent among the topics ably discussed in this work.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type and elegantly bound. Price \$1.00.

The publishers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of "The Marvel of Nations" whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with their paper, one year, for only \$1.25.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

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 subscriptions, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1886.

NUMBER 3.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

HUMAN nature is such that whenever theological creeds are incorporated with political constitutions, and church and State united, it results in evil, and I point to the whole history of England and the continental nations as examples illustrating the fact.—*Rev. A. S. Leonard.*

An Important Truth.

THE following expression we copy from a publication of some years ago:—

"The standard of religion and morality will be elevated in the churches when the ministry recognize the fact that all religious institutions must be subjects of voluntary action, and should never be enforced by civil law. Civil law ought to protect all religious bodies—not one more than another—in their worship. This every State should be willing to do; and this is enough for any State to do."

These are words of truth, and are applicable at all times. To vary from this line of action is to pervert the State from its true policy and object; is to trample on the rights of some and to unduly exalt those of others.

The Truth in the Case.

A JEWISH Rabbi, Rev. Dr. Sonnenschein, published in the *St. Louis Daily Globe* his ideas of this Religious Amendment movement, from which we quote as follows:—

"These 'reformers' would quarrel and fight, setting parent against child and child against parent. They would drive us headlong into the fierce and bloody wars which were witnessed in the Middle Ages in the old countries—France, England, and Germany. In addition to ecclesiastical rivalry and religious fanaticism, they would arouse the unrelenting hatred of political antagonism. Suppose the Catholic clergy in France, where there is a greater Catholic majority than there is Protestant majority here, were to go into council to amend the French Constitution according to their views, what would their Protestant brethren think of it?"

They would think that France was going back to the Dark Ages and to a revival of the Inquisition. Recent events have proved that our country may be thrown into war as easily as any other, and the people will do well to be warned in time, and not be swayed by religious zealots whose zeal is "not according to knowledge."

Policy of the New Government Outlined.

IN the leading article of the first number of the SENTINEL there were pointed out some things which of necessity must be done if ever the Religious Amendment of the Constitution is rendered effective. It was there noticed that the court is constituted the judge and exponent of the law; and if any disagreement arises as to the meaning of the law, or as to what constitutes a misdemeanor in the premises, the court is the authority, and the sole authority, to which appeal must be made. And, therefore, if a question arises as to what is or what is not Christian law, usage, or institution, it must be determined by a court of justice!

There is no disputing this conclusion. And yet it is a conclusion which ought to startle every one who contemplates such a change in our Government as would make such a proceeding possible.

Again, attention was called to the fact that *everybody's construction* of the Bible cannot be enforced, and therefore there must be a selection as to what shall be enforced. We have not the remotest idea, neither has any one who favors the amendment, that the *literal reading* of the Bible will be preferred to some *theological teachings* concerning the Bible. We suggested that this would not be left altogether to the determination of a civil court; such questions might be referred to an ecclesiastical court. But that would make no difference as to the grand result. No matter what were the nature of the court by which such questions should be decided, the fact would still remain that the subject of Christian faith and practice would be removed from the domain of individual conscience, and placed in the hands of a legal tribunal which shall decide what is and what is not Christian faith and practice—what we may and what we may not believe and practice as professed Christians!

We are more than surprised that there is such a persistent denial on the part of the amendmentists that the success of their project would produce a union of church and State. No one denies that there was a union of church and State when Constantine legalized Christianity as the leading religion of the empire. But the church did not *control* the State under Constantine. Professor Blanchard, in the Pittsburgh National Convention, said:—

"Union of church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers, and oversight of its doctrines."

That is exactly what was done by Constan-

tine. But ask any one to point to the sad consequences of the union of church and State, and he would not point to the time of Constantine. He would point to after-centuries, when the church assumed the supremacy over the civil power, and controlled its decisions and its actions. Now if we can prove that it is the design of the promoters of this movement that just such a relation shall exist between the ecclesiastical and civil powers in this land, then all their disclaimers are shown to be made in ignorance of what constitutes the most odious form of church and State, or else are made with the intention to deceive.

In an article in the first number of the SENTINEL the words of Rev. J. W. Foster were quoted, as published in the *Christian Statesman* in March, 1884, as follows:—

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church."

This proposition we most emphatically deny. But it was further shown by the same article, that they teach that it is,—

"The duty of the State, *as such*, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion."

If in these utterances there is not outlined a complete union of church and State, then we affirm that such a union never yet existed.

But we will give a further installment of their expressed intentions in regard to the relation of the churches to the civil power. In an article by Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, an earnest advocate of this Religious Amendment, which was published in the *Christian Statesman*, Feb. 21, 1884, we find the following language:—

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

Here we have the boldest avowal of that which we have suggested would be the possible or probable relation of the Government to questions of theology. The churches will not allow the civil Government to decide upon or settle theological questions; they will decide all that. But it is the sphere of the Government "to serve the interests of the church," and to "adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion;" the churches having decided what is the

true religion which the Government "shall defend and maintain!"

If this is not making the Government the creature of the churches, to be controlled and guided according to their will, then we must confess our ignorance of the meaning of language. And if this would not be a union of church and State, full and complete, then we repeat the assertion that such a union never yet existed. But, call it what they will—a union of church and State or something else—it is just such a state of things as existed in "the Dark Ages" of the Christian church; just such a state of things as led to the erection of the Inquisition, and controlled the action of the civil power in the *auto de fe*—the burning of heretics.

It was also remarked in this paper that such an amendment will "lead to endless religious disputes in our legislatures and in Congress." And, "when a candidate's religious position is to be canvassed in party caucuses, and political demagogues, because they have *wired* themselves into office, have to settle questions on the Bible, then we may write 'Ichabod' on our churches and on the popular religion." We have no doubt that some of our readers imagined that we were needlessly fearful of what would be the result of such a change in the organic structure of our Government. But such have not considered, as we have tried to do, and as the promoters of the movement have done, what must be necessary to give effect to such a movement, or to make it practical. Hear further from the same article from which we last quoted:—

"How is the amendment to be carried out practically? In brief, its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will at once become unconstitutional. But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State legislatures, by the supreme courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

On this we first remark that the ten commandments are not a part of "Christianity,"—not a part of what are universally accepted as "the laws of Jesus Christ." They antedate Christianity. They are the *moral law*, on which the Christian religion is based; they point out and condemn sin, but they do not contain any remedy or pardon for sin. They might be adopted in a Mohammedan nation without at all changing the religious character of the nation. In fact, this is not the *object* of this "National Reform" movement.

But the point to which we wish to call attention is this: "The whole framework of Bible legislation" has got to be "thoroughly canvassed by Congress," etc. Always remembering that their final action has to be determined by the churches. For the article continues:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of

our citizens about these [the churches and the pulpits], the chief discussions and the *final decisions of most points will be developed there.*"

Of course; of course. Nothing less than this is contemplated in this Religious Amendment movement; nothing less than this would meet their demand.

We need not inquire what will be the position of dissenters in this general upheaval of society, religiously and politically. As men must *now* yield their personal feelings and preferences to the will of the majority in civil and secular matters, so in like manner they will *then* have to yield their feelings and preferences, or, in other words, their convictions and consciences, in religious matters. It will not be a substitution of the church in the place of Government; but it will be the Government in the hands of the church,—the enforcement of matters of religion, even as civil and secular matters are now enforced.

We would that such a state of things might never be in America. If the American people are true to themselves, and prove themselves worthy of their patriotic fathers who founded our noble Government, and guaranteed our religious freedom by Constitutional provisions, then such a state of things will never be. But we must confess that we have many fears, when we see the array of influence in favor of the movement, and see so great indifference, on the part of so large numbers, as to the safety of our republican institutions. But we shall do all in our power to warn the people of the consequences of the proposed action, and ever faithfully to occupy our position as an AMERICAN SENTINEL.

J. H. W.

Morality and Religion.

A LETTER has been received asking a question which has arisen in the mind of the writer on reading our remarks on this subject. It is this:—

"Can laws which guard religious rights and protect religious privileges be considered oppressive to non-religionists?"

By no means. It is the duty of every Government to guard *all rights*, and to protect in the exercise of all privileges which may lawfully be exercised. This is not oppressive to the non-religionists. But religion is a *voluntary* matter; under coercion it is worthless and a mockery. That which is a privilege to one, being a matter of conscience, is no privilege to another, whose conscience is not exercised in the same manner. A law to compel the non-religionist to observe religious rites and rules because they are privileges to his religious neighbor, is oppressive. It is injustice to the man and an injury to religion.

The duty of the Government is not exhausted when it has protected the rights of the religious. Governments are not established for the benefit of any one class of their subjects. It is no more the duty of Government to protect the religionist, than it is its duty to protect the non-religionist. The non-religionist has a citizenship; he acquires property; he builds a house; he pays taxes; and he has the same right to be protected that his religious neighbor has. He has no right to disturb his neighbor, or hinder him from living out his religion; and his re-

ligious neighbor has no right to disturb him in the peaceful possession of his home because he is not religious; he has no right to compel him to observe religious rites in which he does not believe. Neither has any class of religionists any right to disturb others because they profess a religion different from their own. And it is equally the duty of the Government to protect them *all*, whatever their religion may be, or whether or not they have any at all.

Another question is proposed, which grows more directly out of the remarks we made upon the ten commandments. It is as follows:—

"Although the first four commandments partake more of the nature of religious precepts than the last six, may not the Government, under some circumstances, restrain from the violation of these? for instance, the third, which forbids blasphemy."

We are glad to notice this query, because we wish to impress more forcibly upon the minds of our readers the distinctions to which we called attention. The main points presented are these:—

1. The ten commandments as a whole are the *moral law*. Each one contains an elementary principle, or truth. They originated in the mind of the Creator, resting upon no contingency over which any creature had or could have any control. They grow out of our relations to God and to our fellow-man by virtue of our creation. And this is the main characteristic which distinguishes them from all other laws.

2. Though they are all moral, yet they are also *religious*, using the word religion in its *primary sense* only; that is, obedience to, or worship of, God, such as holy and unfallen beings could render. But they differ in this, that the religious element predominates in the first four, because they relate more directly to our duty to God; and the moral element predominates in the last six, because they relate more directly to our duty to our fellow-man. But they cannot be so separated that a man may be truly religious and violate any of the last six, or be truly moral and violate any of the first four.

3. But Christianity is a religion in quite another sense. It is purely *remedial*; it grows out of the sole fact that *man sinned*. It does not grow out of any *primary relation*,—that is, any relation which existed by virtue of creation. It is essentially different from the moral law, and its rites and institutions are *religious only*. They have no moral element. For if they were moral also, they could not belong to a remedial system, as they would then be duty *on their own account*. When the precept was announced, "Repent, and be baptized," it was not declared because it was an original or moral obligation, but because of sin; and thus it was added "for the remission of sin." It was in the terms of the *amnesty* which the Government proclaimed to a race of rebels.

Now we are prepared to follow out this train of thought to a further conclusion. Though the ten commandments are moral, only a *moral governor* can enforce them *on a moral basis*. Civil Government, administered by fallible men, can enforce these laws only *on a civil basis*. This is shown by considering that the tenth

commandment, which is among the moral precepts, because it relates to our duty to man, cannot be enforced at all by civil Government; of its violation man can take no cognizance. Human Governments are, in this respect, quite limited in their scope. Pure morality has respect to *intention* as well as to *action*. In the sight of a moral governor, hatred is murder and lust is adultery; but in the sight of civil Governments these are no crimes until they take the form of actions, or open violations of the law. It is for this reason that covetousness cannot be prohibited by human Governments. As soon as it takes the form of action, it comes under the sixth commandment, which forbids stealing.

Thus it will be seen that a civil Government which pretends to enforce the morality of the ten commandments will find itself hedged in by impossibilities; it is compelled to govern only on a civil basis; and if it attempts to go any further than this, it will usurp the prerogatives of Him who alone knows the secrets of the heart.

Now inasmuch as Christianity is *secondary*, or remedial, in its nature, and its laws and institutions have no moral element, being *purely religious*, it is a matter of conviction, of the heart, and does not come at all within the scope of civil Government. Without conviction, without the heart's full and complete acquiescence, it is nothing. It is a matter solely between God and our own souls. *Man has no right to restrain it, and it is impossible for him to enforce it.* Any attempt on his part to do either is a presumptuous usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the Creator. Looking carefully at these principles, and the facts and duties which grow out of them, we are led to admire the harmony of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States with them. We cannot imagine how the *actual and necessary limitations* under which human Governments rest, can be better expressed than they are in that Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In no one part of that instrument is the wisdom of the founders of our Government shown more than in this First Amendment. And if we prove ourselves worthy of such an ancestry, we will preserve it just as they left it to us. Congress has no right to erect a false standard of religion, and it is impossible for it to enforce a true one.

Further thoughts on this subject must be reserved for the future. But we hope that no one will take such a superficial view of these relations as to infer that we believe that Christianity may be divorced from morality. It is not moral itself, though it rests upon and enforces morality. The law is not made void by faith; but the law does not become remedial by faith. Pardon is distinct from the law, the transgression of which makes the pardon necessary. But pardon recognizes the validity of law; for pardon is a nullity without conviction of sin, and "sin is the transgression of the law."

J. H. W.

"God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit, and in truth."

Church and State.

THE fifth resolution of the Cleveland National Reform Convention reads: "*Resolved*, That we *re-affirm* that this religious amendment, instead of infringing on any individual's right of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens."

It is apparently necessary for that party to constantly "re-affirm" that this movement does not tend to a union of church and State; for as their actions and writings all betray that very tendency, a blind must be kept up by each convention *re-affirming* that it does *not* so tend. That such is its direct tendency we propose to prove.

Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the chief speakers in the movement, in explaining to "Truth Seeker" the change that will have to be made in the existing Constitution when the proposed amendment shall have been adopted, says:—

"The first sentence of Article I. of Amendments reads, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This would be made consistent with the proposed amendment by substituting the words 'a church' for 'religion,' making it read, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a church.' This is what the Reform Association believes should be the rule in a rightly constituted State. There should be religion, but no church."

"There should be religion, but no church." What religion should there be? the Christian religion, to be sure. No idea of any other is for a moment entertained by the National Reform party. But the Christian religion is embodied in the Christian church. Apart from the Christian church there is no Christian religion in this world. Christ did not say, On this rock will I build my religion; but he did say, "On this rock will I build my church," and in that church is his religion. The church is the "body of Christ" (Col. 1:18); the members of the church are members of Christ (1 Cor. 6:15); members of his body—the church (Eph. 5:29, 30). Out of Christ no man can live a Christianly religious life; for he himself said, "Without me ye can do nothing." But to be in Christ is to be *in his church*, for we have proved that the church is his body in this world. We repeat therefore that apart from the Christian church there is no Christian religion. This is exactly what the National Reform party believes; and it is the Christian religion as embodied in what they call the *Christian church* that the party wants this Government to make the fundamental law of the nation. And that will be church and State. For the nation to unite with the Christian religion as embodied in the Christian church is to form a union with the Christian church and is therefore a union of church and State.

If they deny our deduction from their proposition as quoted, and insist that they mean literally that there can be "religion [the Christian religion], but no church," then it follows that they mean that the religion of Christ can be separated from the church of Christ. Then

there follows upon this the absurd conclusion that there can be—a church of Christ with no religion, and a religion with no representatives! But if the religion of Christ have no representatives in the world, then there is no religion of Christ in the world. If it be claimed that this is so as far as our nation is at present concerned; and that now our nation must adopt this religion, and by constitutional amendment embody in the nation's fundamental law the doctrine of God and of Christ, and enforce its observance; that will be simply for the State to create for itself the Christian religion, and so will be nothing else but a union of church and State. It is plain, therefore, that by their own proposition, whatever they may claim under it, there is literally no escape from a union of church and State.

If this reasoning is, by the National Reform party, considered unsound, if the deduction which we make from their premise is not logical, then we verily wish that that party would show us where the line shall be drawn between the Christian religion and the Christian church. Will they show us where the line shall be drawn which will shut the Christian religion in the State, and shut the Christian church out? They will never show it. They know just as well as we do, and we just as well as they, that practically they never intend to make any such distinction. And their claim of such distinction is nothing but a piece of Jesuitical casuistry by which they would hide their real intention.

Further, it is a fact that what used to be the Presbyterian Church is now only the Presbyterian branch of the Christian church. That which once was the Methodist or Baptist Church is now merely the Methodist or the Baptist branch of the church of Christ, or the one true church. And it is a subject of constant rejoicing to them that all the differences that once made them antagonists, are being accommodated, and that the one grand object of the "unity of the church" and its work, is about to be realized. And even the Catholic Church is not excluded, but is recognized by some of the leading religious papers of our land as a part of the true church, and is recognized by the Reform Association in its work (not in its theory) as an efficient helper. That this is the position of the National Reform party the following is proof:—

"But these divisions are a fact, and they have been overruled so that they are not inconsistent with the unity of the church. All upon whom the name of Christ is named have their calling. The Methodists have their vocation in the history of the church to arouse Christian life; the Presbyterians their vocation to conserve Calvinistic principles; and the Reformed Presbyterians their vocation to keep unfurled the blue banner 'for Christ's crown and covenant.' We are different divisions of Immanuel's army. The Methodists are the charging cavalry, the Presbyterians the fighting infantry, the Covenanters the batteries upon the heights. We have one Commander-in-chief, and under him we go forward, one united phalanx against the common enemy. And when the victory is gained, the army will be one as the Leader is one."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 7, 1884, page 6.

So then, if, as they claim, all these are but branches of the one church, of course it requires all of them to make up the church. And if it

requires all of them to make up the Christian church, and the representative of Christianity in the earth, when they all unite, as they are doing, and all work to the one point of securing this religious amendment to the Constitution, and under it enforcing their united views, what is that but church and State?

But as they insist that their movement does not tend "in the least degree to a union of church and State," it may be well to lay before our readers the National Reform idea of what is union of church and State. In the Pittsburg convention, in 1874, Professor Blanchard gave their definition of a union of church and State. It is as follows:—

"But union of church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers, and oversight of its doctrines. For such a union none of us plead. To such a union we are all of us opposed."

Let us accept this definition, and see what it proves. Here it is plainly declared that "the selection by the nation of one church" as the recipient of its favor is the union of church and State. In the quotations that precede this it is just as plainly declared that the different denominations are one church. Therefore, according to their own words, when this nation selects this one church, and by Constitutional amendment espouses her to itself as the especial object of its favor, that will be the union of church and State.

But let us examine the point which is doubtless intended in this last quotation, and see whether they fare any better. In the phrase "the selection by the nation of one church," the meaning is, no doubt, that the selection by the nation, for instance, of the Methodist, or the Baptist, or the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as the object of its favor, would be the union of church and State. But if this would be the union of church and State, how is it that the other would not be? If the selection by the nation of one church is union of church and State, we should like to know how the difficulty is in the least relieved by the selection of a dozen or fifty as one. Will some one of the National Reform advocates point out the distinction and draw the line of demarkation?

Once more: In one of the foregoing quotations from the *Statesman*, the Methodists, Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterians are said to be but "different divisions of Immanuel's army,"—the Methodists, the cavalry; the Presbyterians, the infantry; and the Reformed Presbyterians, the artillery, in "one united phalanx" in the one army. Now in the Declaration of Independence our fathers charged that the king of Great Britain had affected "to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power." What a great pity it is that George III. did not have for his advisers some of these National Reform statesman(?)! If he only could have had these, he could have shown to a "candid world" that this charge of his American colonies was altogether false, and foreign to the subject of their grievances. With the assistance of these profound statesman, he could have projected into the controversy this magnificent and most conclusive disclaimer: "We re-affirm" that the es-

tablishment of our military forces in America, instead of tending in the least degree toward making the military superior to the civil power, will afford the fullest security against such a corrupting establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of the liberties of all citizens. But what we mean by making the military superior to the civil power is the selection by the king of one division of the army, the *artillery*, for instance, and making that the depository and the expositor of the king's will. For such a superiority no one pleads. To such a superiority all of us are opposed. For the king to thus select and favor one division of the army would indeed be to make the military superior to the civil power; but for him to so select the whole army together—cavalry, infantry, and artillery—would not tend "in the least degree" to make the military superior to the civil power.

Now these National Reform advocates, as well as all others, know perfectly that for the king of Great Britain to have offered to the American colonies such an excuse as that for his military occupancy here, would have been only to make himself supremely ridiculous in the eyes of all civilized people. Yet when we charge, as we distinctly do, that the National Reform party aims directly at the union of church and State, and affects to make the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power in the Government of the United States, that party, apparently in all soberness, offers just such an absurdly ridiculous plea in justification of its course,—a plea that is worthy only the casuistry of the veriest Jesuit. However, we do not see how we can expect anything else of that party. Its cause is worthy only of Jesuitism and the Inquisition, and can only be justified by such casuistry as a Jesuit might envy. We shall have something more to say on this subject. A. T. J.

The Chinese Question.

THE agitation on the Chinese question has of late assumed unusually large proportions on the Pacific Coast. We have not the highest interest in some political questions, and therefore have paid little attention to this. True, it is denied that it is a political question; but we have passed through one anti-Chinese excitement since we took up our residence in California, when every employer of Chinese laborers was "warned" to dismiss them; and then, as now, it was denied that it was a political movement, but was solely in the interest of the workingmen. But we noticed that the high regard for the workingmen subsided very soon after election! And to justify our suspicions, or to show that we are not alone in thus thinking, we copy the following from the *Alta California* of February 17:—

"Unfortunately there is an election this year, and candidates offer their full suit of canvass to the popular breeze. By the time one-half of them have failed of nominations, their interest in the anti-Chinese movement will have evaporated."

The act of boycotting the Chinese and Chinese labor does not affect us personally, as the house where this paper is published has never employed Chinamen. This, however, was not because of race prejudices, for we should be ashamed to admit that any existed. But the

managers of the establishment preferred American laborers, and they never found any difficulty in securing all that were desired.

On the question of restricting Chinese immigration we think that the people of California have but one mind. All are in favor of shutting off this tide of immigration from Asia. The territory of the United States is large, and we have talked much of offering an asylum to the people of all nations; but we have long thought that this was being overdone. For the welfare of our land and Government, we believe that restrictions or limitations ought to be put on foreign immigration to our shores. China, especially, is very heavily inhabited. She could spare a million of people who would not be desirable citizens here. We would not willingly see the "Chinatown" of San Francisco duplicated in any other city in the United States. We hope it never will be. We do not know by personal inspection as much about it as we have learned from others; but this is only because we would not explore where others did. More than once we have seen enough to convince us that it is a nuisance.

Though some errors may have been committed in executing the present laws, they have really worked well, according to their intention. Where a few hundreds have come in, thousands have gone out never to return. The number now in California, gradually diminishing, cannot work any serious harm to the State. They have done much toward developing the State's resources, and are still needed in some parts of the country. The *Alta* from which we quoted says:—

"Every orchardist knows that unskilled labor in his tree-tops will not only pick this year's crop, but at the same time destroy next year's crop also, by destroying the buds from which it must issue. We invite the attention of the East to this fact to prove the complete domination of Chinese labor here. Here is an industry with an investment of \$50,000,000 which finds itself unwillingly at the mercy of Chinese labor because white labor cannot be had; and to save itself from ruin, and the State from great financial damage, it is compelled to ask time in which to shift its labor to a white basis."

But the decision has gone forth from a self-constituted arbitrary tribunal that time shall not be given, but the Chinese must be driven off, whatever the consequences to the interests of the country. And if the white labor is available, there is no excuse for letting the work fall so exclusively into the hands of the Chinese.

The *Santa Rosa Republican* tells the story of many localities in the following words:—

"There is a great deal of complaint among the farmers in and around Windsor because help is so scarce. Work is abundant, but no one is on hand to do it. The country, however, is full of tramps wandering hither and thither, not being able, as they say, to get anything to do. But they are of that class of men who while they are looking are praying that they will not find. At present, and for the next six months to come, there need not be any idle men in the State. Such, though, will be seen everywhere, most of them preferring to wander from town to town or lie in jail as vagrants rather than do an honest day's work."

This leads us to remark that we regret exceedingly that Governor Morton did not live to make his report to the United States Senate

on this question. As carefully as possible we followed him in taking testimony in California, and the weight of testimony in the cities was against the Chinese, and in the country, amongst the farmers, in their favor. And in our travels in the State we have found it to be ever the same. The farmers have generally given, as their main reason, that the Chinese are steady, laborious, and *sober*, and all this in marked contrast with very many of other laborers. They are the most peaceable and sober of all foreign laborers in America whom we have ever known; in the East the laborers of several other nationalities have proved far more troublesome than the Chinese have on this coast.

We readily concede that, at the present time this is not altogether a political question; it has become a question of morals and of personal rights. Of *morals*, because we are asked to take a position which no Christian can consistently take. We honor those who have zealously labored in the Chinese missions in this State. We have the fullest assurance that under their labors many genuine conversions have taken place. Believing this, we dare not engage in any warfare against that people that we would not engage in against our common Master and Head, who says, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of *the least* of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." When we are asked to unite with those who would deny them the necessaries of life, we remember the words of our Lord, and must emphatically refuse. And whatever may be the consequences for a short season, we know that He who hears the cry of the humble poor will vindicate our decision and our action.

That it is a question of *personal rights* we prove by citing the decision of Judge Sawyer, recently made, in the case of the "Stockton Laundry Ordinance." In this he said:—

"If this ordinance be valid, it is difficult to perceive what rights the people of California have which a municipal corporation is bound to respect. Of course, no one can, in fact, doubt the purpose of this ordinance. It means, 'The Chinese must go.' And, in order that they shall go, it is made to encroach upon one of the most sacred rights of citizens of the State of California of the Caucasian race, as well as upon the rights of the Mongolian. It should be remembered that *the same clause in our Constitution which protects the rights of every native citizen of the United States born of Caucasian parents, equally protects the rights of the Chinese inhabitant who is lawfully in the country.* When this barrier is broken down as to the Chinese, it is equally swept away as to every American citizen; and in this instance the ordinance reaches American citizens as well as Chinese residents."

In this decision Judge Sawyer did not declare the ordinance void solely because it was subversive of the rights of American citizens, but because of its manifest injustice to *all*. Before the law he places all on an equality. This decision must meet the approval of every candid person throughout the whole country; but it is a standing condemnation of the methods now being largely adopted of depriving the Chinese of their rights. All the Chinese who are now in the State are lawfully here, except, perhaps, a few who had no right to come in under the present laws. And, as the San Fran-

cisco *Argonaut* well said, if the Chinaman is lawfully here, if he has a legal right to be here, he has an unquestioned right to live, a right to labor for his living; and the truthfulness of Judge Sawyer's remarks is shown in this, that they who are trying to deprive the Chinaman now here under treaty obligations, of his right to make an honest living, publicly avow their intention to starve out all who will not aid them in starving out the Chinamen! We do not deny their right to let the Chinese entirely alone, and to refuse to employ them, but we do deny their right to *compel others by mob force* to do as they do.

By special invitation we attended an anti-Chinese meeting in this city. The cause for which the meeting was called must certainly have been injured in the mind of every Christian, and of every one who has a high regard for right and justice. We were shocked to hear a man who was introduced by the title of "Reverend," travesty the Bible and utter libels on the gospel. With one thing in his remarks we were pleased, namely, that he admitted the charge that boycotting is a cowardly method of ruining the business of those who disagree with them. We were not pleased to hear the sentiment cheered, as expressed by another, that "if boycotting will not answer, we will do something worse!" Considering that these methods are not only against the Chinese, but against all who are not in union with these unlawful methods, *these threats are startling*, and our citizens ought to be awake to the dangers impending. If the people of California expect to have their petitions respected by our National Legislature, they must go to Washington with utterances vastly different from these. If they wish to present the "united" voice of California, they must not let Congress know that this union has been obtained by *coercion*, by threats of ruination to dissenters; for boycotting is coercion by threats of personal injury, and nothing less.

We speak of this because the desire has been expressed to present the united voice of California to induce Congress to pass more effective anti-Chinese measures. We verily believe that the cause will be seriously injured before Congress by the methods which are now being adopted in California and elsewhere. The Chinese minister at Washington is vigorously pressing upon our Government the fact that his Government will not only require indemnity for the outrages committed in Wyoming and Washington, but will require protection for its people here from further outrages. Our Government expects to have to indemnify China for the riots at Rock Springs and Seattle, and the papers report that at a recent Cabinet meeting the President expressed his determination to protect the Chinese in every right they possess in this country. We think we speak advisedly when we say that the methods now being adopted in California cannot fail to work powerfully against the anti-Chinese cause in Congress and with the President and his advisers.

When these matters are fully discussed in the East, and in the halls of Congress, there must be a re-action against the coercive measures now being pursued. We expect to see the

time, and that not long hence, when they who boycott will be declared the real enemies of the anti-Chinese cause. The honor of California and the Pacific Coast now rests with the very few papers which *dare* to denounce such unworthy methods. Besides the religious papers, honorable mention should be made of the *Argonaut* and *Golden Gate* of San Francisco, and the *Oregonian* of Portland. The latter is the ablest paper in Oregon.

We are native-born American citizens; we did not have to pay for the boon of citizenship; and we think we understand too well the spirit of Americans to believe that they will long submit to be ruled by threats, and coerced to do the will of organizations outside of the law. We are law-abiding citizens, and so intend to be. And we shall try by every lawful means to prove our loyalty to the Government, and shall continue to value our citizenship, providing that the Government makes our citizenship of any value, by protecting us in the peaceable possession of those rights which are guaranteed to us by our Constitution and laws.

J. H. W.

Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law.

AMONG right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly Governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as "Nihilists," who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right to exercise any authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earthly monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25), and the statement of the apostle, that "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1), together with many other Scripture references to earthly Governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist.

Admitting that earthly Governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governors are sent by the Lord "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1 Peter 2:13, 14. Paul says also that the ruler is God's minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. Rom. 13:4.

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly

rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the text last referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, must be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (Ps. 19 : 7), covering in its range every act and thought (See Eccl. 12 : 13, 14; Heb. 4 : 12; Matt. 5 : 20–22, 27, 28), every human law must be embraced within its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:—

"Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And herein it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy; for, with regard to such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to, the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in foro conscientiarum* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."—*Chitty's Blackstone, Vol. I., p. 28.*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God; it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong, unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act, is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience, or expediency.

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute *wrath*? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also decide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:—

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt

have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good." Rom. 13 : 1–4.

The "higher powers" do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, none are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5 : 29.

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly Governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13 : 8–10.

"He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law," and "Love is the fulfilling of the law." What law? Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." See Matt. 22 : 36–40. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue. These, with the exception of the fifth commandment, are directly quoted by Paul, thus clearly showing to what law he refers when he says, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." To make this still more emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law." Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly Governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor—loves his neighbor as himself,—has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly Governments are empowered to take notice.

Thus it is seen that Paul's argument concerning the office of civil Government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human Governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly Governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure any one except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of

the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human Governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind. -

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil Government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the *act* is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.

We see, then, how imperfect are human Governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature—those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor—human Governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.

E. J. W.

"What Does It Amount To?"

"It is generally supposed that when men of intelligence associate together to accomplish any great work, they will employ the most efficient means in their power. When we hear of a society professing to want to secure the prohibition of the liquor traffic, and other great reforms, by Constitutional amendment, and then learn that it is simply to put a short (but growing) confession of faith in the preamble, we are disappointed. Soon after Iowa had adopted her amendment, which was so shamefully snatched from her, an editor from Western Illinois, after visiting Burlington, made in his paper the very original remark: 'Prohibition does not prohibit.' The wish must have been 'father to the thought;' for every one knew that the legislature had not met to pass the necessary laws to enforce the amendment.

"But even if Iowa had stopped there, she was wiser than our 'National Reform' friends, for she did not put it in the preamble. When we see a large and well-officered society, with an abundance of able advocates, boasting a membership of more illustrious names than any other of our day, laboring perseveringly for an object so trivial, we cannot help fearing that, in spite of their disclaimers, there must be something more intended than is now acknowledged. In the present state of the country we are fearful of this movement. It can effect nothing without an enforcing law, and that would be a long step toward what has always proved destructive of liberty—a union of church and State. Such a preamble standing alone, with the present amount of wickedness in high places, would only be the white-wash of Pharisaism. It might answer in the

millennium; but a persecuting church is not likely to help to bring in the millennium.

"Monmouth, Ill. STARK, JR."

REMARKS.—The "National Reformers" have not been backward to avow their objects, as we prove from their own writings, quoted in the SENTINEL. Moreover, they have given a reason for wishing to have the amendment inserted in the preamble. It is that thereby a religious cast may be given to the whole Constitution, and thus ally our Government most closely to the churches, which are to be the exponents of her religious policy. It matters very little where the amendment is placed; everything depends on the nature of the enforcing laws. And all their aims and plans as avowed point unmistakably to the most complete union of church and State.

It may be that many are beguiled to believe that it will be a harmless thing if put in the preamble. But, as remarked, everything depends on the laws of enforcement, and what they intend these shall be they have avowed with great definiteness.

A Significant Fact Acknowledged.

WE have called attention to the fact that when our Government is *nominally Christianized*; when they who do not profess adherence to "Christian laws, usages, and institutions," are declared ineligible to official positions (see editorial in *Christian Statesman*, Dec. 5, 1870); when the "consistent infidel" and the dissenting Christian are disfranchised (see Mr. Coleman in *Statesman*, Nov. 1, 1883), then the *politicians by trade* will unite with the church (the most popular one, of course, thereby making it more popular), and "for a pretense make long prayers," that they may be praised of men—and get office. We are not the only ones who have foreseen this state of things inevitable upon such a change in the structure of our Government as the "Reformers" propose to have made.

In the National Convention of the Reform Association held in Pittsburg, Pa., February 4, 5, 1874, two of the speakers recognized this interesting fact. Dr. Robert Audley Browne, on the evening of the 4th, used the following language:—

"There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decrying this movement, are ready to be its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times, and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress; but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow 'they always thought it was a good thing.' When our Master comes into his kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Zebedee's children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom."

Of course they will. And what is to hinder them from getting those foremost positions if they "join the church" and pray long and strong enough? Is it said that old office-seekers will be marked, and kept from the front? What is to hinder another set, just as plausible,

just as politic, just as hypocritical, rising up and appropriating the offices? That, of course, will assist in keeping the Government consistently Christian, and greatly strengthen the church in that which it prizes so much—numbers!

Dr. Geo. P. Hays made the closing speech on the evening of February 5, in which he said:—

"Politicians are very timid of us now. They will grow wise soon. . . . When once they [the foundation masses] are moved, hundreds of politicians who would not for the world commit themselves to it now, will bawl themselves hoarse in applause, and swear they knew it would be so, and were on that side from the beginning."

We appeal to the reader: Are we not justified in opposing a movement which, if successful, will set a premium of worldly gain on uniting with the church or making a public profession of Christianity? We only wonder that in this age, with the strong lessons of history on this subject before us, any who love our liberties, and have any regard for the cause of pure Christianity, will advocate the religious amendment of the Constitution. Our paper would be unworthy of its name if it did not sound an alarm before the fatal deed is done. J. H. W.

Macaulay on Gladstone.

THE following extract from Macaulay's review of Gladstone's book, "The State in its Relations with the Church," contains some excellent definitions of principles which no one can gainsay:—

"We are desirous, before we enter on the discussion of this important question, to point out clearly a distinction which, though very obvious, seems to be overlooked by many excellent people. In their opinion, to say that the ends of government are temporal and not spiritual is tantamount to saying that the temporal welfare of man is of more importance than his spiritual welfare. But this is an entire mistake. The question is not whether spiritual interests be or be not superior in importance to temporal interests; but whether the machinery which happens at any moment to be employed for the purpose of protecting certain temporal interests of a society be necessarily such a machinery as is fitted to promote the spiritual interests of that society. Without a division of labor, the world could not go on. It is of very much more importance that men should have food than that they should have pianofortes. Yet it by no means follows that every pianoforte maker ought to add the business of a baker to his own; for if he did so, we should have both much worse music and much worse bread. It is of much more importance that the knowledge of religious truth should be wisely diffused than that the art of sculpture should flourish among us. Yet it by no means follows that the Royal Academy ought to unite with its present functions those of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to distribute theological tracts, to send forth missionaries, to turn out Nollekens for being a Catholic, Bacon for being a Methodist, and Flaxman for being a Swedenborgian. For the effect of such folly would be that we should have the worst possible Academy of Arts, and the worst possible Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowl-

edge. The community, it is plain, would be thrown into universal confusion, if it were supposed to be the duty of every association which is formed for one good object to promote every other good object.

"As to some of the ends of civil Government all people are agreed. That it is designed to protect our persons and our property; that it is designed to compel us to satisfy our wants, not by rapine, but by industry; that it is designed to compel us to decide our differences, not by the strong hand, but by arbitration; that it is designed to direct our whole force, as that of one man, against any other society which may offer us injury; these are propositions which will hardly be disputed.

"Now these are matters in which man, without any reference to any higher being, or to any future state, is very deeply interested. Every human being, be he idolater, Mahometan, Jew, papist, Socinian, deist, or atheist, naturally loves life, shrinks from pain, desires comforts which can be enjoyed only in communities where property is secure. To be murdered, to be tortured, to be robbed, to be sold into slavery, these are evils from which men of every religion, and men of no religion, wish to be protected; and therefore it will hardly be disputed that men of every religion, and of no religion, have thus far a common interest in being well governed.

"But the hopes and fears of man are not limited to this short life and to this visible world. He finds himself surrounded by the signs of a power and wisdom higher than his own; and in all ages and nations, men of all orders of intellect, from Bacon and Newton down to the rudest tribes of cannibals, have believed in the existence of some superior mind. Thus far the voice of mankind is almost unanimous. But whether there be one God or many, what may be God's natural and what his moral attributes, in what relation his creatures stand to him, whether he have ever disclosed himself to us by any other revelation than that which is written in all the parts of the glorious and well-ordered world which he has made, whether his revelation be contained in any permanent record, how that record should be interpreted, and whether it have pleased him to appoint any unerring interpreter on earth, these are questions respecting which there exists the widest diversity of opinion, and respecting some of which a large part of our race has ever been deplorably in error.

"Now, here are two great objects: one is the protection of the persons and estates of citizens from injury; the other is the propagation of religious truth. No two objects more entirely distinct can well be imagined. The former belongs wholly to the visible and tangible world in which we live; the latter belongs to that higher world which is beyond the reach of our senses. The former belongs to this life; the latter to that which is to come. Men who are perfectly agreed as to the importance of the former object, and as to the way of obtaining it, differ as widely as possible respecting the latter object. We must therefore pause before we admit that the persons, be they who they may, who are intrusted with power for the promotion of the former object, ought always to use that power for the promotion of the latter object."

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., MARCH, 1886.

SOME matter which we hoped to get into this number of the SENTINEL is necessarily laid over for want of room.

CERTAIN Christians in Tennessee who keep the seventh day, were indicted for working on Sunday, but the indictments were quashed on technical grounds. The Supreme Court of Arkansas has not yet rendered its decision in the cases of those who were convicted for the same offense. Many American citizens are watching these cases with great interest.

WE received a kind letter from an Eastern State, the writer requesting us to send the SENTINEL, saying that he had seen the notice in the *Statesman*, and had for some time thought there was room for such a paper if judiciously edited. We think there is a strong demand for just such a paper, and we shall earnestly strive to make the SENTINEL meet the demand.

Both True and Good.

THE following very sensible remarks we copy from the Woodland (Cal.) *Daily Democrat*. It is a pity that at this time Christians and religious papers are required to turn their attention to matters which are not legitimate to their calling:—

"The Sacramento *Bee*, although a confessedly secular journal, evidently believes in the efficacy of prayer. It suggests that the clergy of the Pacific Coast set apart a day of anti-Chinese service and prayer. It is doubtful whether this suggestion will be accepted. The purpose of Christianity is to save sinners and to break down the idolatrous customs of the world. The command is to preach the gospel to every creature, with no restriction act in the case of the Chinese. . . . The spirit of rebellion which leads to riots is already strong enough without having the voice of the pulpit lend its encouragement. Christianity should be permitted to pursue its own course, and let the secular affairs of the country alone. Politics is sure to prove the bane of religion when they are mixed together. It has ever been the case, that when the church has gone beyond its legitimate sphere, it has been the sufferer."

Notices of the Sentinel.

It is not the intention to largely copy notices of the SENTINEL, but we have just received a couple from Illinois which we will copy. The first is from the *Sentinel* published in Avon, Fulton Co., as follows:—

"We are in receipt of No. 1, Vol. 1, of a paper entitled the AMERICAN SENTINEL published at Oakland, Cal. This paper is published as the national opposition organ to the 'Religious Amendment Party.' Its motto is 'Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.' Let it be remembered that those opposed to a religious political party are not necessarily opposed to Christianity; and further, we hold it as a self-evident truth that they befriend Christianity by every blow struck at any movement which has for its object a union of church and State. Any union of church and State ultimately results in a complete dethronement of all religious liberty in a nation, and lays foundation for the darkest and most despotic an-

archy that could be invented. From the commencement of Governments, history is rife with such examples of the truth of this, that people should look well where they stand before they join the fanatical cry for a Christian crusade in the shape of a political party."

Truth, every word. But the following reminds us of a certain critic, who said he never read a book which he reviewed, because reading it was apt to prejudice him, and hinder a free criticism. It is from a notice of the SENTINEL which we find in the *Morris Daily News*. It is evidently written without prejudice; for the writer certainly never read a single article in the SENTINEL:—

"We have received the first number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, published at Oakland, Cal. It is published in the interest of the 'National Reform Association,' and is an organ of what is popularly known as the 'Religious Amendment Party,' because it is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Its object is to put God in the Constitution."

Well, that is discouraging!

Religion in Politics.

NONE of the present generation, in this land, are better qualified to judge of the influence of amalgamating religion and politics than we are. We passed through one campaign in California where the only question at issue between the parties was one of religion; and we know that none watched the effect more closely and with greater interest than than we did. At that time (1882) California had a Sunday law. In fact, she had two. One in the Civil Code, which made Sunday a legal holiday; the other in the Penal Code, under the head of "offenses against religion," in which Sunday was called "the Christian Sabbath." The latter only was in question.

The issue was forced into politics by certain religionists who demanded, not only the rigid enforcement of the Sunday law, but that a more stringent law should be enacted; and they resolved to vote for no one, of any party, who would not pledge himself to carry out their demands. The Democratic party met this demand by opposing the law, and "all laws intended to restrain or direct a free and full exercise by any citizen of his own religious and political opinions, so long as he leaves others to enjoy their rights unmolested," and demanded in turn the repeal of the then existing law. The Republican convention, evidently thinking thereby to attract the full vote of the churches, resolved in its favor. No other issue of any interest was made between the parties, and thus the strife began.

Such a campaign was probably never before known in American politics, and we earnestly hope we shall never see another. Newspaper editors who were never suspected of having any leanings toward religion suddenly became very religious! The deepest party rancor was manifested, and the most bitter epithets were bestowed, in the most approved religious-political style. And we noticed that the malignity of spirit was mostly shown by those papers which were so suddenly converted into religious-political journals. As a specimen of this kind of "Christian" literature, we copy the follow-

"The whole moral forces of the commonwealth, from center to circumference, have been aroused to furious indignation,—not only all the church people, but all others who sympathize with them, all who have sprung from the loins of Christian women and been baptized on the Christian Sabbath,—and he who expects to be elected on such a damnable platform, especially in this county, is no less than an unreasoning fool. In this Cain-like resentment against mankind, J— T— has kindled a veritable religious war as vehement in its spirit as ever flamed in the glens of Scotland. Since the conflict has been begun by the powers of darkness, let the fighting go on, and the forces continue to be arrayed in solid phalanx; the churches against the gin-mills; Sunday-schools against the brew-houses; Christian women against the destroyers of their households; morality against vice; God against the devil. The former may lose the battle on the Barbary Coast and other confines of hell; but elsewhere, as sure as the great stone was rolled away from the door of the sepulcher on the morning of the first day of the week, the honor of California civilization shall be redeemed."

What a climax! And what a Christian spirit! But it was common in those days for those Christian politicians to call their opponents heretics, infidels, and atheists. And it was well said that "the movement presents an incongruous mixture of politics and religion—politics merely for victory, and religion without reverence." It was indeed a "religious war," fortunately of short duration; and fortunately the people rebuked this frenzied zeal, and what followed? Not one of those editors had a word to say in behalf of religion after election. By their "daily walk and conversation" you could not have told them from the veriest "heretics" in the land.

This is our observation of religion and politics. And if party religious strife raged so bitterly in one short campaign, what might we not expect to see if it were to be repeated in every campaign? Heaven save our country from such a calamity, and Christianity from such a disgrace!

It is due to the reader to explain that the expression in the above extract—"the churches against the gin-mills"—was a sheer deception, for the question of temperance was not involved. The temperance people repudiated the platform, and adopted one of their own. The issue was the Sunday, and the Sunday only; and it was in its behalf that this semi-religious furor was raised. And we promise to do all in our power to warn the people of the danger of suffering religion to be mixed with politics in this country. Christianity needs no such alliance. It depends for its support on the loving spirit and peaceable lives of its professors, and is always injured by the frenzied zeal of worldly-minded advocates.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1886.

NUMBER 4.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE *Christian Herald* is not given to joking, but we can scarcely believe that it had any faith in its own words when it called New York "a Christian city." We do not know the basis of its calculation; but we suppose if Lot could have found ten righteous persons in Sodom, it would be ready to name Sodom a righteous city. On such a basis it is not surprising that they think to make this a Christian nation by amending the National Constitution! The standard of Christianity is altogether too low now, and there is no need to lower it by legal enactments. If the advocates of the amendment spent as much time to convert people to the truths of the Bible, as they do to induce people to enforce the Bible by civil law, they would do far more towards making this a Christian nation.

The Other Side.

THE advocates of a Religious Amendment of the Constitution love to refer to the expression of Mr. Abbot, as follows:—

"If I were a Christian, if I believed in Christianity, I do not see how I could help taking my stand at your side."

But that expression was very unfortunate for Mr. Abbot. It did not destroy the force of his warning and his reasoning against the movement, but it did show that he was inconsistent in his positions. After showing what would be its evil effects upon the nation at large, how it would subvert the liberties of the people, he added:—

"If I wished to destroy Christianity in this country by unscrupulous means, I should encourage your attempt in every way."

And this he said because of the reaction that the attempt will create against Christianity. There are many who are Christians who can see the dangers ahead just as readily as Mr. Abbot could, and who realize that the reaction will be detrimental to Christianity. Mr. Abbot's position implies that, though the dangers attendant upon this movement are very great, and easy to be seen; and though the reaction which it will cause will be fatal to Christianity, yet, were he a Christian, he would favor the movement! Not necessarily. There are many Christians who are not so inconsistent as his words indicate that he would be.

Legalizing Christianity.

IN the first number of the *SENTINEL*, in outlining the course of argument which will be pursued in its columns, the following remark was made:—

"To carry this amendment into effect, any person who refuses to obey the laws and usages of Christianity must be subjected to penalties for his neglect or disobedience. As no law can exist without a penalty, no institutions or usages can be placed on a legal basis without authorizing penalties for their enforcement. This is undeniable."

It may be well to emphasize this point in order to meet the many professions of the amendment party that their movement is harmless; that it is merely to secure a declaration of the supremacy of Christ and his laws, which cannot interfere with any man's rights, or do violence to any man's convictions. But such a declaration would not carry the force of law, and if that was what they are *really* aiming at, it would be harmless indeed. But, as is elsewhere shown in this paper, that is but the foundation on which they propose to erect "an imposing superstructure." The superstructure includes the placing of the Christian religion, or its laws and usages and institutions, which means exactly the same thing, "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." And this means to secure the declaration as the necessary step to legalizing Christianity, which means to enforce it by "appropriate legislation" and the necessary penalties.

It has been said, strangely enough, that a penalty cannot with propriety be introduced until the law has been violated. The fallacy of this is apparent; for the penalty is that which alone distinguishes between *law* and *advice*. Advice leaves an individual free to act at his own option; while law is the expression of authority, and the only option a person has in regard to it is, to obey or suffer the penalty. But advice has no penalty; to attach a penalty thereto would be to convert it into law. The following strong language was used by Blackstone:—

"Where rewards are proposed, as well as punishments threatened, the obligation of the law seems chiefly to consist in the penalty; for rewards, in their nature, can only persuade and allure; nothing is *compulsory* but punishment."

But it is in the very nature of law to be compulsory, and therefore without punishment or penalty, no law can exist. And so, to place Christianity on a legal basis is nothing less than to enforce it by penalties.

It was declared by a writer in the *Christian Statesman* that the religious amendment would

"disfranchise" every "consistent infidel." But that expression only reaches to the voluntary action of the infidel himself, meaning that if he were consistent he could not support such a Government as the amendmentists contemplate. But of course it would not disfranchise the dishonorable or *inconsistent infidel*, because, as we have shown, such a Government would be every way favorable to dishonesty and hypocrisy. If it were calculated to promote morality and uprightness, it would disfranchise the dishonorable and inconsistent, instead of those of better character. They may reply, that they cannot control a person's mind, but only his overt actions. Very true; and this shows the absurdity, the arrant folly, of placing Christianity on a legal basis, or trying to enforce it by law, for without reaching the mind and the heart you have not reached the seat of Christianity. So-called Christianity without this, is only a mockery; and the amendment, at best, would only serve to enforce a mockery of Christianity. The overt actions with which alone human laws have to do, may have no relation whatever to true Christianity. The Christian religion is entirely beyond the reach and scope of civil or human Governments. And we are surprised that every person who has any understanding of the nature of Christianity, and has the capacity to reason, does not at once acknowledge this evident truth.

Such a disfranchisement as that of which the writer in the *Statesman* spoke, resting entirely upon the voluntary action of a man who acts only to preserve his consistency, *is no penalty*. It would be no part of that which enforces the usages and institutions of Christianity. But to put these usages and institutions on a legal basis, there must be penalties. And these penalties, of course, would be for the punishment of those who would not or did not observe the "laws, institutions, and usages," of Christianity! We challenge any man to attempt to trace the facts to a different conclusion.

But these "National Reformers" have over and over said that their movement is not for the coercion of any man's conscience, and if successful it will not interfere with anybody's religion. But such an assertion is preposterous. They know better than to say what they do. In order to enforce Christian institutions and usages by law, these institutions and usages must be defined by law. And, in the midst of the interminable differences of religious beliefs, who shall define them? Who shall determine for this whole nation what are the laws, institutions, and usages of Christianity which they are to perform? Or, rather, who

shall decide, amongst the great diversity of beliefs, which we shall label "Christian," and which shall be ignored and denounced as heretical?

The American people will do well to wake up to the importance of examining these questions, for, unless this religious amendment movement shall be speedily checked, they are questions which cannot long be ignored. With the present prevailing indifference on the subject, the amendment may be carried in default of necessary action to prevent it. And we fear for the result. It will never be carried into effect *peaceably*. We have already defined our position in that respect; we shall offer no forcible resistance to its enforcement. But we cannot expect that all will be like-minded. Mr. Abbot, before the Cincinnati Convention, gave the warning which may one day be seen to be timely. He said:—

"I warn you against the peril of instigating the Christian part of our population to attempt this usurpation. I caution you against the folly of supposing that the majority of the people will finally consent to this subversion of their common liberties. I beg you to count the cost of this agitation before you carry it further. . . . I make no threat whatever, but I state a truth fixed as the hills when I say that before you can carry this measure, and trample on the freedom of the people, you will have to wade through seas of blood. Every man who favors it votes to precipitate the most frightful war of modern times; and it is simply preposterous for any of your number to speak of the liberals as 'threatening war.' You threaten war when you avow a purpose to destroy the equality of religious rights now guaranteed by the Constitution to all American citizens. On the assailant in this struggle be all responsibility of its results."

And the horrors of such a struggle, which is certain to follow the enactment of this amendment, would be greatly increased by the fact that it would not be bounded by State lines, as was our late war. It would be a war of parties in every State, every county, and every neighborhood in the land. And if it did not break out in open violence in every neighborhood, it would lead to endless animosities and strifes which would be anything but favorable to the interests of genuine Christianity. We pray that the Lord may open the eyes of those who are trying, though unwittingly, to precipitate such a struggle in our land.

J. H. W.

A Christian Nation.

AN agent and lecturer of the National Reform Association wrote to the *Statesman* as follows:—

"While the evangelical churches in our land spend \$3,000,000 a year on Christian missions, our nation spends \$600,000,000 a year on rum. Only think, \$3,000,000 for the conversion of the heathen world, and \$35,000,000 for tobacco alone, and yet we call ourselves a Christian nation."

And if "we call ourselves a Christian nation," it is an act of hypocrisy; for we then call ourselves what we are not, and what we never will be. And only one thing could ever make us a Christian nation, namely, the conversion of the nation to Christianity. Thousands may be induced, for various reasons, to vote for the Religious Amendment to the Constitution who care nothing for the Christian religion. But

their votes will count as much as any to make this *legally* a Christian nation!

That we are correct in our judgment that people will vote for the amendment on other grounds than their personal regard for religion, we offer proof. We recently received a letter from one of the Southern States, in which the writer said that the people of that country were in favor of the Religious Amendment for the sole reason that they had been assured that it is the only means of putting down polygamy in Utah! We repeat what we have before said that the "Amendment Party" ought to show what could be done to that end, under such an amendment, that the Government is not already doing without the amendment; and if they cannot do this—as they surely cannot—then they ought to confess the deception which they have been and still are practicing upon the people. It is a shame to the intelligence of that party of eminent men that they make no distinction between crime and religion. It is a shame to them to argue that, under our Constitution as it is, all manner of crimes may be *legally* committed under the name of religion. It is a shame to them that they try to prove the right of the Government to regulate our actions in matters of religion, because its right is undisputed to regulate our actions in things secular. We have heard just such arguments made. One speech in the National Convention held in Pittsburg, Pa., in 1874, was devoted almost entirely to examples of Government controlling the action of its citizens, and every instance was concerning secular matters; and they were given to show that what they seek is in harmony with the uniform policy of the Government! We verily believe that the speaker was so wedded to his theory that he was deceived in regard to the matter of his address. And so were many in his audience; but not all.

The Lansing (Mich.) *State Republican*, in speaking of the National Convention held in Cincinnati in 1872, gave a good testimony in regard to people voting for the amendment who care nothing about religion. It said:—

"Thousands of men, if called upon to vote for such an amendment, would hesitate to vote against God, although they might not believe that the amendment is necessary or that it is right; and such men would either vote affirmatively or not at all. In either case, such an amendment would be likely to receive an affirmative vote which would by no means indicate the true sentiment of the people. And the same rule would hold good in relation to the adoption of such an amendment by Congress or by the legislatures of three-quarters of the States. Men who make politics a trade would hesitate to record their names against the proposed Constitutional Amendment, advocated by the great religious denominations of the land, and indorsed by such men as Bishop Simpson, Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Eastburn, President Finney, Professor Lewis, Professor Seelye, Bishop Huntington, Bishop Kerfoot, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Cuyler, and many other divines who are the representative men of their respective denominations."

And yet every vote so given would be counted as indicating the religious sentiment and feeling of the nation. We would be glad to be assured that the practice of such deceptions as those to which we have referred, will cease. Let us have honest dealing. If anything

should be fairly and candidly considered, it is the question of a change of the entire policy of our Government where the civil and religious rights of our citizens are so deeply involved.

But more than this; we have the assent of the most earnest laborers in behalf of the amendment to the fact which we have stated. Thus Mr. W. J. Coleman, a prominent lecturer of that party, spoke thus in a convention, Oct. 5, 1882:—

"The third principle raised by this National Reform movement is rather theological, so far at least as it is proved by Scripture and not by what is called 'natural religion,' if there be any such thing. I am aware that there is great distaste in this country and time to the acceptance of anything that is proved out of the Bible, and a corresponding liking for the results of *pure reason*; that is, human reason. I am aware that men in general would be fairly willing to go thus far because it would relieve the conscience from a faint suspicion of atheism, while at the same time an acknowledgment of God as Creator does not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience, nor fix a single law requiring their obedience. We have it in our State Constitutions, and it has little or no force. It would be complimentary, but not of itself binding. It is to be supposed that this is about the length that the daily papers consider that we are going."

And it is quite natural to suppose so, seeing that these "reformers" so often assure us that their movement is so very harmless,—simply the recognition of God, and his Son, and the Bible in the Constitution,—which cannot possibly infringe upon any one's rights. And inasmuch as "men in general would be fairly willing to go thus far," because it would "not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience" (as it surely ought not), therefore it oftentimes is convenient to thus present it to the hearers—to win the voters. But this is not their intention. Mr. Coleman continued:—

"If we were to stop here, I should share in their indifference. But we do *not stop here*. This is simply the foundation for an imposing structure. These principles are only premises; the conclusion is yet to come, and it has this dangerous character of the syllogism that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

These are truthful expressions of the aims of that party. They, too, would be indifferent if they were to stop where *no restraint is imposed on the conscience!* And they ought to stop just short of that point. Human Governments are for the protection of society, and have only to deal with actions, or actual violations of law. But we must remember that this is to be a *religious* amendment, and is by no means to stop where no restraints are imposed on the conscience. Fatal admission to their professions of the innocency of their movement. What right have they to impose restraints upon my conscience, or yours, or that of any man? How would they like to have restraints imposed on their consciences? Oh, no; that is not supposable. They are the infallible ones, who alone have a right to freedom of conscience! Does Rome go further than this? People who talk like that would erect the Inquisition, if once the power were in their hands.

With all this before us, people still ask us, "What's the harm?" We fear that our motto is already true of a vast number of American

citizens who are willing to give away their birthright—"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves." But we promise that we shall never have our consciences bound by any human Government without publishing to the world our protest. And we promise to faithfully warn our fellow-citizens of the danger which impends over their civil and religious liberties, and to the best of our ability to earn the name of an AMERICAN SENTINEL.

J. H. W.

What Do They Want?

THE second article of the Constitution of the National Reform Association reads, in part as follows: "The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; . . . 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."

We must suppose that those words are intended to conceal some ulterior design; for we are morally certain that none of the National Reformers care to see just the condition of things which the above article might, on a casual reading, seem to demand. By a little examination of the subject we can see that the expressed object of the National Reform Party could not be realized unless the religious bodies of this country should undergo a great transformation.

Our first question is, What is Christianity? Webster defines it as, "The religion of Christians; the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ." Then right in connection with this, we must answer the question, What are Christian institutions? The obvious answer is, The ordinances of the Christian religion; those instituted by Christ. And as all the professed followers of Christ, professors of the Christian religion, are termed as a body, the church, we may say that Christian institutions are the ordinances of the Christian church.

When we come to an examination of the subject of Christian ordinances, we shall find that there are very few of them. The apostle Paul describes one of them in 1 Cor. 11 : 23-26: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

One Christian ordinance, then, is the Lord's Supper. It was instituted by Christ, is enjoined upon all his followers, and is peculiar to Christianity. One more: Just as Christ was about to ascend to Heaven, he said to his disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and

is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16 : 15, 16. To these two ordinances some Christians add the washing of feet as found in John 13 : 1-15; but all are agreed on the first two. Here, then, we have two, or at the most, three Christian ordinances. They are peculiar to Christianity, and besides them there are no others.

Some one will exclaim, "What about the Golden Rule?" We reply, That is not peculiar to Christianity. Do not misunderstand us. We do not say that the keeping of it is not necessary to Christianity, but that it is not peculiar to Christianity. When our Saviour said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," he immediately added, "for this is the law and the prophets." The golden rule is simply a summary of the last six precepts of the decalogue; but the decalogue was in existence and of obligation before man fell, and consequently before there was any need of Christianity. The ten commands, which comprise all primary obligation, would have been just as much in force as they are now, even if there had been no fall involving the necessity for a Christian religion; and more than this, they are now, as they were in the beginning, of universal obligation; so that they are equally binding on Jews, Mohammedans, Christians, and pagans. But baptism and the Lord's Supper not only are not obligatory upon Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans, but they are positively denied to such until they profess allegiance to Christ.

We repeat, therefore, that the only possible Christian ordinances are baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the ordinance of humility, or feet-washing. These are the features which outwardly indicate the possession of Christianity. And therefore if a nation is to be really a "Christian nation," these features must exist in it. If it demands that all its subjects submit to these ordinances, then it will be, *in name*, a Christian nation; but if none of these features exist in it, then it is in no sense a Christian nation.

Has the United States any of these Christian features? Does it require any or all of them as a condition of citizenship? Everybody answers, No. Then it has no "existing Christian features" to be maintained. National Reform zeal, therefore, in that particular, is entirely misapplied.

Now for a brief consideration of the difficulties in the way of making this a "Christian nation," *i. e.*, a nation having Christian features. At the outset we are met with a controversy over baptism. A large and respectable body of Christian professors hold that nothing but immersion is baptism. Many more hold that sprinkling meets the requirement of the Saviour; while still others teach that either immersion, sprinkling, or pouring is baptism. Most immersionists hold that a single immersion is all that can be allowed, while some claim three immersions are necessary to constitute baptism. Here is an irreconcilable controversy; for though the matter has been under discussion for centuries, it is no nearer a settlement than in the beginning. Concerning the Lord's Supper there is almost equal division. A large part of the so-called Christian church with-

holds the cup from the laity, while many are of late disposed to dispense with the entire ordinance. As for the third ordinance, it is celebrated by but few, the greater part of professed Christians being utterly opposed to it.

But it is useless to carry this point any further, for if you were to put the question, the entire body of "National Reformers" would with one voice declare that they desire no such thing as that the nation shall recognize baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc. And in so saying they would speak the truth. Nevertheless they do declare that this is, or ought to be, a Christian nation, and that "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages," should be placed "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land;" and we know that that can be done only by making the Constitution require the celebration of baptism and the Lord's Supper as a condition of citizenship. It must be that they have something else in mind, which in their opinion is peculiar to Christianity, and upon which there would not be among professed Christians so much difference of opinion. What do they want, anyway? In a future article we shall let them tell for themselves.

E. J. W.

The Stranger—the Dissenter.

THE following poetry appeared in the *Christian Statesman*, copied from *Harper's Magazine*:

AN EASTERN LEGEND.

An aged man came late to Abraham's tent.
The sky was dark, and all the plain was bare.
He asked for bread; his strength was well-nigh spent;
His haggard look implored the tenderest care.
The food was brought. He sat with thankful eyes,
But spake no grace, nor bowed he toward the east.
Safe-sheltered here from dark and angry skies,
The bounteous table seemed a royal feast.
But ere his hand had touched the tempting fare,
The patriarch rose, and leaning on his rod,
"Stranger," he said, "dost thou not bow in prayer?
Dost thou not fear, dost thou not worship God?"
He answered, "Nay." The patriarch sadly said:
"Thou hast my pity. Go! eat not my bread."

Another came that wild and fearful night.
The fierce winds raged, and darker grew the sky;
But all the tent was filled with wondrous light,
And Abraham knew the Lord his God was nigh.
"Where is that aged man?" the Presence said,
"That asked for shelter from the driving blast?
Who made thee master of thy Master's bread?
What right hadst thou the wanderer forth to cast?"
"Forgive me, Lord," the patriarch answer made,
With downcast look, with bowed and trembling knee,
"Ah, me! the stranger might with me have staid,
But, O, my God, he would not worship thee."
"I've borne him long," God said, "and still I wait;
Couldst thou not lodge him one night in thy gate?"

Also the following words are copied from the *Christian Statesman*, original with the "Reverend" gentleman who uttered them at a "National Reform Convention:"—

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistical ideas, and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

And when they are "disfranchised" and banished, or dead and gone, the model Christian Reformers (?) can reverently sing:—

"Ah, me! the stranger might with us have staid,
But, O, our God, he would not worship thee."

But in the meantime we recommend them to use the words of Burns:—

"O wad some power the giftie gie us,
To see oursels as ithers see us."

Judge Black on Utah.

WHEN we were in Salt Lake City, last year, we had a 28-page pamphlet presented to us by a zealous Mormon, the pamphlet being an argument by Judge Jeremiah S. Black before the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives. In this are some strange statements, but we notice only the closing paragraph. It reads as follows:—

"Coming back to the original and fundamental proposition that you have no right to legislate about marriage in a Territory, you will ask, Then what are we to do with polygamy? It is a bad thing, and a false religion that allows it. But the people of Utah have as good a right to their false religion as you have to your true one. Then you add that it is not a religious error merely, but a crime which ought to be extirpated by the sword of the civil magistrate. That is also conceded. But those people have a civil Government of their own, which is as wrong-headed as their church. Both are free to do evil on this and kindred subjects if they please, and they are neither of them answerable to you. That brings you to the end of your string."

As the argument of a paid attorney, for in this capacity he made the argument, it is passable. But as the opinion of a statesman and a jurist, it is more than questionable. He concedes that polygamy is "a crime which ought to be extirpated by the sword of the civil magistrate." But the civil magistrate and the Territorial lawmakers and the church are alike in collusion with crime, and therefore you have no remedy! Now it is a fact beyond denial that the property and even the lives of anti-Mormons, and especially of seceding Mormons, have not been safe in many parts of Utah, except when protected by a power outside of that of the Territory. And if they have authority to legalize one crime, they may legalize any and all crimes. And Judge Black would coolly say: "And what are you going to do about it?"

Traced to its legitimate conclusion, the case would then stand thus: It is the right and duty of the United States to appoint judges to hold courts in Utah. And if theft and murder were legalized in Utah, the Federal Courts would be compelled to rule in favor of theft and murder, because they were protected by the Territorial statutes! And the General Government would be powerless, would have no right to interfere, because the Territory is independent of the Federal Government. If the argument of Judge Black were conceded to be correct, then all Congressional laws for the government of Territories would be nullities, and United States Courts in the Territories would be farces. Fortunately for our nation, this doctrine of crimes is not accepted by the General Government.

But there is one class in the United States which ought to rejoice at the state of things which has obtained in Utah; it is the "National Reform Association." In Utah was presented an illustration of the workings of just such a Government as that for which they are laboring. In Utah the civil Government existed "to serve the interests of the church." In Utah the civil power "formed an alliance" with the church, and acknowledged its obligation "to adhere to, defend, and maintain" the

religion which the church decided was the right religion. If this is not just such a Government as they wish ours to become, then their words give the lie to their desires.

But they may reply, We do not want an alliance between the State and the Church for such an object; we do not want that it should uphold polygamy. Very likely. But, unfortunately, if you ally the Church and the State, as you avow that it is your object to do, you have no possible means of determining what kind of religion, or what acts as religious acts, will be upheld. In such a Government as ours, the religion of the nation would be liable to be changed with every change of administration! Of this we challenge a denial. To hope that the whole body of people would quietly acquiesce in any particular form of religion, year after year, would be the height of folly. The truth is that people are changing their religious faiths continually; and with every change of faith there would be a clamor for a corresponding change in the religious laws. And the vote of the careless, the indifferent, or the unbeliever, would carry just as much weight in the settlement of these questions, as the vote of the most pious Christian.

We do not believe that *the people* are so blind as not to see the truthfulness of our remarks. We shall try, in all honesty of purpose, to arouse the attention of the country to the danger which awaits our liberties if this Religious Amendment shall be carried. J. H. W.

Church and State.

WE have already proved, on two distinct counts, that the movement represented by the National Reform Association carries in itself "the promise and potency" of a union of Church and State in the United States. We shall here present additional proofs to the same purpose.

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, January 31 and February 1, 1872, Mr. Francis E. Abbot presented a remonstrance against the object of the convention. Rev. A. D. Mayo, D. D., of Cincinnati, replied to it. In his remarks he said:—

"One would think the gentleman had come all the way from Toledo to Cincinnati to utter a prophet's warning against some future danger threatened by us. Why, he is now living as a citizen of Ohio, under a Constitution that substantially includes every idea we propose to place in the national charter. The Constitution of Ohio begins with a confession of dependence on Almighty God as the author of the liberties it is made to preserve. It declares that 'religion is essential to good government.' And by 'religion' it means just what this proposed amendment means,—that in order that a State shall endure, its citizens should be religious men; should live according to the highest idea of morality, which, in this State, is the moral system of Jesus Christ; and that the State itself should conform to that idea of morality in its legislation and character, as it hopes for life. *That's all there is in this thing.*"

Dr. Mayo also cited the new Constitution of Missouri, formed after the war had closed, as another example, and said:—

"Just what the people of the State of Missouri did will the people of the United States finally do. They will plant in their great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation's dependence on Almighty God, and its

duty to conform to the laws of religious or Christian morality."

Here is a plain argument that the Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri contain and mean all that the religiously amended Constitution of the United States will mean; that the Constitution of Ohio "substantially includes every idea" that the National Reform Association proposes to place in "the national charter," that the Constitution of Ohio embraces "all there is in this [National Reform] thing." Very well, be it so. From this it follows that in the State of Ohio, under that Constitution, there should be found a condition of government and society such as is expected to be formed in the whole nation by the Religious Amendment to the National Constitution. That is the theory; how stands the fact?

The Constitution of Ohio declares that "religion is essential to good government," and that "means just what this proposed [National Reform] amendment means." Now how much more religion, or how much better government, is there in Ohio than there is in any other State in the Union? How much purer is politics in Ohio than it is anywhere else? Let the late elections in the State testify.

The Constitution of Ohio means just what the Religious Amendment means; and under this proposed amendment the National Reform party insists that our rulers must be "Christian men;" if not actually church members, they must be "men who believe in Christianity" (*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 8, 1877). How does this work under the Ohio Constitution? Why, in 1883 Hon. George Hoadly, an avowed infidel, was elected governor. And under the title of "An Infidel Elected Governor," the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, Nov. 1, 1883, said:—

"By a decision of the popular will, Mr. Hoadly, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion, is governor-elect of the great State of Ohio. His record on this point is unmistakable, not merely in that he was counsel against the Bible in the schools, for a professed Christian like Stanley Matthews stood with him in that effort, but in that he has been for years one of the vice-presidents of the Free Religious Association. He is well known also to favor the programme of the Liberals as to the complete secularization of the State by the abolition of all vestiges of Christian usages from the administration of government. The Christian people of Ohio, therefore, believers in the supreme authority of the Christian religion, are to have for their chief magistrate a man who denies that the Christian religion is revealed from God, and who looks elsewhere for the grounds of moral obligation."

The Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri mean, on this subject, just what the Religious Amendment means; and one of the chief, avowed purposes of the Religious Amendment is to secure forever the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the nation. Now, at the very time when Dr. Mayo uttered these words in Cincinnati, there was then pending in the courts of the State of Ohio this very question of the Bible in the schools. The case went to the Supreme Court of the State. And under that Constitution which they say means just what the proposed National Amendment means, the Supreme Court affirmed the legality of the Cincinnati School Board, prohibiting prayer and the reading of the Scriptures in the public

schools. In St. Louis, also, under their model Missouri Constitution, the Bible has been excluded from the schools. We might thus go through the whole list of subjects which they make prominent in their work; but these are enough to expose the sophistry of the National Reform advocates.

Therefore, if it be true that, on the subject of religion, the Constitution of Ohio means just what the proposed Religious Amendment to the National Constitution means; if in that there is "all there is in this," then it is positively proven that when they shall have secured their Religious Amendment to the United States Constitution, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion," a man who is "well known to favor the abolition of *all vestiges* of Christian usages from the administration of government,"—in short, a man who is opposed to every principle which they advocate, may be president of the great nation of the United States. Under their religiously amended Constitution, the Bible may be excluded from all the schools in the land. Then, too, politics may be just as corrupt everywhere as they are now in Ohio. Where, then, will there be any practical difference between the workings of government under the amended Constitution, and those workings under the Constitution as it now is? None at all. If then they mean what they said at Cincinnati, where lies the efficacy of their movement? Ah! there is the point; they do not mean at all what they said by Mr. Mayo, at Cincinnati. They know that the Ohio Constitution does *not* substantially include every idea which they propose to place in the national charter. They know that that is *not* "all there is in this thing." Says the *Christian Statesman* of November 1, 1883:—

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

And what is the conclusion? This:—

"That such changes with respect to the oath of office, and *all other matters*, should be introduced *into the body* of the Constitution as may be necessary to *give effect* to these amendments in the preamble."—*Memorial to Congress, in 1864*.

Exactly; and one of the very first changes that will have to be introduced into the body of the Constitution to *give effect* to the Christianized preamble, will be to so alter the First Amendment that Congress shall make laws establishing religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and the Sixth Article will have to be changed so that religious tests shall be required as qualification for office.

But in the almost endless discussion that will necessarily arise in regard to the changes with respect to the oath and *all other matters*, where shall the final decisions be made upon what changes shall, or shall not be made? By what shall these questions be tested? That is easily enough discovered; here is the wonderful touch-

stone that is to detect all false legislation and prove the true.

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on *all moral questions*, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the *final decisions* of most points will be developed there. Many nations shall come, and say, 'Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion.'"

Again:—

"We will not allow the civil Government to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."—*Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884*.

To be sure, the united churches are "Zion;" "the law shall go forth of Zion;" "the *final decisions* will be developed there," and "we will not allow the civil Government" to do this or that. And when the churches as one body, under the title of the National Reform Association, shall have reached that place where they can say in the plenitude of their power, "We will not allow the civil Government" to do so and so, there will be no single element lacking to the perfect union of Church and State. However often they may declare by word that their movement does not contemplate such a union, all their affirmations and re-affirmations in denial cannot hide the evidence of their works, nor disprove the fact that the National Reform Association affects to render the ecclesiastical "independent of, and superior to, the civil power," in this Government. A. T. J.

Have Infidels any Rights?

THEY who have heard the "National Reformers" speak, or have read their writings, know full well that they wish to have our Government so changed as to deny the rights of citizenship to infidels. First, they shall be declared ineligible to office in the proposed "Christian" Government, and secondly, they will necessarily be disfranchised. This leads us to ask, in all sincerity, if infidels have *any* rights.

The Saviour, in his "sermon on the mount," taught that the perfection of Christian character is found in disinterested and universal benevolence. We are to be "perfect even as our Father in Heaven is perfect," who "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." See Matt. 5: 43-48.

Were we going to answer our own query as to whether infidels have any rights, we should say that it depends altogether on the relations covered by the question. In the church they have no rights; in our religious systems they have no rights. On this point there can be no dispute. In the church the infidel would be out of his place; he has no rights there—he has no right to be there. By all means keep the infidel out of the church. And as the church has jurisdiction only over its own members, it has no jurisdiction over infidels. To the church is committed the power and duty to exercise discipline, but in the exercise of this

power it has no authority or right to go outside of its own membership.

But the infidel has a right to live. He was born in his fallen condition, for no one is born a Christian. "Ye must be born again," are the words of Christ to all. The disabilities of the infidel he inherited from our common birthhood. And we may not deny him a place in the Creator's domain because he does not, as well as we, appreciate the responsibilities of his position. We all "were by nature the children of wrath, even as others," and it is only by divine grace that we differ from others.

He has a right to acquire the means of living. This necessarily attends upon the right to live. No avenue to business, to the acquisition of property, should be shut up against him because he is an infidel.

He has a right to family privileges. As a son of Adam he has a right to that institution given to the father of the race—to Adam. We cannot agree with the Catholic Church, which makes marriage a Christian ordinance or sacrament, for marriage is older than the Christian church—older than Christianity. That which the Creator gave to the father of the race belongs to the race, and not alone to any class.

He has a right to social privileges. He and his family are not to be ostracized because of his unbelief. In the neighborhood, in the ordinary transactions of life, all stand on an equality.

And it follows of necessity that he has rights in the Government. He has an interest in the proper administration of Government equal to that of any other man. He has the same interest to be protected in his right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He pays taxes to the Government even as others, and has the same right to Government protection that others have. His ability and his judgment in business transactions, and in matters of civil Government, are not to be disputed, nor should they be scorned because of his unbelief. He often has these desirable qualities in a far higher degree than has his Christian neighbor. On this subject we commend the following words of Macaulay to the candid consideration of all:—

"All civil disabilities on account of religious opinions are indefensible. For all such disabilities make Government less efficient for its main end; they limit its choice of able men for the administration and defense of the State; they alienate from it the hearts of the sufferers; they deprive it of a part of its effective strength in all contests with foreign nations. Such a course is as absurd as it would be in the governors of a hospital to reject an able surgeon because he is a Universal Restitutionist, and to send a bungler to operate because he is perfectly orthodox."

But we must not be surprised that these self-styled National Reformers are ready to deny the infidel these rights; to deny them is a legitimate consequence of the course they are pursuing, for they have always been denied where Church and State were united. And more than this, they are not only denied to infidels, but to all Christians who dissent from the faith of the dominant party. It was so when the church of Rome became fully allied to the secular power. It was so in New England to just the extent that the Church and the State were al-

lied. Both Quakers and Baptists, no matter how pure was their Christian life, were denied the common rights of citizenship. It was so in Maryland when the State allied itself to the Protestants, and tried to put down the Catholics. It is so in Utah, where the "Gentiles" are not considered as having any rights which the "saints" are bound to respect; and were it not for our National Government the rights of no dissenters would be regarded. It is perfectly consistent for these religious amendmentists to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors in the union of church and State.

If the infidel has a right to live, to acquire the means to sustain life, to enjoy family and social privileges, he has a right to enjoy these privileges *in the Government* wherever he may chance to be. By virtue of his citizenship he is an integral part of the Government.

But if the infidel has rights in the Government, and has no rights in the church, then the church and the Government must be kept clearly distinct and separate; otherwise he will be deprived of his rights in the State, or exercise them under church regulations. If the church has the right to say that none but Christians shall be eligible to office, or to vote for officers, in the State, it has then the power to administer discipline outside of its membership. And then it would be truly consistent for the church to disfranchise and even to banish infidels, for *infidels have no rights within church jurisdiction*. Every one ought to see that this effort to subordinate the State to the church, and to make the State an instrument "to serve the interests of the church," to "profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," inevitably tends to usurpation in the State and to the corruption of the church.

In the convention in Cleveland, Ohio, Dr. McAllister well said that nations "are a necessity of life." "It is optional with a man," he said, "whether he becomes a member of any of these artificial bodies, banks, bridge companies, etc., or not; he may join them, or not, just as he pleases. But a man cannot prevent his membership in a nation." And why not? Because he cannot prevent his being born within the limits of the nation. His rights as a member of the nation (not of a church) he acquires by birth; and of these none may deprive him. From this conclusion there is no escape, unless our "Reformers" take another (and to them consistent) step, and deny that the infidel has a right to be born! Whether or not he has the right, we consider that it would be *unfortunate* for him to be born under the rule of this "National Reform Association," or in any State of which they had any control.

J. H. W.

Injustice of Religious Intolerance.

THE following thoughts are taken from a work entitled "Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions." The author is unknown. The principles advanced are so much to the point, and so clearly set forth the utter impropriety of a movement just being put forth by the National Reform Party, that we take pleasure in submitting them to the candid reader. He says:—

"Whether established opinions are false or

true, it is alike the interest of the community that investigation should be unrestrained, in order that if false, they be discarded, and, if true, rendered conspicuous to all. The only way of fully attaining the benefits of truth is to suffer opinions to maintain themselves against attack, or fall in the contest. The terrors of the law are wretched replies to argument, disgraceful to a good, and feeble auxiliaries to a bad cause. If there was any fixed and unquestionable standard by which the validity of opinions could be tried, there might be some sense, and some utility, in checking the extravagances of opinion by legal interference; but since there is no other standard than the general reason of mankind, discussion is the only method of trying the correctness of all doctrines whatever; and it is the highest presumption in any man, or any body of men, to erect their tenets into a criterion of truth, and overwhelm dissent and opposition by penal inflictions. Such conduct can proceed on no principle which would not justify all persecutions that disgrace the page of ecclesiastical history.

"Let established opinions be defended with the utmost power of reason; let the learning of schools and colleges be brought to their support; let elegance and taste display them in their most enchanting colors; let no labor, no expense, no arguments be spared in upholding their authority; but, in the name of humanity, resort not to the aid of the pillory and the dungeon. When they cannot be maintained by knowledge and reason, it will surely be time to suspect that judicial severities will be but a feeble protection.

"The allurements and the menaces of power are alike incapable of establishing opinions in the mind, or eradicating those which are already there. They may draw hypocritical professions from avarice and ambition, or extort verbal renunciations from fear and feebleness; but this is all they can accomplish. The way to alter belief is not to address motives to the will, but arguments to the intellect. To do otherwise, to apply rewards and punishments to opinions, is as absurd as to raise men to the peerage for their ruddy complexions, to whip them for the gout, and hang them for the scrofula.

"The penalty of the law can change no man's opinion. In order to change the perceptions you must change the thing perceived. To illustrate: Take any controverted fact in history; let a man make himself perfectly acquainted with the statements and authorities on both sides, and, at the end of his investigation, he will either believe, doubt, or disbelieve the fact in question. Now apply any possible motive to his mind. Blame him, praise him, intimidate him by threats, or allure him by promises, and after all your efforts, how far will you have succeeded in changing the state of his intellect in relation to the fact? It is true that you may so intimidate by threats that you can succeed in making a man assert that he believes so and so, but all the powers of the universe could not make him believe his assertion."

How utterly unjust and absurd, then, to enact laws, and enforce them, that restrict men in their opinions concerning certain doctrines. Men may be forced to yield to the menaces of law, but this brutal way of compelling men to

submit to what they do not believe, serves only to destroy their individuality and check that spirit of investigation which is so essential to intellectual growth.

E. HILLIARD.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Macaulay on Gladstone.

It is the duty, Mr. Gladstone tells us, of the persons, be they who they may, who hold supreme power in the State, to employ that power in order to promote whatever they may deem to be theological truth. Now, surely, before he can call on us to admit this proposition, he is bound to prove that these persons are likely to do more good than harm by so employing their power. The first question is, whether a Government, proposing to itself the propagation of religious truth as one of its principal ends, is more likely to lead the people right than to lead them wrong? Mr. Gladstone evades this question; and perhaps it was his wisest course to do so.

"If," says he, "the Government be good let it have its natural duties and powers at its command; but, if not good, let it be made so. . . . We follow, therefore, the true course in looking first for the true idea, or abstract conception of a Government, of course with allowance for the evil and frailty that are in man, and then in examining whether there be comprised in that idea a capacity and consequent duty on the part of a Government to lay down any laws, or devote any means for the purposes of religion,—in short, to exercise a choice upon religion."

Of course, Mr. Gladstone has a perfect right to argue any abstract question, provided that he will constantly bear in mind that it is only an abstract question that he is arguing. Whether a perfect Government would or would not be a good machinery for the propagation of religious truth is certainly a harmless, and may, for aught we know, be an edifying subject of inquiry. But it is very important that we should remember that there is not, and never has been, any such Government in the world. There is no harm at all in inquiring what course a stone thrown into the air would take, if the law of gravitation did not operate. But the consequences would be unpleasant, if the inquirer, as soon as he had finished his calculation, were to begin to throw stones about in all directions, without considering that his conclusion rests on a false hypothesis, and that his projectiles, instead of flying away through infinite space, will speedily return in parabolas, and break the windows and heads of his neighbors.

It is very easy to say that Governments are good, or, if not good, ought to be made so. But what is meant by good Government? And how are all the bad Governments in the world to be made good? And of what value is a theory which is true only on a supposition in the highest degree extravagant?

We do not, however, admit that, if a Government were, for all its temporal ends, as perfect as human frailty allows, such a Government would, therefore, be necessarily qualified to propagate true religion. For we see that the fitness of Governments to propagate true religion is by no means proportioned to their fitness for the temporal end of their institution. Looking at individuals, we see that the princes under whose rule nations have been most ably

protected from foreign and domestic disturbance, and have made the most rapid advances in civilization, have been by no means good teachers of divinity. Take, for example, the best French sovereign, Henry the Fourth, a king who restored order, terminated a terrible civil war, brought the finances into an excellent condition, made his country respected throughout Europe, and endeared himself to the great body of the people whom he ruled. Yet this man was twice a Huguenot, and twice a papist. He was, as Davila hints, strongly suspected of having no religion at all in theory, and was certainly not much under religious restraints in his practice. Take the Czar Peter, the Empress Catherine, Frederick the Great. It will surely not be disputed that these sovereigns, with all their faults, were, if we consider them with reference merely to the temporal ends of Government, above the average of merit. Considered as theological guides, Mr. Gladstone would probably put them below the most abject drivellers of the Spanish branch of the house of Bourbon.

The Tobacco Plague.

JOSEPH COOK, in a late Boston lecture, spoke as follows, every word of which we heartily indorse:—

"A gentleman long in a public position of honor and responsibility, sends me in writing a very suggestive illustration. A lady from the country came to Boston to do shopping. On her way to Boston a gentleman occupied half the seat with her on the cars. Half his time was spent in the smoking car and the rest with the lady. When she arrived in Boston, she was sick and was obliged to send for a physician. He examined her case, and informed her that she had been made ill by tobacco. She paid the doctor's bill and went home without doing her business, and wondering whether non-smokers have any rights which smokers are bound to respect. Another lady says she cannot come to Boston to do business on account of the ever-present fumes of tobacco in the street and shops.

"No doubt tobacco blunts the sense of propriety. The narcotic nosegay is as unconscious of the odors he exhales as is the eater of onions and garlic. 'Indifference or apathy with regard to the comfort of others,' says the *London Times*, 'is one of the most remarkable effects of tobacco. No other drug will produce anything like it. The opium-eater does not compel you to eat opium with him. The drunkard does not compel you to drink. The smoker compels you to smoke; nay, more, to breathe the smoke he has just discharged from his own mouth.'

"A lady coming from the South for her health was kept in the state-room of the steamer during all the voyage, on account of tobacco smoke on every part of the vessel, and lost the whole effect of the voyage because she could have no fresh air. Her husband, a lawyer, thinks that in equity she could bring a suit for damages against the steamboat company.

"The new State House in Des Moines, Ia., will not allow smokers to enter its portals. An edict has just gone forth that tobacco must not

be used in the halls and corridors of the White House in Washington. Our military and naval academies do not allow their pupils to use tobacco. Several colleges in the West prohibit the use of tobacco by their students. Germany has excellent laws forbidding the sale of tobacco to minors. Eighteen States in the American Union are now teaching children to abstain from alcoholics and narcotics, and my proposition is that the churches, both preachers and members, should rise at least to the secular level of the State Legislatures on both these subjects."

THE following, told by John B. Gough, shows the danger of using alcoholic wine at the communion. And we can but express our surprise that some ministers will persist in using it as a substitute for "the fruit of the vine" used by our Saviour. Alcohol is in no sense the fruit of the vine:—

A gentleman told me in New York: "I was a sad drunkard; I became a Christian at Mr. Moody's Hippodrome meetings at New York. I had signed the pledge. I wanted to do work for the Lord. I joined a certain church because the pastor was very sympathizing with us, and I had been working in his gospel tent, and trying to rescue men. Well, I believed and boasted that the love of Jesus had taken away all appetite for drink. Three weeks ago there was the communion service. I smelled the drink and wanted it. My fingers began to tingle. There was an itching, burning, dry sensation in my throat. I wanted it. I tried to pray. I tried to think that I had come there to show forth the 'Lord's death till he come.' It was of no use. I gripped the seat. I ground my teeth. I sat in perfect agony. The wine approached me. I shuddered from head to foot. If I had taken it in my hand there would not have been a drop of it left. I know it, and I have been fighting that appetite for three weeks with all the power I had to fight anything, and I am very glad you have comforted me by the assurance that I may yet be a child of God, though subject to this terrible temptation."

BREWERS and distillers use per year 40,000,000 bushels of grain, averaging, if ground, forty pounds of flour to the bushel. This would make sixty pounds of bread, or fifteen four-pound loaves to the bushel. Here we have equal to 600,000,000 loaves of bread each year changed into slops containing slow, sure poisons, that do not nutrify or build up the strength of the user, but, on the contrary, slowly and surely destroy his ability and disposition to earn the money with which to buy bread for himself or children.

A man needn't become an abandoned drunkard to impoverish his family. To drink two or three glasses a day is sufficient to make a certain deficiency in the amount of their comfort.

You doubt it? Well, suppose you use at twenty years one glass of beer a day; at twenty-three, two glasses a day; at twenty-five, three glasses a day; at thirty, four glasses a day; at forty, five glasses a day—at an average cost of five cents each. You will have spent, between twenty years and forty years of age, \$1,222.75.

THE *Troy Times* tells of a Troy editor who went into the tailoring establishment of a German to order a suit of clothes. After the cloth had been selected and the measure taken, the tailor demanded a deposit as a guarantee that the customer would come for the goods. To this the editor demurred, saying that he did not know the tailor any better than the latter knew him. After some little conversation, the German, however, waived the deposit, and the clothes were made. When our genial news editor called and paid cash down for the suit, the German was so delighted that he asked his customer to go out and take a drink with him. The editor declined, saying he did not drink; whereupon a gleam of satisfaction and intelligence combined shot across the tailor's countenance as he exclaimed, "Dot's de reason vy you pay for de clothes so quick as you got 'em."

Marvel of Nations.

"OUR COUNTRY, the Marvel of Nations; Its Past, Present, and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It," is the title of a new and popular work, on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens, by U. Smith, author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and other popular works. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a historical, political, and religious standpoint.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a chain of prophecy of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the prophet of God, hundreds of years ago.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. Price, post-paid, \$1.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

Combination Offer.

THE "MARVEL OF NATIONS" WITH THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, ONE YEAR, POST-PAID, FOR \$1.25.

THE publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of the "Marvel of Nations," whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with the *American Sentinel*, for one year, for \$1.25. We trust that many of our readers will avail themselves of this privilege of securing both the book and the paper for so small a sum. Order at once, so as to secure all the numbers of the SENTINEL.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

Geikie's Life of Christ.

THE Life and Words of Christ, by Cunningham Geikie, Acme Edition, extra cloth, 800 pages, 50 cents; postage, 10 cents. Profoundly interesting—marvelously cheap.—*Albany Evening Tribune*.

The best of all the lives of Christ—a marvel of cheapness.—*Portland Christian Mirror*.

A great and noble work, rich in information, elegant and scholarly in style, earnestly devout in feeling.—*London Literary World*.

It is a work of profound learning.—*Archbishop of York*.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The Great Controversy.

THE new (1886) illustrated edition of "The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan during the Christian Dispensation," by Mrs. E. G. White, contains over 500 pages, a portrait of the author, and is illustrated by *twenty-one full-page cuts*. The book is printed and bound in the very best style; olive green muslin with jet and gold stamp. *Over ten thousand have been sold in six months*.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other.

The closing chapters give a vivid picture of the warfare of the church, her final redemption, and vividly describe the triumph of the people of God, the destruction of Satan and all his followers, and the renewing of the earth, which ends the awful controversy between the Son of God and the powers of darkness.

Earnest Christians of all classes and creeds will find in it encouragement and instruction. The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

Sent post-paid to any address in America for \$1.50, or to foreign countries 8s., post free.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., APRIL, 1886.

THE pages of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are stereotyped, and we can furnish it at any time in any quantity desired. We can but be pleased with the favor with which it has been received throughout the country.

OHIO is the birthplace of the "National Reform Association." It is a large and well-populated State, and the Reformers are putting forth the greatest efforts to convert it to its movement. It is to be hoped that the friends of civil and religious liberty—of equal religious rights before the law—will put forth every effort to give the SENTINEL a wide circulation in Ohio. Doubtless there will be a hard struggle over that important ground.

THE *Christian Statesman*, upon its first view of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, congratulated itself that it was going to have opposition, for want of which its cause was languishing. But since that time it has preserved the most decorous silence on the subject. As it said that this is the first real opposition that it has received, and appeared to feel so pleased with the prospect before it, we have been led to wonder that it does not further make its delight manifest to the public. We do not court opposition; we stand for the defense of the truth, and are very willing to be corrected if we are in error. The National Reform Association is a large and influential body, boasting amongst its members some of the most eminent men in the land. We recognize and freely acknowledge the ability of these men, but we think they are in error on this question, having wrong views of the proper objects of civil Government, and of the proper relations of the State to religion. We should hesitate to enter into combat with them on equal ground; but with the advantage of such clear truth as we are striving to maintain, we do not fear the result of the most thorough investigation.

A PAPER in Texas, after speaking of the object of the National Reform Association, says:—

"Up to the first of January there was no publication in the country especially devoted to the work of combatting this politico-religious heresy, but the void is now well filled by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, California. The SENTINEL is one of the neatest printed publications we have seen, and is edited with a vim that shows brains are at the back of it that will give the 'Religious Amendment Party' plenty to do to defend their sophistries. It is refreshing to see some of our religious journals opposing this amendment business, notably the *New York Independent*; but this party will cause trouble if it is not set down upon vigorously by those who venerate the wisdom of our forefathers, who wisely declared the complete divorcement of Church and State is the safeguard of our liberties."

An editor of a paper in Ohio, sending for the SENTINEL, which he had not seen, wrote:—

"This is a community of National Reformers, and many people are subscribers to the *Christian Statesman*, with whose principles I do not agree. I am an advocate of the principles of

Christianity, and a firm believer in the religion of Christ, yet am opposed to making religion the foundation of our national Government. The rule of Christ is spiritual and not civil, and we regard any approach to a union of Church and State with a great deal of apprehension. We believe that a resort to the civil power for the protection of the truth of the word of God, and for the defense of the church, would result disastrously to both. We hope that your paper will, while not occupying infidel ground, successfully combat the doctrines taught by the National Reform Association, and prevent any radical change in our national Constitution that will render it in any form a confession of the religious faith of any class of citizens."

We believe in both "protection" and "defense" when anybody's rights are assailed, but on this question the "Reformers" are the assailants, and the Government should protect the rights of all classes of its citizens against their machinations.

There Is Danger.

THE following brief notice of the SENTINEL is from the *Boston Herald*:—

"Somebody out at San Francisco is so scared by the good people who want a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that he has started a paper to oppose their designs. The next thing some one will be organizing a society to fight the movements for inducing water to run up hill. Such a society would be as useful as such a paper."

Every one who is acquainted with the *Boston Herald* knows that it is an able paper, but in this case it has not read up on the strength and doings of the National Reform Association, or it has not considered well what may be done by a comparatively small body which has influence to turn the majority in a political contest. An association which can number among its officers four governors, five State superintendents of public instruction, nine bishops, fifteen judges of higher courts, and forty-one college presidents and professors, with Doctors of Divinity, and other eminent men, must command influence. In fact, there is no other association of any kind in the United States that can equal it in this respect. If the *Herald* will stop a moment to consider, it must know that a society with such strength and influence could easily organize a force which would turn the scale either way in a general election; they could control a body of voters which either party would consider worth its while to capture by the strongest pledges.

And then it must be borne in mind that their profession is high, and their object *apparently* praiseworthy. They claim that they will purify the atmosphere of the political field, elevate the standard of public morality, reconcile differences which disturb our peace, eradicate such abominations as Mormon polygamy, etc. If we were to credit all their utopian schemes or professions, we must believe that they could inaugurate the millennium by a general convention, if the people would only amend the Constitution as they desire. And we are not ignorant of the fact that thousands are captivated by these specious claims, and are pledging support to their measures when the time comes for action.

It is a singular fact that in New England,

the home of the Puritans, the National Reformers seem to be doing little or nothing. It is, perhaps, owing to this fact that so able a paper as the *Herald* seems to think there is as little danger of securing a Religious Amendment to our Constitution as of reversing the law of gravitation. But we know what influence they are gaining in the great West; we know by the experience of a religio-political campaign in the State of California, what such a movement may accomplish when it can offer success to a political party for espousing its cause. And we verily believe that it will be but a short time when the *Herald* will change its mind, and wonder why there have not been more to sound the alarm of danger ahead.

It is but a few years since the "National Reform Association" was organized, and its growth has been almost without a parallel. And no wonder, considering the standing of its leaders, and the persistency of their efforts to bring their views and aims before the public. We have received a letter from an observing gentleman in one of the States of the Mississippi valley, who says that our paper is timely, and its arguments just and unanswerable, but considers it tardy in its appearing. To keep pace with the progress of the amendment work it should have been started a number of years ago.

A WORKER in the amendment cause reports from Topeka, Kan., as follows:—

"Monday I presented the subject before the Ministers' Association. The question was heartily seconded by the pastor of the Lutheran Church. He moved that the Association give its indorsement to the cause. It seemed as if this motion would have been carried unanimously, but two Baptist ministers expressed their decided opposition, saying that such an amendment would have no more effect on the Government than the inscription on our coins, 'In God we trust.' Government, they said, had no right to legislate on religion."

These Baptist ministers were true to the noble history of the Baptist denomination on the question of liberty, both civil and religious. We are always surprised when we hear a Baptist minister, as we sometimes do, favor the amendment.

DR. J. P. THOMPSON, in his work entitled "Church and State in the United States," says:

"Liberty of opinion, liberty of worship, liberty in all matters pertaining to religion, is not a privilege created or conceded by the State, but is a right inherent in the personality of the individual conscience; and the State is pledged not to interfere with that right. Such is the theory of the National Constitution."

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MAY, 1886.

NUMBER 5.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

Story on The First Amendment.

JUDGE STORY, in his "Exposition of the Constitution," speaks thus of the object of the First Amendment:—

"The same policy which introduced into the Constitution the prohibition of any religious test, led to this more extended prohibition of the interference of Congress in religious concerns. We are not to attribute this prohibition of a national religious establishment to an indifference to religion in general, and especially to Christianity (which none could hold in more reverence than the framers of the Constitution), but to a dread by the people of the influence of ecclesiastical power in matters of Government; a dread which their ancestors brought with them from the parent country, and which, unhappily for human infirmity, their own conduct, after their emigration, had not, in any just degree, tended to diminish. It was also obvious, from the numerous and powerful sects existing in the United States, that there would be perpetual temptations to struggles for ascendancy in the National councils, if any one might thereby hope to found a permanent and exclusive national establishment of its own; and religious persecutions might thus be introduced, to an extent utterly subversive of the true interests and good order of the Republic. The most effectual mode of suppressing the evil in the view of the people, was, to strike down the temptations to its introduction."

MANY express sympathy with the position of the SENTINEL, who yet consider that our work is of little use because the effort to secure a Religious Amendment to our national Constitution will never amount to anything. That is because they do not know the strength of the National Association which is laboring to secure it. They will wake up to their mistake not many years hence.

"LET those who imagine that a nation can be made Christian by incorporating the letter of a Christian creed into its Constitution, remember the lessons of history. The worst despotisms that have ever cursed the world, were administered in the name, and by the assumed authority, of God."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Bold and Base Avowal.

WITH the self-styled National Reformers the name of "Rev. Dr. Jonathan Edwards," of Illinois, stands very high. And we ask no better evidence that it will not do to intrust civil authority to the hands of ecclesiastics, than the fact that the most eminent professors of Christianity, even those to whom their fellows look up with reverence, often assume the most overbearing demeanor when asserting what they claim as their special prerogatives. We would not be misunderstood in this expression. We would as readily trust to their hands the exercise of the functions of government as to the hands of any others, as long as they will confine their actions to the sphere for which civil Governments exist. It is only when they assert their right to enforce their theological ideas that they are self-asserting and arrogant.

Dr. Edwards delivered an address at the National Convention of the "Reformers," held in New York in 1873. In this address are a number of things worthy of notice; but one portion of it, which we now consider, is particularly offensive to all who have any regard for the rights of our common humanity, as it is contrary to the spirit of Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles.

First, we will notice an error into which all these reformers run by confounding civil with religious rights and privileges. In fact, they draw no line between them, as we have before shown. As the Government deals with us in civil matters, so would they deal with their opponents in matters of religion. Thus he speaks:—

"We may not buy a lot among the fine houses of Broadway, or the fashionable avenues of New York, and there set up and operate a foundry, a tin shop, a bone-boiling establishment, or a soap chandlery. If we try it we shall find both ourselves and our business treated as a nuisance. People do not like the smoke, the noise, the fumes of such establishments. The majority are against you, and in this country and in all republics majorities govern. To be in a minority involves more or less of inconvenience. In business, in politics, in fashion, in morals, and in religion, whoever differs materially from the majority will certainly be made to feel it more or less in due time."

Were the blasphemer and the hardened scoffer to place our religious rights and privileges on a level with the right to erect a tin shop or a foundry in a certain locality, or were such an one to class our religion with worldly business, with politics, or the fashions, we should not be so greatly surprised. After reading further from Dr. Edwards we can better measure the height and breadth of his religion; and some,

perhaps, will even give him credit for consistency in making religion no more sacred than "a bone-boiling establishment or a soap chandlery." that is, judging by the religion which he represents in his utterances. We do not hesitate to say that if the Government should deny us the right to boil bones or make soap *anywhere*, we should acquiesce and seek some other business. But if the same Government should insist that we deny the faith we hold and abstain from the practice of the religion we profess, we should dissent in the most emphatic terms. We would not yield our religious faith and practice for all the majorities the world can produce; we would not accept another in its stead, either in theory or practice, at the demand of the strongest Government or the most relentless tyrant. This is our declaration, and that of every genuine Christian in the land. We only ask for grace to maintain it.

Would Dr. Edwards yield his religion to the will of the majority, even as he now yields in many secular matters? Oh, no. That is no part of his scheme. It is not his religion of which he speaks when he subordinates religion to the will of majorities. It is *somebody else's* religion; somebody's religion which does not agree with his; it is somebody's religion which he cannot control without the aid of the civil power!

But this is only the prelude to the avowal to which we specially call attention. In classifying those whom he considers enemies to their cause, he speaks as follows:—

"The Atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him, mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and end-all of consciousness and of character.

"The Deist admits God, but denies that he has any such control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

"The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or—worse—sheer imposture.

"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 as 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 is the leader in the discontent and 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."

Every one who has any knowledge of the Seventh-day Baptists, either in regard to their *history* or to their *principles*, must set down the above utterances of Dr. Edwards as not only uncharitable but unchristian. They were the conservators of religious freedom at a time when there was much danger of a permanent union of Church and State in New England. More than to all others, we verily believe, it was to those of that faith that Rhode Island owed her liberality to all sects of Christians, so far in advance of the other colonies at an early day. The Seventh-day Baptists of Rhode Island and the Baptists of Virginia left to this country a legacy of the principles of both civil and religious liberty, for which we have reason to be thankful even at the present day.

But the ill-will—we might in truth say the malice—of Dr. Edwards towards them arises from the "accident of [their] differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy." We doubt the propriety of calling that an "accident" which grows out of conviction and intention. It is not our desire to enter into a discussion of the subject thus laid open by the National Reformers in their statement of the objects of their movement; but this affords us an excellent opportunity to show the spirit of this professed reform, and what we may expect at their hands if they ever get control of our Government. Dr. Edwards admits that the Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity; and we affirm that he would be unable to find in their faith an item which is not considered orthodox by large bodies of Christians in the land, except in the case of the "accident" mentioned. Our readers may query, as we do in all seriousness, if the fact of their observing the original day of the Sabbath—the identical day which all concede was embodied in the fourth commandment of the decalogue—is a good and sufficient reason for classing them with atheists.

There is not a single point of religious belief upon which there is entire uniformity of faith among the churches; why, then, should a difference on this point be singled out and branded as atheism? The National Reformers affiliate with the Unitarians, who differ with them materially on the nature and divinity of Christ. They speak well of the Catholics, expecting yet to work together with them in their pretended reform, though the Catholics do not recognize them as being any part of the Church of Christ, and they openly and habitually deny in faith and practice the second commandment, which forbids adoration of images. These appear to be immaterial errors, while the observance of the seventh day of the week is branded as atheism, though the observers are confessed to be orthodox in every other respect!

We take up two declarations of these reformers, namely, that the Bible shall be recognized as the supreme rule of conduct in the nation, and that the ten commandments shall be acknowledged as the rule of morality in our Government. Is it a fact that the practice of the Seventh-day Baptists in observing the sev-

enth day is such a wide and manifest departure from the Bible and the ten commandments, that they may with reason be called atheists? Every school-boy who is taught in the Bible knows that it says that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." So far it is according to the Bible. And every school-boy knows that the commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Thus it is "according to the commandment."

ADMISSIONS OF THEIR OPPOSITIONS.

Now it is by all conceded that "the mass of Christians" do not keep that seventh day which is spoken of in Gen. 2 and Ex. 20. Without entering at all into the controversy as to the correctness or lawfulness of the change from that day to another, we are compelled to inquire: Is the change so clearly laid down in the Scriptures, or another day so clearly enjoined, that a person must be an atheist to deny that change? We will draw the answer to this question from the most orthodox authorities, without offering any opinion of our own, or giving any coloring either way to the testimony.

1. Dr. Buck's Theological Dictionary says: "It must be confessed that there is no law in the New Testament concerning the first day:"

2. The Encyclopedia of McClintock & Strong uses the same language.

3. The Augsburg Confession says: "We find not the same commanded by any apostolical law."

4. Dr. Heylyn, of England, in his History of the Sabbath, says: "For three hundred years there was neither law to bind them [the churches] to it, nor any rest from worldly labor required upon it."

5. Dr. Scott's Commentary says: "The change from the seventh to the first appears to have been gradually and silently introduced, by example rather than precept."

6. The *Christian Union*, answering a question on the subject, said: "The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, not by any positive authority, but by a gradual process."

7. The *Inter-Ocean*, also answering a question, said: "The change of the day of worship from the Sabbath, or the last day of the week, to Sunday, the first day of the week, was done by the early Christians; but the work was so gradual that it is almost impossible to tell when the one left off and the other began. It was not until after the Reformation that the change was confirmed by any legal enactment. In the first ages after Christ it does not appear that the Christians abstained from their regular business upon that day, but they were accustomed to meet early in the day, and indulged in singing and some other religious services. It was not until the beginning of the third century that it became customary for Christians to abstain from their worldly business and occupation on that day."

8. Dr. C. S. Robinson, in the *Sunday School Times*, said: "It is not wise to base the entire Sabbath [Sunday] argument on the fourth precept of the decalogue. . . . We shall become perplexed if we attempt to rest our case on simple legal enactment. Our safety in such discussions consists in our fastening attention

upon the gracious and benevolent character of the divine institution." But, query. Is not that an evasion? Doubtless the Seventh-day Baptists would not disagree with him upon the "benevolent character of the divine institution," but they would ask him to open the Bible and show them what *is* "the divine institution."

9. The *Christian at Work* says: "Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an explicit injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as 'a holy day to the Lord.' So some have tried to build the observance of Sunday upon apostolic command, whereas the apostles gave no command upon the matter. . . . The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scripta* [plain text] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument."

It is true that others claim more than this in the behalf of the first day; but it only serves to show that the subject of a change is so obscure that they cannot at all agree among themselves! We could greatly multiply testimonies like the above, but these are quite sufficient for our purpose, showing as clearly as can be shown that the Seventh-day Baptists, in their observance of the seventh day, do not walk contrary to any fact or precept of the Bible, but rather have the *litera scripta* of the commandment on their side, and thus, on Biblical grounds, "have the best of the argument." And yet for the accident of clinging to the exact language of the Bible, and thereby disagreeing with these *model reformers*, they are boldly branded as atheists!

Now comes in a most interesting query: When the Constitution is religiously amended, what shall be done with these people who presume to disregard "the traditions of the elders," who are so perversely atheistical as to stand upon the *litera scripta* of the decalogue? Dr. Edwards has given us definite information on this subject. He speaks thus for the body, for it has published his address to the world, and others of their number have spoken much in the same strain. He said:—

"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. He not only rejects and opposes my faith, but he aims to overthrow every institution, and to dissolve every relationship growing out of my faith. He would destroy the very foundations, pull down everything, and build up nothing. But he shall be tolerated. He may live and go free, hold his lands and enjoy his home; he may even vote; but for any higher, more advanced citizenship he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified."

The reader must remember that this language is applied to the Jew and the Seventh-day Baptist. They and atheists are "one party." They are all "counted together." They must "be treated as one party." And how very gracious these "mild-mannered" reformers are! The poor Seventh-day Baptist may be tolerated as a lunatic or conspirator may be tolerated. He may even "live and go free, and hold his lands and enjoy his home," if he "*does not rave.*" Let him hold his peace;

let him hide his knowledge of the *litera scripta* of the ten commandments, for woe be to him if he crosses the track of "*my faith*!"

We grow more and more distrustful of humanity when we read the literature of that people, and see their unblushing effrontery in declaring that a Religious Amendment to the National Constitution is necessary "to secure the rights of all classes." Can they possibly think that the people are so blind that they cannot perceive the deception which is being practiced? that they cannot discover the enemy of equal rights lurking under these specious pretenses? We pity those who cannot see this. We must blame those who *will not* see the danger impending, or who are in any wise instrumental in precipitating such a calamity upon our country. They are not asking for protection, for this they now have most fully; *they are seeking for power.* And their own avowals prove that if ever they get the power they seek, this land will cease to be "the land of the free."
J. H. W.

A Lesson from Ezra.

WHILE the so-called "National Reformers" continually deny that their movement has any likeness to a proposed union of Church and State, they do not deny that they want to make such changes in our national Constitution as will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. It is true that they insert the words "of our Government," after "usages;" but as our Government has no Christian usages, all understand that the usages of the Christian church are referred to. The design of the National Reform party is, then, to so change the Constitution that Christian usages may be enforced by civil law. It is not necessary for us to call it a union of Church and State; we will simply remember that the avowed purpose is to make it possible to compel people to follow certain Christian usages, and this by the power of the law of the land.

Since the advocates of this state of affairs are fond of referring to the Bible for precedents for their proposed scheme; and since they imagine that they are following in the footsteps of the ancient worthies, we invite them to a brief consideration of the course which was pursued by one excellent man of old, "a ruler in Israel."

Ezra was undoubtedly a man of God. He was a man of stern integrity and of the most sincere piety. Moreover, he was a statesman, well versed in the ways of courts, and was also a brave soldier, and a skilled leader of men. When, after long delay, and much discouragement, the Jews were confirmed in the privileges granted them by Cyrus, king of Persia, Ezra was the one to whom the work of restoring Jerusalem was intrusted. The Jews had been captives in a foreign land, but God had worked upon the hearts of the heathen king, so that they were allowed to return to their own land and re-establish the worship of Jehovah.

With quite a train of followers, Ezra set out for his own country. But the way was long and dangerous, and there were many even of the subjects of the king of Persia, who wished only evil to the Jews and their work. Here

was the time, if ever, for Ezra to invoke the aid of the king, and secure a company of soldiers to protect him and his companions. But he did no such thing. After getting his people together, he halted at the river of Ahava (Ezra 8:15-18), and sent for the priests of the Lord. As soon as the priest had arrived, Ezra proceeded as follows:—

"Then I proclaimed a fast there, at the river of Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath are against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this; and he was intreated of us." Ezra 8:21-23.

The result is told in the following words:—

"Then we departed from the river of Ahava, on the twelfth day of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem; and the hand of our God was upon us, and he delivered us from the hand of the enemy, and of such as lay in wait by the way." Verse 31.

This is our text. The application is plain. Ezra says: "I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him." Ezra felt that if he should ask the king for protection, it would be virtually a denial of his faith. The Jews had told the heathen of the power of Jehovah, no doubt quoting the words of Moses: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." And now if Ezra should ask kingly protection, the heathen would say, Where is your God? If he is so powerful, why do you not depend upon him, instead of seeking the protection of an earthly monarch? Such questions would have been well put. Ezra knew it; he knew that to ask for protection from the king would be to proclaim the weakness of Israel.

The same principles will apply to-day. The Christian religion is from God. Christ, its founder, said that he spoke only the words of God. He said also, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. If Christians in the nineteenth century, contrary to the precept and example of their leader, appeal to force, they simply proclaim their lack of faith in God. The National Reformers will, it is true, disclaim any design to appeal to force in support of Christianity; but laws are for nothing, if they are not to be enforced. No custom is made legal, unless it is desired to enforce that custom. To "enforce" means to support by force. And therefore when Christian usages are placed on a legal basis in the fundamental law of the land, it is nothing else than an ap-

peal to force of arms, if necessary, to support those usages when they are violated. But such an appeal to force would be a virtual proclamation that God had departed from those making the appeal. It would be a confession of one of two things: Either that the ones making the appeal had no faith in God's power to care for his own cause, or else that the customs in whose support civil authority was invoked, did not have the support of divine authority.

It is just as plain now as it was in the days of Ezra, that religion is lowered in the eyes of the world, when civil power is invoked in its behalf. To place Christian institutions on a legal basis in the law of the land, would be to put them on a level with human institutions. Therefore it is in the interest of religion that we oppose this proposed Constitutional Amendment. As Christians we do not want to see any institution or usage that is really Christian, and which therefore bears the divine impress, sunk to the level of "a police regulation." Christian institutions have the support of God, and therefore do not need the support of the State; and if the institutions which it is proposed to enforce are not really Christian, then certainly Christians should condemn the movement.
E. J. W.

Morality and Religion.

THE Christian religion, as we have said on this subject, is a *remedial system*. If man had not sinned, such a system would not have existed. Man would then have been justified by his obedience. The commandments of God contain the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13, 14. His law is perfect. Ps. 9:7. His commandments are righteousness. Ps. 119:172. Hence, if man had not sinned he would have done his whole duty; he would have been perfect and righteous in complete obedience to a perfect and righteous law. He could not have been condemned, because all his actions would have been right. And thus it is written, "The doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. 2:13.

And we have said the law, in every part, grew out of the will of God alone; it arose from no contingency connected with man's probation. It is original obligation, all its relations existing by virtue of creation. And as it is perfect, and contains the whole duty of man, it is a complete summary of all morality. From the day that man first owed allegiance to his Creator, and duties to his fellow-creatures, no new morality has arisen either in principle or in precept. There is no just reason for the expression which we have often heard, "The moral laws of the gospel." If any morality exists by virtue of the gospel, that fact would prove that the moral law previously existing was imperfect; that it did not contain all morality, and therefore did not contain the whole duty of moral agents. The necessity for the gospel originated in man's transgression; but man's transgression could not possibly give rise to moral obligation. It did create a necessity for a system of redemption, of restoration, but all the laws of such a system are—what theologians correctly term—*positive* laws, in distinction from *moral*.

This is a truth of which sight is too often lost, though the distinction itself is almost uni-

versally recognized. Many seem to consider that the institutions of the gospel are twofold, both moral and positive. But that is an error, as we have shown. The gospel *enforces all* morality, but it *originates none*. A Government, in declaring an amnesty or offering pardon to those who have been in rebellion, either expresses or implies the condition that they must cease their rebellion and return to the support of, and obedience to, the Constitution of the Government. But the amnesty or pardon does not originate the Constitution or add a particle to its force and obligation. Both Christ and his apostles enforced the law of God, and constantly referred to the Scriptures, the word of God, as authority for their teachings. But they never announced that they were authorized to give power and efficiency to the law, nor to annul one precept of the law and erect another in its stead, or to add any new morality to that which existed before. They taught repentance and the remission of sins. Theirs was purely a "ministry of reconciliation." Of course we speak now of "the moral law" only, not of the types and ordinances of past dispensations. These were temporary, and were adopted for a development of the gospel or remedial system. Not one of them existed originally by virtue of the work of creation, as did the ten commandments; not one of them ever would have existed if man had not sinned.

The law of God is very brief in its terms, but universal in its application. There is not a relation in life, except those which grow out of sin, which it leaves untouched. In few words, it guards our rights in respect to *life, chastity, property, and reputation*. Examining these four precepts, we find that they cover all the rights which our fellow-creatures can invade, and all the duties which we owe to them. - If these are obeyed in the spirit of love, which is the spirit of the law, we then observe the golden rule; we do to our neighbor just what we would that our neighbor should do to us. And thus it is seen that *there is nothing religious in the golden rule*. It relates only to duties between man and man, and surely we are not required to worship one another! It is not at all peculiar to the gospel; the Saviour said, "For this is the law and the prophets." It needs not a word to convince any one that it would have existed as perpetual duty if man had not fallen—if there never had been any such a system as the gospel. And so we might proceed, step by step, to show that not a single item of morality that ever was taught is peculiar to the gospel.

To break any of these commandments which relate to our duty to our neighbor is to infringe upon the rights of our neighbor; and, therefore, it is perfectly proper for the civil Government to punish for the violation of them. The very object of Government is the preservation of rights, or the protection of its citizens.

But it is not the office of civil Government to declare that a man shall worship God, or to decide in what manner he shall worship, if he chooses to worship at all. And herein is shown the inconsistency of the National Reformers. They declare that the ten commandments shall be enforced if the amendment shall be secured. And they say that there is nothing in their movement which can or will hinder

the Catholics working with them. And yet they well know that the Catholics, in their worship, violate both the letter and the spirit of the second commandment. In the enumeration of religious errors which these reformers say ought to be suppressed, we have never known them to mention this item of false worship. They denounce the false worship of the Chinese as dangerous to our Christianity, but say not a word against the worship of "Mary." Why is this? It may be that the Catholics are too numerous to be meddled with, and it may be that they count on the aid of the Catholics to secure the amendment, knowing that such an amendment perfectly coincides with the Catholic faith in regard to the relation which the Church sustains to the Government.

We have little hope, if any, that we shall succeed in causing the amendmentists to recognize the difference between morality and religion—between those things which civil Government may and may not enforce or regulate. It is not to the interest of their cause to do justice to their readers in laying down the true principles of Government. As a specimen of their method of treating these subjects, we copy the following from the *Statesman* of April 1, 1886:—

"Our Government does not trespass on liberty of conscience when it provides that the moral law of which Christ is the author shall decide all questions in our national life."

Who can tell what they mean by the above? To what moral law do they refer? Is it to be found in the Old or the New Testament? There is a moral law in the Old Testament, namely, the ten commandments, but in that there is not one *Christian* feature. The Jew accepts it heartily; if it were adopted as the Constitution of our Government, it would shut out neither the Jew nor the Mohammedan. That would not make us a "Christian nation." And we confidently repeat our affirmation that the gospel of Christ does not originate one jot of morality. There is not a particle of morality in the New Testament which it does not derive from the Old. The gospel is purely and only a remedial system—not at all a moral system.

The *Statesman* was once pressed on this very point. The question was propounded to it if, when they asked to have "all Christian laws, usages, and institutions placed on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," it included baptism and the Lord's Supper. It enumerated its points as follows:—

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

True, they cannot; and why not? Simply because baptism and the Lord's Supper are "Christian institutions," and the other things enumerated are not! If anything is wanted to convict them of deception, they have furnished

it above. A certain advocate of the Religious Amendment, who was also an officer of the Association, when asked what effect their legislation would have upon the rights of the Jews, said:—

"We are not a Jewish, but a Christian nation; therefore our legislation must be conformed to the institutions and spirit of Christianity."

If these people do not intend to deceive, why do they not speak in plain terms, and tell us just what they mean? The Jews had laws regulating marriage, punishing blasphemy, for false oaths, providing for religious worship, thanksgivings, fasts, and guarding the Sabbath. And, moreover, as regards prayer in our legislatures, something less than thirty years ago, when there had been a long and bitter strife in our National House of Representatives over the election of a Speaker, a Jewish Rabbi was invited to act as chaplain one morning, and that day the strife ended in a peaceable election!

To legislate for Christians as distinguished from Jews, and to recognize Jesus Christ as ruler, and his laws as the laws of the land, it is necessary to place on a legal basis that which is peculiar to Christianity in distinction from Judaism. But in the above enumeration by the *Statesman* there is not a single point of that character. Indeed, if they drop out baptism and the Lord's Supper, it will puzzle them to find any "Christian institutions" at all! It is very true that "in any candid mind" these stand apart from the objects which they profess to seek; but "in any candid mind" they must necessarily be included in the enumeration of "all Christian institutions." But we are fearful that we have not candid minds to deal with in refuting the fallacies of the National Reform Association.

This distinction will be noticed further. We close this article with the affirmation, and we can maintain it, too, that no Christian institution is properly a subject of human legislation and enforcement. As was said before, infidels have no rights in the Christian church, and therefore infidels have no right or privilege to observe Christian institutions; they belong to Christians only. When enforced by civil authority, they are perverted and abused.

J. H. W

"Influence of the Union."

UNDER this head, Baptist Noel, the English author, in his book on the Union of Church and State, speaking of the excommunication of dissenters, says:—

"Without the aid of the union, these canonical fulminations would be simply ridiculous; but when solemnly promulgated by a synod of the State-paid clergy as the doctrine of the national church, they attach the stigma of schism to dissenters in the minds of myriads. Under the shelter of these canons, bishops proclaim them in their charges to be schismatics, clergymen echo it from their pulpits, and even liberal men in the establishment are afraid openly to deny it. By aid of the union, the establishment, rising above all competition, can loftily look down upon all other churches as sectaries. 'This is not a mere State church,'

says the excellent bishop of Calcutta, 'but the religion of Christ our Lord as established by his providence and grace in Great Britain in the second century, . . . the Christian religion wisely and mildly established by a Christian Government. Much less is our church a sectarian body, as some would call it; that is a small number of persons who have cut themselves off from the mass of Christians by certain peculiarities; but the national church of the Government, nobles, and people of our religious country.'

"This doctrine, originated and sustained by the union, besides being in the highest degree unjust to dissenters, inflicts upon them many injuries.

"Persons thus trained from childhood to look upon dissenters as schismatics, whom they should, according to the apostle's command, avoid (Rom. 16 : 17), are afraid to hear the gospel from their lips. Were a dissenting minister to open a chapel for worship in any large village where there is a moral and benevolent rector, whose doctrine is unsound and whose life is worldly, few among the villagers would dare to hear the schismatic. Were the two ministers upon the footing of legal equality, as in a village of the United States, the multitude would flock to hear the gospel; but here where the State maintains the worldly pastor and frowns upon the evangelist, his doctrine is suspected, his person is despised, and he cannot gather a congregation. A similar spirit has hitherto impeded the evangelic labors of dissenters in every city of the kingdom."

And so it will ever be wherever the church is placed under the patronage of the State. It is sure to result in a loss of spirituality in the body of professors.

Persecution or Nothing.

THE National Reform Party has by resolution affirmed, and even re-affirmed, that their work does not tend in the least degree to a union of Church and State; that it does not threaten the liberty of any people, but that, on the contrary, it will furnish the strongest safeguard to the liberties, both civil and religious, of all citizens; but their actions contradict their words. And not only so, their words contradict themselves. This can be clearly seen by any one who will read the publications of the National Reform Association. The fact of the matter is, that under their National Reformed Constitution there would be no real liberty at all, either civil or religious. The *Christian Statesman* says:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us, the laws of Christian morality."

To enforce is to force; to constrain; to compel; this then, being interpreted, means, force all, compel all,—infidels, atheists, Jews, heathen,—to keep the laws of "Christian morality." Says Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the secretaries of the Association:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

They propose first to force all to keep the laws which they shall establish as being those of Christian morality; then those who will not be forced, will be disfranchised. And then

what? Oh, the gradation is easy. Rev. E. B. Graham says:—

"If the opponents of the Bible [that is, the National Reform views of the Bible] do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own, on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

That is pretty heavy, but there is one more step that could be taken, and it is taken. Rev. Jonathan Edwards says:—

"Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

The "true inwardness" of this last can be the more readily appreciated when it is understood that this reverend gentleman defines atheism to be whatever opposes National Reform.

The liberty, then, which the National Reformers propose to guarantee to every man is the liberty to do as *they* say, and the liberty to conform to what *they* shall establish as Christianity and morality. And *that* is a kind of liberty that is strictly compatible with absolute tyranny. Such liberty as that the papacy at the height of its power was willing and anxious to grant. Indeed, of that kind of liberty the Inquisition was the best conservator that the world has ever seen.

And when we read these things, and many others of like import, in the National Reform literature, and, in view of them, express our fears that religious intolerance and persecution will be the inevitable consequence of the success of the National Reform movement, they seem to think it passing strange. To them it seems only "folly and fanaticism" that anybody should harbor any such fears. Then they come cooing like a dove: "Why you need have no fears at all; we would not hurt a hair of your heads." But the sentiments expressed in the above quotations are spoken with too much earnestness, and are received with too much favor in the National Reform Conventions, for us to allow any weight whatever to such honeyed phrases as that, we need have no fears, and, they would not hurt a hair of our heads. But even if we had all pleasant words and fair speeches on their part, and had none of these plain and forcible expressions of their real sentiments and feelings, we should be none the less assured that intolerance and persecution would be the result of the success of the National Reform Party. First, because all history proves that such a thing is to be dreaded; and, secondly, because such a result is inseparable from the success of such a movement.

We repeat: *Intolerance and persecution are inseparable from the success of such a movement as is represented in the National Reform Association.* Their purpose is to place what they decide to be Christian laws, institutions, and usages, upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. Such Christianity thereby becomes the law of the land; and the only point upon which turns the question of persecution or no persecution is, Will the law be enforced? If the law shall not be enforced, then their movement will be a failure; for, so

far as any real, practical results are concerned, the whole matter would stand just as it does at present, and the present order of things is the cause of their sorest lamentations. But if the law shall be enforced, then there is persecution, for compulsory conformity to religious opinions is persecution. So the sum of the matter is this: If the laws which they shall establish shall not be enforced, their movement will be a failure. If those laws shall be enforced, then there will be persecution. And that the principles which they advocate will be enforced, if they obtain the power, is just as certain as that human nature is what it is, or that two and two make four. A. T. J.

A Cool Calculation.

At the National Convention of the National Reform Association held in Cincinnati in 1872, Mr. Abbot, editor of the *Index*, a man opposed to Christianity, was permitted to present a protest against the movement. While there were some things in his address with which we cannot agree, we believe his words of warning were not too strong, but they faithfully portrayed the danger that lurks in the amendment movement. He said:—

"I make no threat whatever, but I state a truth fixed as the hills when I say that before you can carry this measure and trample on the freedom of the people, you will have to wade through seas of blood. Every man who favors it votes to precipitate the most frightful war of modern times."

The Convention played a shrewd game when it put forward "Rev. A. D. Mayo" to reply to Mr. Abbot, for Mr. Mayo can speak more words to less purpose, and better cover with sophistry the most evident truth, than any other man in the Convention. This is his characteristic. In his reply he said:—

"Why, he is now living as a citizen of Ohio under a Constitution that substantially includes every idea we propose to place in the national charter. . . . As a citizen of Ohio he is exposed to all the danger of disfranchisement and persecution to which he would be exposed if this amendment was made." Etc., etc.

Now Mr. Mayo and his associates in that Convention knew that his speech was sheer deception, from first to last. More than a year before that time the *Statesman* said that their movement contemplated "practical ends," because under their proposed change of the Government no one would be permitted to hold office who traveled on the first day of the week! And they have loudly deplored the fact that an infidel has been elected Governor of Ohio. Now if, as they claim, no man who violates the precepts of the Bible could hold office under the amended Constitution, would there be such a parallel between it and the Constitution of Ohio as Mr. Mayo claimed? There would not; nor do they intend to have it so. We repeat, that Mr. Mayo's speech was a deception, and they knew it was.

And Mr. Mayo ridiculed Mr. Abbot's apprehensions of war, and of any trouble whatever growing out of their remodeling the Government. And the advocates of the amendment, including the conductors of the *Statesman*, have always treated the fears of their opponents with ridicule. And yet they look upon the very troubles that others predict, and even war

itself, as possibilities which may grow out of their movement. Thus we show that their pathway is marked with deception from beginning to end. For proof see the following from the pen of one of the Secretaries of the Association, Rev. M. A. Gault, published in the *Statesman* of April 1, 1886:—

"It cost us all our civil war to blot slavery out of our Constitution, and it may cost us another war to blot out its infidelity."

Slavery was an institution; it was bounded by State lines and upheld by State laws. It concerned man's conduct toward and treatment of his fellow-man. It was, therefore, a matter proper to be dealt with by the Government. But who can see even an approach to a parallel, in any of these respects, between slavery and infidelity? Infidelity is not bounded by any civil or geographical lines. It is in every community. It exists side by side with Christianity in thousands of households. It is held by the undisputed right of private judgment—undisputed in every land having any just claim to being civilized. It is held by tens of thousands of American citizens, each one having the same interest in the Constitution, and in the proper administration of the Government, and the same right to the protection of the Government, that the conductors of the *Statesman* have.

Were not these people growing almost insane on this subject they would never hint such a thing as they have here spoken. They must be aware that to take the first step toward inaugurating a war, a civil war, against infidelity in any shape or manner, would be to invite the application of a torch to every church building in the land. They must know that that would not be a war of States or sections. It would be a most deadly strife in every school district, in every neighborhood throughout our wide domain. That is not the speech of Christians; it is the wild talk of religious bigots. And we greatly fear that they will yet bring upon our country the terrible calamity of which they so coolly speak. Reports show that they are making many converts to their schemes in the churches, in the theological schools, in the colleges—everywhere that it is possible to reach those who may exert a controlling influence upon society.

Let not the people be deceived by the idea that their movement is not taking root in the country. The danger is great, and it is imminent. May the warning be heeded in time.

J. H. W.

National Religion.

SOME years ago the New York *Independent* published the following article on the effort which is being made to unite the Church with the State. The words have not lost any of their force:—

"The fathers who framed the Constitution of the United States, wisely dissevered it, and the Government created by it, from all organic connection with the religion of the people. They contented themselves with simply declaring that 'Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;' and that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification

to any office or public trust under the United States.' The melancholy history of the past had instructed them, as it ought to instruct all, that the absolute severance of the State from all organic connection with religion, is the only ground of safety to the civil and religious liberty of the people. Though not atheists, they had the wisdom to frame a Government whose fundamental law left religion to the inalienable rights of the individual conscience, and made all religious proscription or persecution constitutionally impossible.

"The resolutions of the late Pittsburg Convention proceed upon a very different theory in the construction of civil government. We ask the attention of our readers to the fourth one of the series: '*Resolved, That, in order to maintain and give permanency to the Christian features which have marked this nation from its origin, it is necessary to give them authoritative sanction in our organic law.*' This more than surprises us. Do the members of this convention really mean what they say? Does Judge Strong, of Pennsylvania, design to place himself on this ground? Or was the resolution hastily adopted, without due reflection? If we understand the import of their words, these gentlemen propose that Christianity shall be authoritatively incorporated into the 'organic law' of this country; and this is just the principle of all the religious despotisms which have cursed mankind and corrupted religion in centuries past. It is in *kind* the very doctrine adopted by the pope of Rome and all his cardinals. These 'Christian features,' referred to by the convention, are simply the *religious beliefs and practices* of that portion of the American people known as *Christians*. They can be nothing else. They certainly are not the 'features' of infidels or Jews. Now, observe that these beliefs and practices are, according to the theory of the convention, to be maintained and made permanent. In what way? Not by preaching Christianity as Christ and the apostles did; not by the circulation of tracts, and the distribution of the Bible among the people; not by the influence of holy lives and individual conversions to the truth; but by giving '*them authoritative sanction in our organic law.*' This means, if it means anything, that Christianity, as *somebody* understands it, is to be incorporated into the structure of the National Government and become an integral part of the Constitution. An 'authoritative sanction in our organic law' can mean nothing less.

"Now, we take the liberty of saying, that no such method as the one proposed, is at all necessary 'to maintain and give permanency to the Christian features which have marked this nation from its origin.' Ever since the organization of this Government, now nearly one hundred years ago, Christianity has lived and prospered in this country without 'any authoritative sanction in our organic law;' and we see no reason for supposing that it cannot continue to do so for all time. It asks no such service at the hands of the State; and, moreover, the history of all such experiments shows that the State cannot extend the service without doing more harm than good. We hence believe that in this respect the framers of the Constitution were much wiser than the mem-

bers of the recent Pittsburg Convention. The thing is just right as it is—right for the Government, right for religion, and right for the free and untrammelled exercise of human liberty; and, as we have no doubt, the large majority of the American people are of the opinion that it is best to keep it right. We are in favor of reforms, but not those that go *backward*, and lead toward the despotisms of the Dark Ages. The doctrine of these gentlemen is impracticable in this country, and wholly undesired, even if it were practicable; and we hence advise them to apply their efforts and resources to some more legitimate object. The proposition itself, upon its very face, supplies its own answer when presented to the American mind. We are opposed to the whole idea from beginning to end, in every possible form and stage of its application."

Church and State in America.

In a work entitled "Religion in America," written nearly half a century ago, we find some interesting facts concerning the union of Church and State in the United States a couple of centuries ago. It was written by a Presbyterian clergyman especially for the information of Europeans. We wish we had room for longer extracts than we are able to give in this number. Of the evils resulting from the union in New England, the author says:—

"It gave rise to internal difficulties of the gravest nature with such of the colonists as were not disposed to agree to all the measures by which it was carried out, and led to the adoption of the harshest proceedings against those persons. One of the first cases of this kind was that of Roger Williams, in 1633-35, and it shook the colony to its center. That remarkable man had been educated for the English bar under the patronage of Sir Edward Coke; but influenced by the conviction that he was called to the ministry, he took orders in the Established Church. Expelled from that church by the bishops, on account of his Puritanical principles, he came to Boston in 1631.

"Taught by persecution to examine how far human Governments are authorized to legislate for the human mind, and to bind its faculties by their decisions, Williams soon perceived that a course was pursued in America which he could not but condemn as repugnant to the rights of conscience. Regarding all intolerance as sinful, he maintained that 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Jesus Christ.' The law required the attendance of every man at public worship; Williams pronounced this to be wrong, for to drag the unwilling to public worship looked like requiring hypocrisy. Not less did he oppose the law that taxed all men for the support of a system of religious worship which some might dislike and conscientiously disapprove. 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' he replied, 'from them that hire him.' Public functionaries were to be taken only from among members of the church. Williams argued that, with like propriety, 'a doctor of physic, or a pilot' might be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church.—[*Bancroft.*] In

the end, Roger Williams was banished from the colony, and having retired to Narragansett Bay, there he became a Baptist, and founded what is now the State of Rhode Island. Absolute religious liberty was established there from the first.

"The next case occurred in 1637, and ended in the expulsion of Wheelwright, Anne Hutchinson, and Aspinwall, who, although they held some very extravagant notions on certain points, would have been harmless persons had the only weapon employed against them been truth.

"Testimony to the like effect is borne by the history of the colony in subsequent years. 'Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offense. The State was a model of Christ's kingdom on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or whatever a jury might call blasphemy, was the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God, was punished by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from the ministry of the word was punished by fine.'—[Bancroft.] Everything indicated that this union between Church and State was operating in such a manner as rapidly to undermine the rights and principles of both. The Anabaptists were treated in some cases with great harshness, and when, in 1651, the Quakers made an attempt to establish themselves in the colony, they were expelled, and prohibited from returning upon pain of death,—a penalty actually inflicted on four of them who returned in contravention of this enactment."

A Constant Menace.

HAVING survived the perils of internal war, and promising to pass safely through the trials and agitations resultant from it, our country is endangered by the constant menace of a class of restless agitators, a portion of whom are sincere in their desire to accomplish good results, and the remainder hypocritical and wholly selfish, while all are fanatical. The leaders of this class sometimes appear in one guise, and then in another—sometimes under the political, and then under the religious, banner, but always under the flag of fanaticism. Their grasp is upon the pillars of the temple, and should it fall, theirs will have been the responsibility. Whatever form their irrepressibility may take, its object is always inimical to the spirit of our free institutions. The most noteworthy movement of this class that has recently been made, is the attempt to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would require all who acknowledged its supremacy to believe in the Christian religion. Aside from most unjustly expatriating our large and respectable number of Jewish citizens, there would be little objectionable in this, save the principle of its incorporation into the fundamental law of the land. However slight, it is the entering wedge of Church and State. If we may cut off ever so few persons

from the right of citizenship on account of difference of religious belief, then with equal justice and propriety may a majority at any time dictate the adoption of still further articles of belief, until our Constitution is but the textbook of a sect beneath whose tyrannical sway all liberty of religious opinion will be crushed. "Honor the Lord," is the rallying cry of these crusaders. That has been the cry of all perpetrators of acts of cruelty, injustice, and oppression, from time immemorial. It was the cry of the Spanish Inquisitors and the English and German torturers of reformers. It brought Cranmer to the stake, incited the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, and caused witches to be burned by the Puritans. The people of enlightened America, we believe, have learned to know that a nation stands most honored in the sight of Heaven, when all of its children are left free to exercise the full right of conscience, and to worship God as they shall see fit, silently in their own hearts, or with impressive form.—*Champlain Journal.*

Juvenile Smokers.

A BRITISH physician, observing the large number of boys under fifteen years of age on the streets with cigars and pipes in their mouths, was prompted to examine the health of this class of smokers, and for that purpose selected thirty-eight boys between the ages of nine and fifteen. In twenty-two of these cases he found various disorders of the circulation and digestion, palpitation of the heart, and more or less marked taste for strong drink. In twelve there was frequent bleeding of the nose, and twelve had slight ulceration of the mouth, caused by tobacco. The doctor treated them for the ailments, but with little effect. The habit of smoking was discontinued, when health and strength were soon restored. The effect of tobacco in creating a taste for strong drink is unquestionably very great. If the testimony of some tobacco users and medical men is of any weight, one of the most radical methods of keeping the young from being led to intemperate drinking is to deny them tobacco. It is the opinion of many medical men that the rising generation is in more danger from tobacco than from alcohol.—*Sci.*

His Last Cigar.

MR. GOODFELLOW is a well-known Sunday-school superintendent in a flourishing city in one of our prairie States. He is head and front of the temperance movement in his town, and an uncompromising enemy of tobacco; nevertheless, within the memory of many living witnesses, he used to love a good cigar as well as any one. He tells how he was finally cured:—

"On leaving my office one evening, in accord with my usual custom, I lighted a fragrant cigar, which I proposed to enjoy as I pursued my homeward way. I had advanced but a few steps when I saw sitting on the curb, puffing away at the stump of a villainous cigar, a youngster whom I recognized as a member of my Sunday-school. A quick disgust filled my soul, and words of reproof rose to my lips; but how could I utter them with the weed be-

tween my teeth. The disability was not nearly so apparent in its physical as in its moral aspect. Clearly the cigar must be gotten from sight, or my lips remain sealed, and the boy left to follow the bent of an evil inclination, and doubtless become a victim of a pernicious habit. Quick as thought I whipped the cigar from my mouth, and held it behind my back, while I administered a merited reproof and timely warning. The boy threw away his stump, and promised not to try another, and I backed around the corner, fearing to turn lest my own sin should be discovered, and my influence destroyed. When fairly out of sight, I threw my cigar into the gutter, inwardly vowing before God never again to touch the weed; and I never have."

How many fathers are ready to make a like sacrifice for the sake of their sons? How many teachers, that they may consistently warn their pupils of evil likely to follow in the wake of this habit? How many pastors, that they may present themselves undefiled in the sight of the youth of their charges, and lead them in the ways of purity and true temperance?—*Church and Home.*

TEMPERANCE AND GOSPEL SONGS.

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN HEALTH AND TEMPERANCE ASSOCIATION.

BOTH the words and music are entirely new, except a few choice selections of the most popular pieces. The Temperance music is not only new but varied, including ANTHEMS, GLEES and QUARTETS

"I think 'TEMPERANCE AND GOSPEL SONGS' one of the best temperance song books I have seen."—D. C. BABCOCK, Dist. Sec. National Temperance Pub. Society of New York.

"This book is far superior to all other temperance song books I have seen for solid, practical, Gospel temperance songs."—P. T. LYNN, Musical Director, Hornellsville, N. Y.

"Among the many things that made our meeting a glorious success throughout, was the inspiring singing by our grand choir, from your new work, 'TEMPERANCE AND GOSPEL SONGS.' It is overflowing with good music and fine hymns. It is a great advance in the line of temperance music books, and ought to find a place and have a large sale among the temperance organizations throughout the country. It is the best book of the kind I have ever seen."—C. HENRY MEAD, Conductor Silver Lake (N. Y.) Temperance Camp-Meeting.

"The music throughout is musician-like—a rare excellency in such books. The words, too, are fresh and have a meaning."—W. T. GIFFE, Logansport, Ind.

"I am much pleased with 'TEMPERANCE AND GOSPEL SONGS.' Think it will be a favorite among temperance workers."—FRANK M. DAVIS, Jacksonville, Fla.

Price, in board covers, 30 cts or \$3.00 per doz.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE COMING CONFLICT;

—OR—

THE GREAT ISSUE NOW PENDING IN THIS COUNTRY.

By W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

This book contains a complete history of the rise and progress of the National Reform Party, together with an exegesis of the last portion of the thirteenth chapter of the book of Revelation, assigning to the United States its proper place in prophecy.

EMPHATICALLY A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

434 pages, in muslin covers, and will be mailed to any address post-paid, for \$1.00.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES,

—A—

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

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

IT CONTAINS NO PAID ADVERTISEMENTS,

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

All who see it agree in pronouncing it first-class in every respect. Send for free sample copy, and circular. Terms, per year, \$2.00. Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, California.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., MAY, 1886.

WHEN the *Statesman* gave so large a notice of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we hoped that it would continue its friendly offices; but its editor and correspondents seem to be attending a perpetual "mum social." We incline to the opinion that it is their wisdom to hold their peace (Job 13:5) in regard to our exposure of their fallacies and sophistry. We are confident that they can make no good defense when their positions are assailed by a correct line of argument. And we would be pleased if we could hope that they would come to realize this fact, and cease their efforts to undermine the foundations of our Government.

READ carefully the article on "National Religion" from the *New York Independent*. It is solid truth; and regard for the interests of both the Church and the State should lead all to counteract, as far as possible, the movement which will subvert our Government if it should be successful.

THERE is an idea worthy of consideration in the reason given by Judge Story for the prohibition of a Government religion in our National Constitution. See quotation on the first page of this paper. And the reason holds good to-day, and the safeguard is more needed now than it was then.

THE "Reformers" refer to God's Government for Israel, and the kingdom of Christ, as if that which they seek were in harmony with the former, and is the bringing in of the latter. We purpose to show that they err in both respects. Their movement is merely a human device to compass selfish ends. There is nothing in the Scriptures to justify it.

The Price of Liberty.

HALF a century ago, this motto was in constant use: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The idea was deeply fixed in the minds of the American people that vigilance must guard and wisdom preserve that boon which their valor had won. But scarcely a century has elapsed since our fathers suffered the almost incredible hardships of the Revolution, and the generation that now has the welfare of the country in charge is forgetting the lessons of 1776, and has grown into the idea that liberty is an assured thing to this people and to their posterity, and that it no longer needs to be guarded with ever watchful care.

If attention is given to the subject, it will be found that in nothing else were encroachments upon our liberties so much dreaded by our forefathers as in the union of Church and State. They brought with them to this land a lively sense of danger in this respect. Their own experience and observation had taught them the lesson. And the action of the puritanical party in New England had strengthened their conviction that any approach to such a union was fraught with danger to somebody's civil and religious rights. The framers of our Gov-

ernment guarded against this danger in the body of the Constitution, and strengthened the safeguard in the First Amendment. They faithfully discharged their duty to us; now it remains for us to faithfully preserve the blessing we have received of them.

One of the worst features of our times is, that a large and influential and growing association is now putting forth the most strenuous efforts to entirely change the whole structure of our Government in this respect, and the people are not alarmed. In every direction they are gathering adherents among those who are best calculated to exert a strong influence over their fellow-men; their plans are well laid, and pursued with the most persistent vigor; but when the danger is pointed out, those who ought to have the liveliest interest in the matter, treat it as a joke, and ridicule the idea that such a thing can ever be accomplished in this "land of freedom." Whether it remains a land of freedom depends upon our vigilance and faithfulness to our highest interests.

Difficult to Learn.

DR. SPEAR, of Brooklyn, N. Y., wrote an excellent book with the title of "Religion and the State." We shall take occasion to quote from it in the future. On the exercise of individual conscience, he says:—

"There ought to be room in this world for all the consciences in it, without any encroachment upon the rights of each other; and there would be if all men, in their relations to each other, would be content to exercise their own rights of conscience in a reasonable manner. This would leave every man to determine the religious question for himself, and, as the necessary consequence, relieve every man from all impositions, burdens, taxes, or disabilities arising from the determination of the question by others. Though the rule is a simple one, it is, nevertheless, one of the most difficult things for bigotry to learn. The only way to learn it effectually is not to be a bigot."

The Doctor's recipe is excellent, but scarcely practicable in all cases. It is somewhat as if one should say that the best antidote for a fever is not to have a fever! Unfortunately, there is a class of persons who are bigots, and how are they to learn this useful lesson? We might pity them and let them alone; but, unfortunately again, bigotry seems to be contagious in some localities. Well, we promise to do all in our power to prevent its spread by letting the light into its lurking places. It flourished best in the "Dark Ages," and we do not wish for their return.

THE Lancaster (Cal.) *Weekly News*, speaking of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and of the efforts now being put forth to change the form of our Government, says:—

"When it is further considered that there is no poison so easily instilled into the public mind as that which is insidiously administered under the sugar-coating of double-distilled piety, it must be confessed that it is well that an alert sentinel should be put on guard before any considerable breach is made in the 'outer wall' which protects our civil and religious liberties. And we will say this for the *Sentinel*, that its articles are ably and carefully concocted, without offensiveness toward the orthodox or 'unco-gude,' and they should be read by every one

who is a Christian or pretends to be one. He who is not may also find pleasure and profit in them. Its price is only 50 cents a year, and we commend the journal to public favor."

We shall never give offense to the orthodox; for we profess to be orthodox also, fully "believing all things written in the law and the prophets." And this is the strongest reason why we oppose the Religious Amendment of our Constitution: Such alliances with earthly powers always have been detrimental to pure Christianity, and they cannot fail to be wherever they are made. We do not wish to see the standard of religion brought any nearer to a point of worldliness than it is now.

THE question has been raised as to how the religious sentiment of the coming generation will be kept up if our country is made "a Christian nation" according to the views of the "Reformers." There can be no difficulty whatever. Non-professors or non-church-members will not be eligible to office, and therefore every man will surely become a church-member by the time he becomes eligible to office. Infidelity will be at a great discount under such an arrangement. There might be some necessity for preaching to the women if they should prove so indifferent as to be willing to be out of the fashion. But that difficulty might also be removed by adopting "female suffrage," and making them eligible to office. Then "the offense of the cross" will have effectually ceased, and the millennium will be a fixed fact. Delightful prospect!

DIPHTHERIA.—The Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., have for sale an excellent little book on the treatment of diphtheria. It has proved a priceless boon to many households who have followed its directions when this terrible scourge found its way into their families. It is an act of humanity to advise our readers of the existence of this treatise. Price, in board covers, 25 cents. Address as above.

"THE movement looking to the amendment of our National Constitution, so as to put our Government upon an acknowledged Christian basis, is fast growing in popularity. The pulpit, the press, and the platform—the great engines of every reform—are pushing forward its interests. Meetings for its discussion are multiplying over the land."—*United Presbyterian*.

REV. ROBERT BAIRD said: "The putting of witches to death in Massachusetts was a legitimate result of the attempt to build up a sort of theocracy, having for its basis the civil institutions of the Jewish commonwealth."

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1886.

NUMBER 6.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

OAKLAND, CAL.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE National Reform Party proposes to make Christ King of the United States, and yet they maintain that the Government must still remain a republic! Will the *Christian Statesman*, or some other one of the advocates of this "reform," tell us how this thing can be?

How Will They Do It?

WHEN the National Reform Association shall have accomplished its task; when it shall have obtained its proposed amendments to the Constitution, and the consequent legislation; when, by the application of its religious tests it shall have secured the conformity of all Christians, and, by the application of the Rev. E. B. Graham's mild-mannered measures; and the Rev. Jonathan Edwards's mode of Christian endeavor, shall have cleared the country of all dissenters; when thus they shall have created their Christian nation, we should like very much to know how they are going to keep it Christian. There will be, constantly, and by thousands, those who will be coming of age, and who will assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

Now if while the young were growing up any of them may have by any means imbibed sentiments of dissent from the Christian faith of the State; or if any of them should arrogantly assume the privilege of thinking for themselves, and should thereby have been led to question the right of the State to regulate the religious opinions of its citizens; what is the State going to do? If it allows these "infidels" and "atheists" to become citizens, it will be no more a Christian nation than it is now. What, then, will their "reformed" nation do to preserve its Christian life and character? We can see nothing else than that it must do one of two things: Either apply the religious test to each individual as he comes of age, or else have all the children born Christians. Now which scheme will be employed, we confess we are utterly at a loss to tell. Of course the latter would at one stroke obviate every difficulty; but how in the world they can accomplish it, is what puzzles us. Our desire is that some of those most interested in this "reform" will enlighten us on this point.

The Republic of Israel!

THIS expression must sound strange to the ears of every reader of the Bible; but we adopt it from the National Reformers, who, in their wondrous zeal for a religious Government in the United States, and in their equally wondrous determination to bend the facts of the Bible to suit their purpose, actually assert that the Government of Israel, instituted at Sinai, was a republic!

It was promised in the SENTINEL to show that these self-styled Reformers are in error in their theory of the kingdom of Christ, both in respect to the history and the prophecies of the Bible. In this number we will briefly examine the subject of history, to show that they greatly err in affirming that what they seek in the United States is in conformity with the Government of Israel as it existed under the immediate direction of Jehovah. A writer in the *Christian Statesman* used the following language:—

"The nation of Israel was organized at Mt. Sinai, as 'the custodians of the law, liberty, and religion of mankind.' A republican form of Government was given them. The three departments of Government, the legislative, executive, and judicial, were substantially represented in it. Moses, as the Judge or President, was the chief executive officer. The seventy elders formed the Congress of General Government. The court of the gate or civil Sanhedrim was the arbiter of justice. The heads of the tribes and princes thereof constituted the tribal or State Governments. It was a representative Government. The people were sovereign. They elected their rulers to represent them in office."

We are now dealing with *facts*—facts of history; facts important in their relation to the question in issue, and it is, therefore, our duty to characterize statements in correct terms. The above extract is worse than a mere "fancy sketch;" it is a shameful perversion of the history given in the Bible. We have seldom seen so much assumption in so little space as the above paragraph contains.

1. When Israel was called out of Egypt, the Government under which they were led was a *theocracy*, pure and simple. And every one knows that a theocracy is the very opposite of a republic.

2. There was no legislative department in the Government. A republic was well described by President Lincoln as a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." But no such Government was instituted at Sinai, or at any other place or time, for Israel. Even Moses, the highest among them, was not a legislator; *Moses never made any laws.*

He enforced that, and that only, which he received directly from the Lord.

3. The seventy elders were not legislators; they never made any laws. They did not constitute a "Congress" in any sense in which that word is used in a republic or in any representative Government. The *Statesman* and its correspondents can only make these assertions good by pointing to the act by which they were constituted a legislative body, or pointing to some law which they enacted. This they cannot do. But by their failure to do this they will stand convicted of misrepresenting the Bible to serve the purpose of their worldly ambition. There is not a Sunday-school scholar in the land, of intelligence and study, who does not know that God alone gave laws to Israel, which Moses and the seventy elders were to enforce and administer, with the explicit direction to add nothing to them, or take anything from them.

4. The patriarchal system existed to the time of the exode. "Elders" were aged men, heads of families or tribes. The father of the family was priest and ruler, no matter how old his sons might be, nor how numerous their families. And his prerogative descended to the first-born. This order continued until the Lord chose one family to serve as priests for the nation. At first elders were such in this sense only.

5. The Lord directed that seventy "from the elders" be selected by Moses—not making or to make them elders, but—because they were elders. The word of the Lord was as follows:—

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there; and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone. And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him; and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." Num. 11: 16, 17, 25.

6. The assertion that "the people were sovereign" is false even to an absurdity. They possessed no sovereignty in the Government in any respect whatever. Neither the people, nor Moses, nor the seventy, were consulted in regard to the laws they were to obey, or to the penalties to be enforced. They entered into

covenant with God to be his people and to obey him, but God conferred no legislative power upon any of them.

7. Although the Government was a theocracy, under the immediate and sole direction of God, the religious and civil elements were kept distinct, the priests having no inheritance with the tribes, and all but those designated by the Lord as priests being ineligible to the priesthood. All religious rites being ordered by the Lord, the civil rulers had no authority to control them, or interfere in their performance. The prophets through whom the Lord directed the affairs of the Government, might or might not be priests. Sometimes this office was given to women. All was ordered of the Lord, and the people had no voice in any of these matters.

8. The people finally demanded a king, not to better their Government, but to be as the nations around them. Though the Lord listened to their request, the thing displeased him. He said it was equivalent to rejecting him as their ruler. He gave them a king, but he reserved to himself the right to choose the king for them. Even in this they were not consulted. Saul was chosen of the Lord and anointed before the people knew anything about him. He was rejected—not by the people, but by the Lord—and David was chosen and anointed in like manner, without the knowledge of the people. And the powers of the king were so limited by the rules and laws which were given to them, that Israel was once sorely afflicted because King David presumed to take a census of the people without consulting the Lord!

9. The religious rites of Israel were mostly types, not models to be followed by future Governments. And no Government could adopt them as models without denying the priesthood of Christ, the antitype.

And now, reader, we leave it to you to judge in this matter. Was there any semblance to a republic in the Government of Israel, in any period of its history? Are not the Amendmentists guilty of deception in trying to palm off such statements as those we have quoted, as historical truths of the Bible? We have claimed, and we insist, that their movement contemplates an entire change in the structure of our Government. It is impossible to carry their plans into effect, and to retain the republican features of our Government. The rights of certain classes of citizens will be ruthlessly trampled under foot as surely as they succeed in changing the Constitution as they desire and intend to do.

But one other feature of their contemplated work will now be noticed. It is closely related to the subject herein considered. By them it is termed "Bible legislation." We quote again the words of a writer in the *Statesman*:—

"But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

What is meant by "Bible legislation"? Nothing else but legislation upon the Bible and its teachings. This writer says that "the chief

discussions and final decisions of most points will be developed" in the churches. But we deny the right of Congress, Legislatures, Courts, lawyers, and also of the churches to legislate concerning the doctrines and duties contained in the Bible. When they propose to do this, we ask them to show their credentials. Who gives them authority to enter upon any such a work? Was this the province of the "Congress" of Israel, to "legislate" concerning what God commanded them to do and to teach? Where is the evidence? Such power was never committed even to the apostles of Christ. They taught that which they received by revelation; and they taught that at the death of the testator the covenant was ratified, and nothing could thereafter be added to it. Their office was neither legislative nor executive, but ministerial. But certain ones are now dissatisfied with the heavenly calling of "ambassadors for Christ;" they choose rather to be self-appointed legislators and executives; they aspire to a position to which God never appointed mortal man.

For all that they seek to be and to do they have no warrant in the holy Scriptures. But they have a precedent; they are following, in the footsteps of a most illustrious predecessor. He is described by Paul in 2 Thess. 2, as "that man of sin, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." If they think this application is unjust, we ask them then to answer this question: How is it possible for one to exalt himself above the position of a legislator upon the word of God? No one can legislate upon a matter which is above his authority; and he who legislates upon the Bible, and declares *authoritatively* what man may and may not do in regard to the word of God, and how man must and must not receive its precepts, truly exalts himself above the word of the Most High. Jehovah has magnified his word above all his name (Ps. 138:2) and his righteous justice will not long suffer such an insult to his authority.

This was the crying crime of that man of sin; he usurped the place of God, by sitting in judgment upon the consciences and religious convictions of his fellow-creatures. This usurpation led him to "wear out the saints of the Most High" (Dan. 7:25); upon this usurpation the Inquisition was built. And this is exactly the authority which certain misguided religionists now ask the people of the United States to place in their hands! And that is what they call "National Reform." That, they affect to believe, is necessary to Christianize the nation, and exalt the name of Christ in the earth. We believe the whole movement has its spring in selfish ambition; and we think that their arrogant and overbearing manner of treating those who do not coincide with *their faith* fully justifies our belief. Their profession of sincerity does not at all change the aspect of the matter. The same sincere regard for the honor of God and for the success of his truth in the earth was professed by their predecessors in this work; but that profession did not mitigate the horrors of the dungeon, the rack, and the burning stake.

Thus much at present for the historical view.

They profess that their movement will also fulfill prophecy. While we cannot agree with their conclusions, we shall not altogether controvert their claim. But we invite them to study Rev. 13:11-18, with the connection. It may be that this is the very prophecy that their movement would fulfill. And after carefully examining the several points, then they might profitably compare with it chap. 14:9-12. If they consider such an application fanciful, we reply, that we shall hereafter endeavor to show that their interpretations of prophecy are only fanciful, and contradictory of the plainest declarations of the sacred word.

Our readers may rest assured that we shall not lose sight of *the principles of Government* which we have tried to expound and vindicate in the preceding numbers of the SENTINEL. But the "National Reformers" profess that theirs is a "Christian" work, in harmony with the teachings of the holy Scriptures. It is our purpose to meet them on every point, and to expose their fallacies in every direction; for theirs is a work of fallacy and error in whatever light it may be viewed. J. H. W.

"What Think Ye of Christ?"

As we have read the arguments of the so-called National Reformers, in which they claim for Christ a political sovereignty, we have involuntarily asked the above question. We have wondered whether they really regarded Christ as the divine Son of God, or as a scheming politician. Two quotations will suffice to show that our query is well grounded. In the *Christian Statesman* of April 22, in reply to the statement that "The apostles and primitive Christians never tried to get an amendment inserted in the statutes and laws of the Roman Empire," M. A. Gault says:—

"Christ and his apostles did not work to amend the Roman laws and constitution, because it [Rome] was not a republic. Its power did not come through the people. Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people, and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can."

That is as much as to say that if Christ had come in the days when Rome was a republic, he would have set about amending its laws. Instead of going about Judea and Galilee doing good, preaching the gospel to the poor, healing the broken-hearted, and those that were oppressed of the devil, he would have gone to Rome, got himself elected to the Senate, or as consul, and would at once have set about making Rome a Christian nation, by legal enactment! This is the way the "National Reformers" are doing, and they profess to be followers of Christ. The Lord, through the psalmist, said to the wicked, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself," and that statement seems to be applicable in this case. Because they bring religion down to the level of party politics, they imagine that Christ would do the same.

Before commenting any further on the above, we will quote the illustration which a "National Reformer" gave to show why Christ did not accept the office of king when he was on earth. The illustration is quoted by Rev. Wm. Ballentine, in his reply to Dr. W. Wisbart. Said the lecturer:—

"Had General Grant, after taking Richmond, been offered the office of township constable in any locality, he would have repelled the office with disdain. So Christ, being offered the small principality or kingdom of the Jews, refused acceptance; but if he had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world, as Grant the presidency of the United States, like him, Christ would have accepted."

We cannot conceive how a man calling himself a Christian could use such blasphemous language, except on the ground that he was drunk with the idea of a union of Church and State. The question, "What think ye of Christ?" is indeed a pertinent one to put to the self-styled National Reformers. And the answer to the question, as drawn from their own statements, would be, "A selfish man of the world; a politician seeking the highest office." In this we do not wish to be understood as implying that General Grant was such a man. There is no point of comparison between General Grant and Jesus Christ. General Grant was a man; Jesus Christ is the Son of God. General Grant, as a man, acted with manly dignity; but if Christ had done the same thing he would have been man and not God. The party of which the *Christian Statesman* is the organ, is wont to brand every one who opposes it as an atheist; but the above quotations show that the effect of imbibing National Reform principles is to give one low views of Christ and his work. We never heard an infidel express sentiments more derogatory to the character of Christ. Being Christians ourselves and adoring Christ as the divine Mediator between God and man, we oppose the work of the National Reform Party because it is unchristian in its tendency.

To go back to Mr. Gault's assumption that Christ would have attempted to amend the laws of Rome if it had been a republic. Says he, "Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people; and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can." No, of course not; there would have been just the difference between an empire and a republic. The laws of Rome reflected the sentiments of the emperor, and the people acquiesced in them just the same as the people in a republic do in laws made by their representatives. The emperor was to them a divine being, an object of adoration, and therefore his laws did reflect the sentiments of the people. Therefore if Christ had been such a one as he is described by the Religious Amendmentists, he would have gone to Rome and converted the emperor. The emperor, being converted, would at once have placed "all Christian usages, institutions, and laws" on an undeniable legal basis, and, *presto*, Rome would have been a "Christian nation." And since "the empire of Rome filled the world," by that act the whole world would have been "Christianized."

But, hold; that very thing was done. Not by Christ, however, but a little less than three hundred years after he declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Constantine the Great is generally known as "the first Christian emperor." He made laws in favor of Christians, and although he was not baptized till near his

death, he fully identified himself with the professed Christian party. In his day the whole Roman Empire became "Christianized." At that time there existed just the state of things which the Religious Amendment Party is now striving to bring about. As an evidence of this, and to show how thoroughly "National Reform" principles were carried out, the church historian, Socrates, tells us that no one was allowed to possess any Arian document, under pain of being burned at the stake, together with the prescribed document. And so strictly was this edict of that "Christian" emperor carried out, that not a line of the writings of Arius is in existence.

Like causes produce like effects. As the result of the "Christianization" of the State by legal enactments in Constantine's time, bishoprics were bought and sold just the same as secular offices were then and are now. The richest and most influential men secured the office of bishop, and used that office to increase their wealth and influence. Since religion was regulated by the civil law, the emperor was the natural head of the church; and since he also was the dispenser of patronage, men professed Christianity in order to secure office. The emperor continued to be head of the church until he transferred that dignity to the powerful bishop of Rome, whose assistance he needed in civil matters. Religion was then a matter of policy. And that is just what would happen in this country if religion were upheld by legal enactment. We care not how pure the motives of some of the advocates of the Religious Amendment may be; when the proposed Amendment is adopted, the results briefly indicated above will follow just as surely as the night follows the day. And that is the state of things which these men in their blindness imagine that Christ would sanction!

And this naturally brings us to another thought that was suggested by the second quotation, which says that if Jesus had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world he would have accepted. We call to mind the fact, recorded in two of the Gospels, that Jesus *was* once offered "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them." Did he accept? Not even in thought. Why not? Because the condition was that he should fall down and worship Satan. That same offer is still held out to the church. Many are becoming dazzled by the sight, and many, led by a selfish zeal which they suppose is zeal for Christ, are eager to accept. But the conditions have never changed, and if at any time before the nations are given to Christ to be dashed in pieces, his professed followers accept, professedly in his name, and for him, the sovereignty of any or all of the kingdoms of this world, it may be set down as a fact that it is because they have accepted the conditions which Christ rejected with holy scorn.

If those who are so loudly clamoring for Christ to be recognized as the head of this Government, would study his life and get proper ideas of his exalted character and of the nature of his kingdom, they might truly honor him. As it is, their work tends only to degrade Christianity and to dishonor Christ. Christ not

only did not seek, but he resolutely shunned political alliance, and "he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." E. J. W.

The Natural Right of Mankind.

THE following is a copy of an Act "for establishing religious freedom," which was adopted by the Legislature of Virginia in 1785. It is a masterly presentation of the truth on this subject, and of "the natural right of mankind." It will bear close study just now and onward, for the National Reform Party is set for the infringement of "the rights hereby asserted." The Act was drawn up by Thomas Jefferson, whom the National Reformers entitle, "a Unitarian of the liberal school."

"Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in his almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established or maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world, and through all time; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that preacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards which, proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than on our opinions in physics and geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy of the public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right; that it tends only to corrupt the principles of that religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments those who will externally profess or conform to it; that though, indeed those are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on suspicion of their

ill-tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty; because, he being, of course, judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough, for the rightful purposes of Civil Government, for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and, finally, that Truth is great, and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons—free argument and debate—errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them:

“Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever; nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

“And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural right of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.”

Personality of the State.

THE fundamental proposition upon which the whole National Reform structure is built, is that “the nation is a moral person.” If this proposition will not hold good in the sense in which they use it, their whole scheme is a fallacy. That it will not hold good is certain.

Their idea of the State as a moral person will not allow that it is the whole people, but that it is a mysterious, imaginary something which stands separate and distinct from the people which compose it. Their concept of a State is that it is formed of all the people, yet that it is not all the people, but a distinct entity, having a personality all its own; and this personality that springs in some way from the whole people, is a person in the eyes of men just as distinct as is General Sherman or Mr. Blaine. As therefore General Sherman, or Mr. Blaine, or any and every other person, is a moral person, is responsible to God, and must acknowledge that responsibility, so this other individual, which springs in part from each individual, being a person as real, as distinct, in the eyes of men as is any one of the people, is a moral person, is responsible to God, and must acknowledge that responsibility. As it is the duty of General Sherman, or Mr. Blaine, or any other person, to have a religion, and to exercise him-

self about religious affairs, so this person called the State or the nation must have a religion, and must exercise itself about religious affairs. With this very important difference, however, that, whereas General Sherman, Mr. Blaine, John Smith, James Robinson, Thomas Brown, John Doe, and Richard Roe, having each his own religion, must exercise himself in that religion without interfering with the exercise of anybody else's religion; this other individual must not only have a religion of its own, and exercise itself with that religion, but it must exercise itself about everybody else's religion, and must see to it especially that the religion of everybody else is the same as its own.

A State, as pictured by Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., in the Cincinnati Convention, is as follows:—

“What is the State? . . . Its true figure is that of a colossal man, his consciousness the resultant of the consciousness of the millions that compose this gigantic entity, this body corporate, his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal the end to which they are moving; a being created in the sphere of moral law, and therefore both moral and accountable.”

But that is not all; they even go so far as to give it a soul! In this same speech Professor Sloane said:—

“‘The State has no soul’ is the dictum of an atheistic political theory. On the contrary we say, with the famous French priest, Pere Hyacinth, ‘What I admire most in the State is its soul.’”

Well, if the State be, as he also said, “a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as General Grant or Mr. Colfax,” then we cannot wonder that it should have a soul. But what is the soul of the State? He tells us:—

“Moral principles are the soul of a nation; these are the informing spirit that mould its various elements into a compact unity, and that bind them together with bands stronger than steel.”

Does Professor Sloane mean to say that “moral principles” composed the soul, and were the *kind* of a soul that “General Grant or Mr. Colfax” had? Are moral principles the soul of each of the millions of people that compose this “gigantic entity”? If, as he says, the consciousness of this colossal man is “the resultant of the consciousness of the millions that compose him, his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal their goal,” then why is not his soul their soul? If moral principles are his soul, and he is but the resultant of all the others, then what can their souls be but moral principles? Truly this is a new conception of the soul, which we commend to the consideration of psychologists and theologians. We confine ourselves to the political aspect of the question.

The Doctor proceeds:—

“A still more practical view of the subject is taken when we consider the moral obligations of a nation as such; like an individual, it is held bound in the judgment of mankind to the fulfillment of its obligations. Great Britain, France, and Italy owe enormous debts. The same is true of our own country. Shall the obligations of these debts be met? May the nation repudiate? If not, why not? Or does the law, ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ bind a nation as well as an individual? . . . Do we not apply to nations the same adjectives

expressing moral qualities, which we apply to men? Has not Great Britain a national character as well defined in the minds of men as her queen or Prime Minister—a character into which her physical character and resources scarcely enter, but which is determined by moral qualities? Is not the United States a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as General Grant or Mr. Colfax?”

Having thus established, as they suppose, their proposition that the State is a moral person, the fundamental principle of the whole National Reform movement is, as stated by themselves:—

“The nation being a moral person, must have a religion of its own, and exercise itself about religious affairs.”—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 28, 1884, p. 5.

It is too often the case with a person who is eager to prove a particular proposition that he first resolves upon his conclusion, and then makes “a *major* of most comprehensive dimensions, and, having satisfied himself that it contains his conclusion, never troubles himself about what else it may contain;” and as soon as it is examined it is found to contain an infinite number of conclusions, every one being a palpable absurdity. This is exactly the logical position occupied by the advocates of this so-called National Reform. Take the statements which we have here quoted, and who cannot see that they apply with equal force to any conceivable association of human beings for a common purpose? Let us here apply their argument in a single case, and anybody can extend it to any number of similar cases.

What is a railroad company? Its true figure is that of a colossal man, his consciousness the resultant of the consciousness of the stockholders of this gigantic entity, this body corporate; his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal the end to which they are moving; a being created in the sphere of moral law, and therefore both moral and accountable. It is composed of moral beings subject to moral law, and is therefore morally accountable.

A still more practical view of this subject is taken when we consider the moral obligations of a railroad company as such; like an individual it is held bound in the judgment of mankind to the fulfillment of its obligations. May the railroad company repudiate? If not, why not? Or does the law, “Thou shalt not steal,” bind a railroad company as well as an individual? Do we not apply to railroad companies the same adjectives expressing moral qualities which we apply to men? Has not the Erie Railroad Company a character as well defined in the minds of men as its president or its cashier—a character into which its physical character and resources scarcely enter, but which is determined by moral qualities? Is not the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as is General Sheridan or Mr. Edmunds?

“The railroad company has no soul” is the dictum of an atheistic political theory. On the contrary, we say, with the famous financial priest, James Fisk, Jr., what I admire most in the railroad company is its soul. Moral principles are the soul of a railroad company. The denial of the moral character and accountability of the railroad company is of the nature of atheism; it is practically a denial of God's

providential government—leads to the subversion of morals, and the destruction of the railroad itself. That a railroad company is possessed of moral character, that it is therefore a subject of moral law, and consequently accountable to God, is not theory but fact; not hypothesis, but science. That all men do not admit that a railroad company is a moral being, and accountable to God, does not prove that it is not an established principle of moral and political National Reform science. Therefore *the railroad company, being a moral person, must have a religion of its own, and must exercise itself about religious affairs.*

There, that is a genuine National Reform argument. And we submit to any candid mind that it is just as good in proof of the personality and moral obligation of the railroad company as it is for that of the State. And not only for the railroad company and the State, but likewise, and equally, good for the personality and moral obligation of banks, insurance companies, steamship companies, gas companies, water companies, publishing companies, lodges, benefit societies, clubs, corporations, and associations of all kinds; and the logic of the whole situation is that each and every one of these must in its corporate capacity "have a religion of its own, and must exercise itself about religious affairs." If the premises of the National Reform Association be true, this conclusion and a number of other equally absurd inevitably follow, or else there is no truth in syllogisms. But if the logic of the thing be so absurd, it only demonstrates the absurdity of the principle.

Now the National Reformers, being wedded to the principle, and wishing to be divorced from the inevitable conclusions, resort to the fallacy that railroad, bridge, steamboat, etc., companies are "but creatures of the State," and so are not moral persons. Dr. McAllister in the Cleveland convention, in trying to meet this point said:—

"The nation is a moral person, created by God, and creation implies the authority of the creator; but a company of the kind described, receives its charter from the State, is subject to the laws of the State."

With that, place the following from Rev. T. C. Sproull in the same convention, speaking to the same resolution as was Dr. McAllister:—

"If the nation is not a moral being, it cannot be subject to the law of God."

Accordingly, between the State and the company, we have the following

CONTRAST.

<p>The nation is created by God; therefore the nation is a moral person, and hence is subject to the law of God.</p>	<p>The company is created by the State; therefore the company is not a moral person, and hence is not subject to the law of God.</p>
--	--

Now if, as they say, the railroad and other companies are not-moral persons; and if, as they also say, and which is manifestly true, these not-moral persons (or companies) "cannot be subject to the law of God," then why is there so much ado made about these "Sabbath-breaking railroads," these "Sabbath-breaking steamboats," and so on through the list? Then why are the railroad companies told, as they are in the address of the International Sabbath Association, printed in the *Statesman* of Feb. 7, 1884, pp. 2, 3:—

"Your action in thus multiplying trains to desecrate the day of rest is in direct violation of divine law"? "In view of your responsibilities to God, . . . you cannot afford to do this."

We would respectfully submit to the consideration of the National Reform Party the following: From your own premises there is not, and there cannot be, any such thing as a Sabbath-breaking railroad company, nor any other kind of a Sabbath-breaking company. For you say, first (truly), the Sabbath is a part of the law of God; secondly, you say that a not-moral person "cannot be subject to the law of God;" thirdly, you say that the company, as distinguished from the Government, is "not a moral person"; and then, you inconsistently accuse the railroad companies of "direct violation of divine law"!

Now how is it possible for a person, being, or thing which "cannot be subject to the law of God," to violate that law? It is plainly impossible for a not-moral being to violate moral law. It is equally impossible for such a being to have any "responsibilities to God;" because where there can be no subjection to law, there can be no violation of law; and where there can be no violation of law, there can be no obedience to law; and where there can be no obedience to the law of God, there is no responsibility to God. Therefore it just as absolutely follows from your premises that a railroad or other company cannot break the Sabbath, as that two and two make four. And it is just as absolutely true that your resort to a fallacy to escape an absurdity, has involved you in a glaring inconsistency; for it is plainly inconsistent for you to hold a being subject to that to which you say it "cannot be subject."

But if you persist in holding the companies responsible to the law of God, you must admit that they are moral beings, and hence equally with the Government must profess a religion, and have a test, and with that, logically admit an infinite number of other absurd conclusions; in short, admit that every combination of human beings for a common purpose, must, as such combination, profess a religion and have a test.

Here, then, is the dilemma of the National Reform Party,—either an inconsistency or an absurdity. But we have no ground for hope that they will abandon either the fallacy or the absurdity. For as the fallacy was adopted for the express purpose of escaping the absurdity, for them to abandon either would be to abandon their cause. Therefore we have only to expect that they will act in harmony with the ways of error always, and hold to both the absurdity and the inconsistency, and when questioned about either, do as is suggested by Rev. R. C. Wylie in the *Statesman*, of Feb. 14, 1884; that is, "adopt a plan that will prevent a repetition" of any such questions. A. T. J.

"STATE churches commonly die of moral pyæmia. History has not yet proved that, without reformatory awakenings from outside, and disciplinary dislodgements within, a church of Christ welded to the State can be saved from sinking into a Sybaritic civilization in which the crumpled roseleaf takes all spirit out of evangelistic enterprise."—Prof Austin Phelps, D. D., in *Congregationalist*.

Religion and the Church.

WHEN so much is said *pro* and *con* about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by "the church." Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If in speaking of "the church" we should refer to some special denomination, we would thereby imply that no other denomination could be a part of "the church." With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term "the church" with reference to any particular sect.

In the Bible "the church" is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that "he is the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1:18); and again he says that God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:22, 23. Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the church, as Paul says, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and that this body is Christ is shown by the words, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

"The church," then, in the strict sense of the word, is composed of those who are "in Christ," who have been converted, "born again," and are consequently "new creatures." From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them together, can be called "the church." Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of "the church," because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian.

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the church is known only to Him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of his church. Thus we assume, since we cannot decide, that each individual's profession is an honest one.

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church. It is that which makes the church, and without that there is no church.

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment Party is in favor of a union of Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the National Convention held in New York in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Peoria, Ill., said:—

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant; or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of

all the other sects; or that all these sects would combine to effect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing—and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions.”

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform Party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining “the church,” taken in connection with Dr. Edwards’s positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists.

“But,” says one, “do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?” We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any man religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State.

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian—a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so likewise the profession of religion by the State, constitutes a State church. It is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And when such union shall have been effected, what will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment Party is pledged to bring about.

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding?

E. J. W.

The Higher Law.

THE following is from the pen of Rev. Wm. Ballantine, a Presbyterian minister who has from the first been a firm opposer of the Religious Amendment party, and an exposé of its fallacies. This extract is from a “Reply to Dr. W. Wishart,” in a National Reform Convention. In future numbers we shall present more from the same source:—

Some persons are very anxious to have the Bible recognized as the supreme law of the land, thinking that if this were done, it would secure righteous enactments and their judicious enforcement. But a moment’s reflection should convince them that the influence of God’s word cannot be increased by human authority. If his authority as its Author, and the energy of his Holy Spirit, do not render it efficient, no civil enactment can. He is our Sovereign and the Bible is his law, and to him alone are we accountable for our belief in its doctrines, and the practice of its principles. Does human authority command contrary to its precepts? Then our duty is to obey God rather than man. It is to us, then, the higher law. But trammel it with human legislation, make it the law of the land, and it ceases to be the higher law. Then you are bound to receive as its teachings, in any matter of dispute, not your own honest convictions of its truth, but the interpretation of your civil judges. If this interpretation and your belief of its truth conflict, there is no remedy—no higher law to appeal to. No alternative is left you but either to submit or rebel against legitimate authority, for you have made it the law of the land and appointed civil authorities to interpret the law of your conscience. Such treatment would not only belittle, but destroy the influence of the Bible. How powerful and weighty were the appeals of Sumner, Seward, and Chase to the higher law, in their advocacy of the downfall of slavery? The inspiration of their principles, drawn from such a divine source, caused the autocrats of the South, as they sat in the Halls of Congress, to tremble like Belshazzar of old, when he saw the divine hand writing the epitaph of his kingdom—“MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN.” In this controversy, had it been the formal law of the land, it would have become secularized in the “irrepressible conflict” about its meaning, and the mighty logic of its sacred influence would have departed. Excellent on this subject are the following editorial remarks in the Cincinnati Gazette of February 7, 1872:—

“The movement to put into the Constitution a declaration of spiritual authority originates with a class of persons who think that religious liberty and the system of government which separates Church and State are failures. It is not strange that they should have this lack of faith, for the system is an experiment which our Government alone of all the Governments of the world is trying. It is not strange that many should think that religious liberty is licentiousness, and that a State without a State religion is a godless State, and is virtually an expression of contempt for religion; for in all ages of the world, States, whether pagan or Christian, have taken charge of the religion of their citizens. In stating this as the conviction of these movers, we give full consideration to

their disclaimers and explanations. In spite of all these, no plain reason can be given for inserting in the Constitution an acknowledgment of a spiritual authority in our Government that does not mean a declaration of religious duties on the part of the State which make the State a church, with the power and the duty to enforce religious observances, and to *disqualify* and *disfranchise* those who do not subscribe to what the State lays down in purely spiritual matters.

“These movers labor under the mistake of supposing that anything which they believe to be true is a proper thing to put into the Constitution. When they affirm this source of existence and authority, and this allegiance, and this authority of the Bible as a rule of conduct, they find very few to dispute. The proper application of all this is that all men should make Christian morality and Christian duty the rule of their conduct in public affairs, and thus should make religion the higher law of political action. But their conclusion is that because what they declare is truth, it should be put into the Constitution and thereby be made coercive law. Their religious zeal is greater than their knowledge of constitutional law. The Constitution is not a platform of abstract declarations, nor is it a creed which people are to assent to, but to make the law of their conduct according as they can hold. It is a body of fundamental law for the government of the country. It is made to be carried into effect by the Government, by legislative, judicial, and executive administration. This declaration of spiritual authority is to be a mere mocking of God, or it is to have the same force as all other parts of this fundamental law, and it is to be carried into effect by the same instrumentalities.

“God and religion are not abstractions. They have their written law, the Bible. These declarations mean—if they have any meaning—that the Bible shall be the law of the Government, by which all our laws are to be tested, and which our courts are bound to administer. Now to say that the Bible is sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to say that it shall be made the law of our Government, are two widely different things. The first is a declaration that all Christians subscribe to. The second is what very few of them will accept. Our laws are to be administered by the ordinary infirm human agencies. Do we desire to put the divine law into their hands to define and execute?

“Human nature will remain as it was before. No miraculous change will be wrought by this declaration. The Government will continue to be administered by men of ordinary passions, such as are elected by the average intelligence and virtue, and the average ignorance and corruption of the voting population. Viciousness, and ignorance, and corruption will continue to be powers in the body politic the same as before, and these will continue to elect legislators, executives, and judges of their own sort. The consummation will be that a spiritual authority will be created to be administered by a low order of political instrumentalities, and men will find that they have foolishly parted with their freedom of conscience, and instead of the law of God have set up a very *bare human contrivance* to rule over them.

"Do intelligent people think that what they have seen of the nature of popular government—a thing which cannot rise higher than the average intelligence and virtue of the voting masses—is such a thing as they would like to confer spiritual authority upon? Do they really think religious liberty so poor a thing that they would part with it so basely? Instead of elevating our politics by dragging religious administration into them, they will drag down religion to the level of our politics.

"Even in the individual affairs of religion, men do not treat it as an abstract element which is to execute itself. They associate themselves and form organizations to interpret its law and to carry it into life.

"So a State religion cannot be a mere abstraction. It must have form and expression and a corporeal existence. A State religion—that is, the declaration of spiritual authority and spiritual duties in the State—must have a State church to define it. In fact, the State must be the church. These agitators for an amendment to confer religious power and duties on the State are not conscious how cheaply they are proposing to barter away the priceless pearl of religious liberty. But they must see that they are laying down doctrines which will make it necessary to keep the political machine in their own hands in order to save their own religious liberty, and thus that they are periling the rights of conscience upon the chances of political control."

National Reform Opposed to True Protestantism.

THE principles of the National Reform Party are essentially papal. Opposition to that party is essentially Protestant. The success of that party will be the subversion of every principle of the Reformation, and the triumph of the principles of the papacy. The following extract is from the "Augsburg Confession," read before the Emperor Charles V., and the Imperial Diet June 25, 1530. It presents the true, Christian, and Protestant doctrine of the position that should be occupied by the Church and the State respectively. This is not the doctrine held by the National Reform Party; therefore that party is anti-Protestant. The people must awake to the fact that the conflict between the Reformation and Catholicism, between Protestantism and the Papacy, is not yet ended.

"Many have unskillfully confounded the episcopal and the temporal power; and from this confusion have resulted great wars, revolts, and seditions. It is for this reason, and to reassure men's consciences, that we find ourselves constrained to establish the difference which exists between the power of the church and the power of the sword.

"We, therefore, teach that the power of the keys or of the bishops is, conformably with the word of the Lord, a commandment emanating from God, to preach the gospel, to remit or retain sins, and to administer the sacraments. This power has reference only to eternal goods, is exercised only by the minister of the word, and does not trouble itself with political administration. The political administration, on the

other hand, is busied with everything else but the gospel. The magistrate protects, not souls, but bodies and temporal possessions. He defends them against all attacks from without, and by making use of the sword and of punishment, compels men to observe civil justice and peace.

"For this reason we must take particular care not to mingle the power of the church with the power of the State. The power of the church ought never to invade an office that is foreign to it; for Christ himself said: 'My kingdom is not of this world.' And again: 'Who made me a judge over you?' St. Paul said to the Philippians: 'Our citizenship is in Heaven.' And to the Corinthians: 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God.'

"It is thus that we distinguish the two governments and the two powers, and that we honor both as the most excellent gifts that God has given us here on earth."

Liberty-Loving Presbyterians.

THE first body of ministers of any denomination, to openly recognize the act of Congress in issuing the Declaration of Independence, was the Presbytery of Hanover, Virginia. At its first meeting after the Declaration, they addressed a memorial on the subject of Church and State, to the Virginia Assembly. The following paragraph from that memorial by those liberty-loving Presbyterians, we commend to the consideration of the National Reform Party, whose active public workers so far have mostly been Presbyterians. We should like to see them meet these sturdy principles so well stated by the Hanover memorialists.

"In this enlightened age, and in a land where all of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious as well as civil bondage. Certain it is, that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion; and there is no argument in favor of establishing the Christian religion but may be pleaded, with equal propriety, for establishing the tenets of Mohammed by those who believe the Alcoran; or, if this be not true, it is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome. . .

"Neither can it be made to appear that the gospel needs any such civil aid. We rather conceive that when our blessed Saviour declares his kingdom is not of this world, he renounces all dependence upon State power; and as his weapons are spiritual, and were only designed to have influence on the judgment and heart of man, we are persuaded that if mankind were left in the quiet possession of their inalienable religious privileges, Christianity, as in the days of the apostles, would continue to prevail and flourish in the greatest purity by its own native excellence, and under the all-disposing providence of God.

"We would also humbly represent that the

only proper objects of Civil Government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence; the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge."

"To illustrate and confirm these assertions, we beg leave to observe, that to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an inalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and the reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another."

The First Six Months.

THE time of those who subscribed for the AMERICAN SENTINEL for six months, expires with this number, also the time of those to whom the SENTINEL was sent in lieu of the *Signs Supplement*. We trust you are pleased with the SENTINEL and hope that you will send us your renewal promptly. Terms: single subscription 50 cents; or the paper one year and "Marvel of Nations," post-paid, for \$1.25. The SENTINEL, in clubs of five copies, to one name and address, for \$2.00; ten or more copies at 35 cents each. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Cor. Twelfth and Castro Streets, Oakland, Cal.

New Premium Offer.

WE will send the *Pacific Health Journal* one year to any address, and the "Practical Manual of Health and Temperance," post-paid, for \$1.00. Or the *Journal* one year and the two books, viz., "Temperance and Gospel Songs," and "Diphtheria: Its Causes, Prevention, and Proper Treatment," post-paid, for \$1.00.

SMITH'S DIAGRAM OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES,

—SHOWING—

THE RELATION OF ANY MOTION TO EVERY OTHER MOTION, AND ANSWERING AT A GLANCE OVER 500 QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE;

—TOGETHER—

WITH A KEY CONTAINING CONCISE HINTS AND DIRECTIONS FOR CONDUCTING THE BUSINESS OF DELIBERATIVE ASSEMBLIES.

A work designed for Students, Teachers, Professional Men, all who may be called upon to preside over business meetings, all who ever have occasion to take part in business proceedings, and all who may wish to inform themselves on the important subject of Parliamentary Rules. The subject is here presented under

AN ENTIRELY NEW ARRANGEMENT,

By which a great amount of information is presented to the eye at once, in a MARVELOUSLY CONDENSED FORM. By an ingeniously-devised system of diverging and converging lines, all the rules applying to any given motion, and all the motions coming under any given rule, are presented at one view, FACILITATING IMMENSELY the acquisition of a general knowledge of this subject, and furnishing to a Chairman instant information on any point upon which doubts may arise.

IT IS TO THE STUDY OF PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE WHAT A MAP IS TO THE STUDY OF GEOGRAPHY.

Bear in mind that every member of a deliberative assembly should understand parliamentary rules as well as the Chairman, to avoid the mortification of moving out of order.

Size of Diagram, 12½ by 6½ inches, printed on bond paper. A key is appended to the Diagram, containing full explanations, hints, and directions for conducting deliberative proceedings, printed on fine calendered paper, with ornamental colored border. The whole is put up in neat muslin covers, embossed in jet and gold, convenient and durable for pocket use.

Price, by mail, post-paid, single copy, . . . 50 cents. Agents wanted in the Western States.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., JUNE, 1886.

SPECIAL attention is called to the article in this number of the SENTINEL under the head of "The Higher Law." It is full of sound wisdom. And we think every article will be found interesting and instructive. Our work is an important one, and it is our intention to make the SENTINEL worthy of the cause which it advocates.

THE Religious Amendmentists claim that Moses was president of the Jewish republic. Yet we remember that he was on several occasions impeached by the Jews, who went so far on one occasion as to think of stoning him. Now we would like to have some one of the new "Reformers" tell us why they let Moses continue in office, when they were so dissatisfied with him. Why did they not have another election, and get a man more to their liking? Religious Amendment history and logic are very difficult things to harmonize with truth and common sense.

TO COERCE men into the outward exercise of religious acts, by penal laws is indeed possible; but to make them love either the religion which is thus enforced, or those who enforce it, is beyond the reach of human power. There is an inherent principle of resistance to oppression seated in the very constitution of most men, which disposes them to rebel against the arbitrary exercise of violence seeking to give direction to opinions; and it is not, therefore, to be wondered at, that one sanguinary law to compel men to live piously should beget the necessity for more.—*Dr. Hawks.*

A WRITER in the *Statesman* says: "We do not want a State religion. . . . What we want is a religious State." These "Reformers" can present more cavils, evasions, and deceptions than any other people. They say the State is a person. They want a person with religion, but no personal religion! All this will apply to any individual as well as to a State. But what can be the nature of that person's religion who has no personal religion, we cannot imagine. The truth is that religion is only a personal matter, and not at all a State matter. "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." No laws, nor Constitutional Amendments, nor coercive measures can add one whit to the religion of a State or of individuals.

"It [the civil power] forbids no man any right except the right to disobey laws that represent the Christian morality of the civilized world, or that phase of it to which the American people have arisen."—*National Reform Party.*

"The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death, and banished the 'Antinomians' and 'Anabaptists,' not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violations of the civil laws. This is the justification which

they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is: wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal."—*Baird.*

"Clashing Voices."

THE *Christian Statesman* runs a department under the head of "Clashing Voices." It is conducted by Rev. M. A. Gault; that is, he makes his voice clash with voices of those who do not favor National Reform. It is our purpose to keep the *Statesman* company as far as is possible, and therefore we are minded to indulge a little in the line of "clashing voices."

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, 1872, Prof. Sloane, D. D., said:—

"Every Government, by equitable laws, is a Government of God; a republic thus governed is of him, through the people, and is as truly and really a Theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel."

This is the kind of a Government the National Reform Party proposes in this country. And yet in the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, among the things with which they think they are wrongly charged, President Brunot, named this:—

"We are charged with meaning to turn this republic into a Theocracy."

We should like to know wherein lies the falsity of the charge.

In the first National Convention ever held by the National Reform Party—Alleghany, Jan. 27, 28, 1864—a memorial and petition to Congress was adopted. In that memorial there was embodied in the preamble of the present Constitution the Amendment which the "Reformers" propose. And to that amended preamble was attached the following:—

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, and all other matters, should be introduced into the body of the Constitution as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments in the preamble. And we your humble petitioners will ever pray."

A special committee was then and there appointed to carry this memorial to Washington, lay it before the President, and before Congress. It, with a long address, was presented to President Lincoln, Feb. 10, 1864. And yet in the New York Convention, 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards said:—

"Our proposed Amendment is confined chiefly and almost exclusively to the Preamble of the Constitution."

Language of the same import was held by Dr. Mayo, in the Cincinnati Convention, 1872. He said:—

"The Constitution of Ohio begins with a confession of dependence on Almighty God as the author of the liberties it is made to preserve. That is all there is in this thing."

And in the Pittsburg Convention, in speaking of the Fourth Article, and the First Amendment, in the body of the Constitution, President Brunot said:—

"We have not proposed to change these."

Here are some "clashing voices" which we wish Mr. Gault would arise and explain.

Who Shall Decide?

At a National Reform Convention a little over a year ago, one speaker said, "There are but two religions in the world, the true religion of Christ, and the other, comprising all false religions." This is true; but each individual who professes religion at all, is sure that the religion which he possesses is the true and only religion and that the thousands who differ with him all hold false forms of religion. Of course all cannot be right, but reason would say that each one must be allowed to make his own choice, since each one must answer for himself before God. If A, B, and C disagree with one another on religious matters, and each one conscientiously believes that he alone has the true religion, it is manifestly as unjust to make A and B conform to the views of C, as it would be to compel B and C to agree with A, or A and C to accept the opinions of B. Besides being unjust, such coercion could not possibly result in any real good even though the decision were made in favor of the one having the true religion; for there would be no heart in the forced compliance of the other two, and their sense of injustice done them would more than ever prejudice them against the views which they before thought erroneous.

Now for the application. The Rev. Jonathan Edwards says: "Religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing—and that we aim to make a feature in our institutions." And what kind of religion do they propose to incorporate into the State? Only the true religion, of course; or, rather, what they regard as the true religion. Well, suppose that a few thousand people hold different views and cannot conscientiously accept the State religion? Of course they will be regarded as heretics or heathen, and will be forced to conform to the State religion. This must necessarily happen, for if the State has laws it must execute them. But what if there are some of these "heretics" who will not hypocritically profess that which they cannot believe? Then of course they must be punished. This is the inevitable conclusion. A State religion can be nothing else than a persecuting power.

If we are asked what punishment we suppose will be inflicted on the aforesaid heretics, we cannot tell. But we know what punishments were inflicted on heretics in the Dark Ages when the State did have a form of religion, and it is not probable that those who are so anxious to fashion this Government according to that model, would hesitate to adopt the same methods.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1886.

NUMBER 7.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

In the gloomy years that followed the Revolution, the Episcopal Church continued prostrate, and felt the loss of her establishment most severely. Then did it seem as if nothing short of her utter ruin would satisfy the resentment of her enemies. She had, indeed, in the day of her power, been exclusive, domineering, and persecuting; her own sins had brought upon her this severe visitation. From her case, as well as from all past experience, persecuting churches should learn that a church that oppresses will one day be herself oppressed, and most likely by those on whose neck she had placed her foot.—*Baird.*

In the Canonsburg Woman's Christian Temperance Union National Reform Convention, Rev. D. S. Littell, of Cloakey, Pa., delivered an address on "The Relation of Civil Government to Christ," in which, says the report:—

"He ably argued that it was the duty of civil government to enforce the will of Christ so far as that will has reference to the outward conduct of the individual. So far as that will pertains to the heart and inner feelings, it is the business of the Church to see to its enforcement, the Church and the State being Christ's two arms for carrying out his will."—*Christian Statesman June 3, 1886, p 7.*

Now baptism is an essential part of the outward conduct of the individual in performing the will of Christ. Therefore, according to this able argument, it is the duty of civil government to enforce baptism. Will these worthy missionaries be as generous in this matter as was their great prototype, Constantine, who gave a white garment and twenty pieces of gold to every convert? or will they employ the converting power of Charlemagne, and "wipe out" all who will not be so "Christianized."

Again the Lord's Supper is a part of the will of Christ that "has reference to the outward conduct of the individual." Therefore, it is the duty of the civil government to enforce the observance of the Lord's Supper! In this, will the National Reform hierarchy follow the example of its papal predecessors? If not, why not? If the success of Mr. Littell's "ably argued" doctrine would not be the union of Church and State, can anybody tell what would be such a union?

A Characteristic Expression.

"REV. M. A. GAULT," a constant contributor to the *Christian Statesman*, speaks as follows in that paper:—

"The individual may confess Christ through motives of hypocrisy, but not so of the nation. Such a confession in its Constitution can only be made through the prevailing sentiment of the nation. And, therefore, as true conversion in the individual, so this amendment in our National Constitution includes the triumph of every moral reform."

This is, in every respect, a most singular expression, but just such as we might expect from the "National Reformers." It is the very opposite of everything that is reasonable on the subject. Even the confessions of "Reformers" themselves show its inconsistency. There may be many reasons for people voting for the amendment who have no conscientious regard for Christianity. Dr. Browne, in the Pittsburg National Convention of 1874, spoke as follows:—

"There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decrying this movement, are ready to be its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times, and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress; but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow that they always thought it was a good thing." etc.

Yes, any prospect or promise of success will insure their hearty co-operation, in there is to them any hope of selfish gain in the way of office. This will be the necessary result of the success of this boasted "reform;" it will attract all the old political hacks to its side, with the understanding that they must profess their adherence to Christianity in order to have any show for office. This result we have pointed out from the beginning of the movement; it will serve to set a premium upon hypocrisy, for the greatest demagogue will, under such circumstances, make the strongest profession and the longest prayers. And it must be remembered that the vote of each one of these time-serving hypocrites would have the same weight and influence toward "Christianizing" our nation that the vote of Rev. Mr. Gault himself would have. And yet he dares to assert that the religious profession of the nation would be free from the uncertainties or the liability to hypocrisy that attends an individual profession!

In the same convention in which Dr. Browne outlined the course of office-seekers in relation

to the proposed amendment, Dr. Hays spoke to the same point. He said, when the masses begin to move, "hundreds of politicians who would not for the world commit themselves to it now, will bawl themselves hoarse in applause, and swear they knew it would be so, and were on that side from the beginning."

Thus do the "Reformers" themselves recognize the fact that the ambitious, the selfish, the hypocritical politicians will give their adherence to their movement for the sake of worldly gain. And yet again they will assert that in carrying this amendment into effect there will be none of the "motives of hypocrisy" which may attend individual confessions of Christianity! We can hardly give them credit for being deceived in a matter so plainly to be seen by all.

The Lansing, Mich., *State Republican* gave a very truthful representation of the case when it said: "Thousands of men, if called upon to vote for such an amendment, would hesitate to vote against God, although they might not believe that the amendment is necessary, or that it is right; . . . such an amendment would be likely to receive an affirmative vote which would by no means indicate the true sentiment of the people. . . . Men who make politics a trade would hesitate to record their names against the proposed Constitutional Amendment, advocated by the great religious denominations of the land, and indorsed by such men as Bishop Simpson, Bishop Melvaine, Bishop Eastburn, President Finney, Professor Lewis, Professor Seelye, Bishop Huntington, Bishop Kerfoot, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Cuyler, and many other divines who are the representative men of their respective denominations."

The editor of the *Cincinnati Gazette* is a Christian, and a man of acknowledged ability. In speaking on the subject of the amendment he said:—

"The Government will continue to be administered by men of ordinary passions, such as are elected by the average intelligence and virtue, and the average ignorance and corruption of the voting population. Vice, and ignorance, and corruption will continue to be powers in the body politic the same as before, and these will continue to elect legislators, executives, and judges of their own sort."

And such will be the millennium of the National Reformers. No thoughtful and candid person will deny that these statements are reasonable and just, and they are also justified by the admissions of Doctors Browne and Hays.

Again, the absurdity of the remarks of Mr. Gault is shown in this: The majority of the voters of the United States is composed of people who are irreligious or indifferent to religion.

Of this latter class are multitudes who attend meetings, show respect to Christianity, but have no personal, heart-felt interest in it. Many of these would no doubt vote for the amendment. If, then, the amendment were adopted it would not be by a vote indicative of the "prevailing sentiment of the nation." But in order that this national confession of Christ should be free from the worldly motives which may taint the individual confession, as Mr. Gault claims that it would be, there must not be merely a "prevailing sentiment," but a *universal sentiment* of adherence to pure Christianity; but none but the wildest dreamer expects that such a state will ever mark our national politics. An individual confession of Christ must be single-minded; if the motives of the heart are mixed, partly for Christ and partly for Baal, the confession is worthless. How, then, can a national confession of Christianity be more certainly and necessarily pure than an individual confession, while a large proportion of the individuals composing the nation are irreligious? And not only so, but according to Mr. Gault's own statement, the confession of that part of the individuals professing religion may be tainted with "motives of hypocrisy," yet the religion of the nation, in the aggregate, would be high above all hypocritical motives. And therefore it is an accepted fact, according to the philosophy of these reformers, that the religion of the nation would be necessarily higher and purer than the religion of the individuals composing the nation! Yea, more; though only a part of the nation is religious at all, the religion of the whole nation would be purer than that of the religious part of the nation. Just where this super-abundance of pure national religion would be lodged is not easy to see. If it were in the hearts of the people as individuals, then individual confessions of Christ would be as free from "motives of hypocrisy" as the national confession would be; but "Rev. Mr. Gault" says they are not. Here is abundant room for Mr. Gault to "rise and explain."

It is also in order for these professed National Reformers to point to a national confession of Christianity, from the time of Constantine to the present, which has been worthy of our deep respect because of its purity or freedom from motives of hypocrisy. While Christianity was separate from the State, and while Christians were oppressed and persecuted by the State, then were they devoted and consecrated, and Christianity proved its heavenly origin in the lives of its adherents. But when it was allied to the State and received State patronage, then the church became corrupt, and her highest offices were soon filled by worldly, designing men who confessed Christ "through motives of hypocrisy." As before remarked, the legitimate result of uniting the Church to the State is putting a premium on hypocrisy; it is inviting selfish office-seekers and wily politicians to make a profession of religion a material part of their "stock in trade." All the errors and wrongs and persecutions of the papal system are traceable to the union of the secular and ecclesiastical power. We see its evils everywhere in the Greek Church. The highest form of national religion is found in England, and there we see that "livings" are sold like rail-

road stocks; openly irreligious men, who care only for games and sports, hold responsible places in the church, and "sub-let" the work of the gospel at enormous profits! Such a thing is possible only where there is "national religion."

We must express our surprise that men of education and fair intelligence will utter such absurdities and sophistries as are everywhere found in the literature of the "National Reform" people. They seem to be actually intoxicated with the hope of worldly aggrandizement through a change in the structure of our Government. They show themselves utterly at fault in treating of State matters. If anything were needed to prove that it is not wise to intrust the reins of civil power to the hands of ecclesiastics, as such, they furnish the proof in the crudity of their views in questions of national politics. It would be well for the cause of religion if they would cease to electioneer for civil power, and give themselves to the ministry of the word. And it will be well for the nation, well for our civil and religious liberties, if the people shall receive the warning, and reject all overtures for such a corrupting alliance, which cannot fail to degrade religion, and to deprive some classes of equal rights and privileges in the Government.

J. H. W.

National Reform and the Chinese.

EVER since Congress passed the Chinese Restriction Act, the *Christian Statesman* has been in great tribulation, because of the great wrong committed by the nation in that piece of legislation. Now in this article we propose no discussion of the righteousness or unrighteousness of that act of Congress, or whether it was just or unjust in itself. Our controversy is with the *Christian Statesman*, on its own published propositions, all of which are editorial utterances, and therefore stand as authoritative principles of National Reform.

By act of Congress the importation, or emigration, of Chinese laborers was prohibited for a period of ten years. This act the *Christian Statesman* denounced at the time. In its issue of Sept. 25, 1884, among "the gravest of moral evils, evils which threaten the very life of the nation," "injustice to the Chinese" is named. In its issue of Oct. 23, 1884, it says that "the unchristian Chinese policy of the two great parties is part of the indictment which the better conscience of the country is charging upon them." Again, in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, we read:—

"The two leading political parties have vied with each other in displaying their readiness to exclude the Chinamen from our shores, and have declared for the policy of exclusion, in their respective platforms. This policy, on the other hand, is felt by large numbers of Christian men to be *in violation of the natural rights of men*, as well as *contrary to the spirit and teachings of the religion of Jesus*, and increases the dissatisfaction with which, on other grounds, these parties and their platforms are regarded."

But what do the *Statesman* and the National Reform Party propose instead of this? We read:—

"We may not shut the door in the face of any one who wishes to come and dwell with

us. No nation has the right to do this, even for the preservation of religious character." "Make all men welcome to our shores, but give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation; and that believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . . *Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality.*"

Let us analyze this position and see wherein it differs from the position of the political parties which it condemns. By the term "laws of Christian morality," the *Statesman* means the ten commandments. With this definition then it says, "Enforce upon all that come among us the ten commandments." Now "enforce," according to Webster, means "to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor." Therefore the *Statesman* says: "*Force, compel, all that come among us to keep the ten commandments.*" "*Execute with vigor the ten commandments upon all that come among us.*" But the second commandment forbids men to make, to bow down to, or to serve, graven images; and this bears with particular force against the Chinese, for they do make and worship graven images; so that it may fairly be said that of all the Chinese who should ever desire to come to this country, they would be, without exception, idolaters. Now when, by constitutional amendment, this shall have been declared a Christian nation, and notice shall have thus been given that all who come here will be compelled to keep the ten commandments, will that be a sufficient argument to induce the Chinese to abandon their idols that they may come here? Allowing all the wondrous efficacy that has been ascribed to National Reform, such could hardly be expected of it, for the Chinese are just as sincere in their worship, idolatrous as it is, as are the National Reformers in theirs; and it certainly will require something more than an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to convince them that their worship is wrong. So it is easy enough to tell what the Chinese will do when the time comes that they shall have to choose whether they will abandon their worship or come to the United States. With such an alternative, they will never come to this country. Therefore the success of the National Reform policy will just as absolutely exclude the Chinese from this country as does the act of Congress which is now in force, and which is so unsparingly denounced by that party.

Now to show that the force that is given to their expressions, by the definitions before given, is not more than they intend, we give some more of their words on this subject. In the *San Francisco Chronicle* of September 24, 1884, appeared an account of a Chinese procession in that city, in honor of their god How Wong. In the *Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1884, under the caption, "Idolatry Publicly Tolerated," the account is copied in full, and then commented on as follows:—

"The remedy lies, not in the exclusion of the Chinese from our shores, where they have from God a perfect right to come, but in the legal prohibition of their public idolatry, which they have from God no right to practice, and which *no Christian Government ought to tolerate on its soil.*" "Odious it is, offensive to Christian sen-

sibilities, provoking the anger of Heaven against the nation which tolerates it. But the American people generally would doubtless be shocked by the suggestion that such open idolatry *should be suppressed by law*. But if this is, as claimed, a Christian nation, and if Jehovah is our God, why should the suggestion be considered as strange or impracticable?"

It is plain, therefore, by their own declarations, that the Chinese cannot come to this country and bring their worship with them, and that, as we have seen, works the exclusion of the Chinese as effectually as any other means that could be employed. And all this must be done, the *Statesman* says, to "maintain our Christian character;" and this, too, after stating explicitly, as above, that "no nation has the right to do this even for the preservation of religious character." The *Statesman* may talk of the servility of political parties all it pleases, but if there ever was a political party that exceeded the National Reform Party in hollow pretense, or sham principle, we should like the *Statesman* to point it out.

There is another phase of this question. Suppose that while the United States refuses to "tolerate" the worship of the Chinese, they should refuse to "tolerate," in their country, the worship of the Christians. Suppose that when this nation has "suppressed by law" the worship of the Chinese, they should retaliate and suppress by law the worship of the Christians. What could this nation do? Remonstrance would come with very poor grace from the nation that first committed the intolerance. And so the sword of National Reform would cut both ways; it would not only shut the Chinese out of this country, but would shut Christianity out of China.

Now let us draw a comparison between the action of Congress which the *Statesman* condemns, and the action of the nation which it would approve.

IT CONDEMNS	IT APPROVES
An act of Congress which excludes the Chinese.	An Amendment to, the Constitution, the effect of which will be the same.
An act which excludes the Chinese for <i>ten years</i> .	An act which would exclude them for <i>all time</i> .
An act of Congress which might be repealed by any subsequent Congress.	An act, the effect of which would be the same, and which could not possibly be effected by less than three-fourths of the whole nation.
An act which excludes only one class of Chinese—laborers.	An act which will exclude all classes of Chinese but one—Christian Chinese.
An act which excludes only one class of one nation for ten years.	An act which, with one exception—Christians—excludes <i>all classes of all nations for all time</i> .

Therefore if the action of Congress and the political parties are by the National Reform Party to be condemned seven times, surely the National Reform Party itself must be condemned seventy times seven. A. T. J.

"PROPERLY speaking, there is no such thing as 'religion of State.' What we mean by that phrase is the religion of some individual or set of individuals, taught and enforced by the State. The State can have no religious opinions; and if it undertakes to enforce the teaching of such opinions, they must be the opinions of some natural person or class of persons."—*Supreme Court of Ohio*.

"Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein."

National Reform Opposed to the Bible.

WHEN we use the term "National Reform," it is understood that we refer to the theories advanced by the Party which is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A true reform could not, of course, be opposed to the Bible; but the so-called "National Reform" movement is in no sense a reform, and that because it is opposed to the Bible. We use the term because it has been assumed by the Party, and not because we regard the movement as a reform.

The great point which the leaders of that Party aim to make is that Jesus is now the literal ruler and Governor of nations; that, for instance, the President of the United States is only the nominal head of this Government, but that Jesus Christ is the real head—the king—and that therefore his sovereignty should be formally acknowledged. If they were not infatuated they could certainly see the absurdity of speaking of the king of a republic, even if they could not see how antagonistic their position is to the truth of the Bible. We believe, however, that those who have not become intoxicated with the wine of National Reform error, can readily see the following points:—

When God had created the earth, he 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, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1: 26-28.

In this work of creation the Son was associated with the Father, and was the active agent, for by him the worlds were made (Heb. 1: 2), and John says, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1: 3. Therefore it was the Son, as well as the Father, who gave the dominion of the earth to man.

With the narrative in Genesis agree the following words of the psalmist: "The Heaven, even the heavens, are the Lords; but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Ps. 115: 16. From these two texts nothing can be plainer than that the dominion of this world has been intrusted to men.

Let no one imagine that we would intimate that God has nothing to do with this earth. We do not so believe, and the texts that we have quoted do not so teach. The greater includes the less, and the statement that the heavens are the Lord's; is equivalent to saying that God rules over all, as it is stated in Ps. 103: 19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Therefore "the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." Ps. 24: 1. But, while these texts recognize God's right to all things, as Creator, they do not conflict with the statement, "the earth hath he given to the children of men."

For what purpose has he given it to the children of men? That they may govern it, even as stated in Gen. 1: 26, 27. This is shown in Rom. 13: 1-4, where it is stated that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that rulers are appointed to bear the sword of justice. The expression, "the powers that be are ordained of God," refers to authority in general, rather than to particular Governments. And this should be sufficient to show that, although God rules the entire universe, he is not the head of any earthly Government. If he were, then there would be but one correct form of Government, and the officers of that Government would be appointed directly by Him, as in the case of the ancient Jewish Government. But no one can claim that of the various nations of earth, one is ordained of God, to the exclusion of the others.

Take for instance, Russia, Germany, England, and the United States. Here we have four Governments, all differing in their structure. Which of them is ordained of God? All of them. They are all for the purpose of preserving order, and of guarding the rights of each individual against the encroachments of others. This is all that earthly Governments are ordained to do. The whole of the law against the violation of which they can execute wrath is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and this they can enforce only so far as concerns outward acts. They cannot compel a man to love his neighbor in his heart, but they can see that he does his neighbor no personal wrong, and when they do this, they are carrying out that for which they were appointed. And in thus executing justice between man and man the ruler is ordained of God, whether he is born to the throne, or whether he is elected by the people, or appointed by a few. The Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, the Queen of England, and the President of the United States, are all equally ordained of God as ministers of justice; not because God is personally at the head of any one of these Governments, but because he has ordained that men shall be under authority, and the individuals above referred to are in authority in their respective Governments. In the discharge of their duty, they are each personally responsible to God, just the same as the humblest peasant.

But, although man was given dominion over the earth and all that it contains, all things are not now under him. Adam was overcome by the tempter, and so forfeited his dominion. He has not now perfect dominion over the earth, because it does not yield to him the increase that it formerly did; and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea are not passively subject to his control. What man forfeited, he has no power to regain. And so, since we do not now see all things put under him, Paul says that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. 2: 9. Not only did Christ taste death in order to restore to man his forfeited life, but he also bore the curse of the earth (compare Gen. 3: 17, 18 and Matt. 27: 29), that he might redeem it, and restore to man the possession that he lost.

Since Christ alone could redeem the lost dominion, and has paid the price, it is to him that it is to come. Says the prophet, "And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Micah 4:8. And so Paul directs the minds of the disciples forward to the time of "the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1:14. And when that time shall come, and the kingdom shall be given to Him "whose right it is," those who have suffered with Christ shall also reign with him. 2 Tim. 2:12; Rom. 8:17.

But it is not within the power of men to restore the kingdom to Christ. Here is where the would-be National Reformers make their fatal blunder. They say, "We must gain the world for Christ, and place him in his rightful position as Sovereign." But God 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. When some of the people "thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear," Christ told them that he was as one going into a far country "to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Luke 19:11, 12. And Daniel, in the prophetic vision, saw the giving of the kingdom to Christ by the Father, and has described it in the following language: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7:13, 14.

Add to the above the following prophetic account of the time and circumstances of the giving of the kingdoms of this world to Christ, and the utter folly of the claims of the Amendmentists will be apparent:—

"And 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. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, 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." Rev. 11:15-19.

Here we see that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, only when the time comes that the dead shall be judged, and when the corrupt of earth shall be destroyed. Compare Ps. 2:8, 9 and Rev. 19:11-21.

In this brief survey we have learned concerning Christ's sovereignty, (1) That he is not now

ruler of this world; the dominion given to man in the beginning, has been forfeited, and Satan having usurped the authority is "god of this world." (2) Man has no power to recover the lost dominion; Christ alone has the power, and he has paid the price. The controversy therefore, is between Christ and Satan. (3) We are now only waiting "the redemption of the purchased possession," when the kingdoms of this world shall be given to Christ, and he will reign forever as actual sovereign of this world. (4) He has now gone to receive the kingdom, and to return. (5) The Father has promised "the uttermost parts of the earth" to Christ for a possession, and he alone has power to bestow the gift. (6) Men do not win the kingdom to Christ and then place him on the throne, but on the contrary, when Christ comes on the throne of his glory, having received the kingdom, he will call the righteous to come and share it with him. Matt. 25:31-34. And (7) this will be only at the end of the world, when the dead shall be judged, and the wicked destroyed.

It has been before shown that the so-called National Reform theory is absurd; we think this shows that it is unscriptural. That is the reason for its absurdity, for whatever is unscriptural must be absurd. When we consider God's great plan of salvation, and the infinite price that has been paid for the redemption of the earth, and of man, that he may be assisted to a place in the kingdom of God, it seems little less than blasphemous presumption for the puny creatures to arrogate to themselves the task of placing the Creator on his own throne!

E. J. W.

Design of the Proposed Amendment.

In June, 1873, Rev. Wm. Ballentine, then pastor of the Associate Congregation of Bloomfield, Ohio, delivered a lecture before the Associate Synod, on National Reform. A few weeks afterward, Dr. Wishart published a reply in the *United Presbyterian*, of Pittsburg, and to these strictures Mr. Ballentine replied in a pamphlet, being denied admission to the columns of the *United Presbyterian*. With this explanation, we invite the reader's attention to the following extract from Mr. Ballentine's pamphlet. It shows in a clear light how the proposed amendment, if adopted, will lower the Scriptures to the level of ordinary civil affairs:—

"The ambiguity of the language in which the second proposed amendment is couched, viz., 'That the Lord Jesus Christ is Governor among the nations,' is a valid objection to its insertion in a civil instrument of government. It is susceptible of a two fold interpretation. We can understand it in what we believe to be the true theological sense, that Jesus Christ as King and Head of Zion, is Ruler among the nations, and in, 'Jacob ruleth to the ends of the earth.' But in this sense it is purely a matter of faith, and has no more claim for insertion in the Constitution than any other doctrine in our religious profession. But it is also susceptible of being understood in what we believe to be a heterodox sense, and in this sense it seems to be understood by its advocates, viz.: That Jesus Christ, in some sense, as the civil head of nations, ruleth among them. Understanding it

in this sense, we cannot advocate its insertion, being theologically wrong. Neither in the former sense can we advocate its insertion, it being purely a matter of faith, having no more authority for its insertion than the perseverance of the saints, predestination, or any doctrine of faith set forth in the Westminster standards. In regard to the third amendment, 'That his revealed will is of Supreme authority,' we believe it to be too indefinite to secure the end intended. If it is simply regarded as a statement of truth, without the force and sanction of law, it will not secure respect for the authority of Scripture from those who have not their understandings opened to understand the truth of God. If, on the other hand, we regard it as having the force and sanction of law, we make the Scriptures of divine truth the formal rule of the magistracy, and so constitute civil rulers the judges and interpreters of Scripture. From this, as a church, we have always demurred, and we still see no reason why we should change our ground.

"It will probably be denied by some, that the third amendment, which we have opposed, is designed to make the Scriptures the formal rule of the civil magistrate. If this be not the design of some of their leaders, we fail to comprehend the import and force of plain English. We will give some extracts from the *Christian Statesman* that will speak for themselves. In its issue of May 15, 1868, we have a prize offered by the Reformed Presbyterian congregations of Pittsburg and Allegheny, Pa., for the best manuscript on several topics, and among others for this: "*The Bible as the supreme law in civil matters.*" This may be viewed as too abstract to prove anything. Let us, then, hear the concrete or the application. In its issue of December 15, 1868, in reply to the inquiries of of Mr. J. McFarland about the efficiency of said amendments to arrest the commission of frauds in Philadelphia and New York, and the demoralization in politics, the editor answers: 'Precisely in this way: The amendment which we propose will be, when it is adopted, a deliberate and solemn utterance of the national will. The people, in their sovereign capacity, will declare: "We recognize Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government; the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority." Once enacted into the Constitution, this language *has the force of law.* It makes all the requisitions of the Bible concerning civil government "supreme law," and, among others, this: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Congress would at once be legally bound to make laws purging national offices of immoral and irreligious men. No Sabbath breaker or profane swearer, no man known to be guilty of drunkenness or licentiousness, could *legally* hold office or vote after the passage of this amendment!'

"The editor of the *Christian Statesman* surely understands the fundamental principles of this movement. He has been one of its inaugurators. What, then, is the import of the above extract? Does it not teach that whenever the amendments are adopted, that they have the force of law—that the requisitions of the

Bible concerning civil governments are a 'supreme law'—that Congress must enforce it in purging national office? If this would not be making the Bible the formal rule of Congress, we think language cannot express it. The evidences on this point throughout the columns of the *Christian Statesman*, like the 'possessed,' hath their name 'Legion,' for they are many. In the issue of June 1, 1869, the editor again, writing under the caption, 'Sufficiency of the Proposed Amendment,' uses the following language: 'The design of the pending movement of National Reform is not to secure mention of God in the National Constitution merely because such mention would be decent and becoming. It is not, in the view of its most earnest supporters, to express a sentiment which the nation already feels, and to exhibit a Christian character which, as a nation, we already possess. The necessity for the reform lies far deeper than such arguments would imply. The success of our cause would have a far more momentous effect. Our labors are an attempt to bring this nation into subjection to God, and the conviction that we are not, as a nation, in allegiance to the King of nations, but in rebellion against him, and so in imminent danger of destruction, is the real impulse of the movement.'

"Does this extract not clearly show that it is not the design of the 'earnest supporters' of this movement to give expression to the Christian character of the nation, by simply acknowledging God. This would be 'decent and becoming,' but it would be too tame. Something deeper, more radical, is aimed at. The design is pointedly declared 'to bring this nation into subjection to God,' by giving to the amendments, as was observed in the former extract, 'the force of law,' and expurgating all the departments of government. One of the amendments the editor expresses in the following language: 'That the Holy Scriptures, as a revelation of Christ's will, are the supreme law of nations.' Giving the Scriptures, which are here declared to be the 'supreme law of nations,' the 'force of law,' is surely making them the 'formal rule' of civil government. If it is not, what words could express it more clearly?"

"Further on, having noticed the omission of any express recognition of the Sabbath, the moral qualification of rulers—the duty of the State—the religious instruction of her children and the relations of Church and State—he adds: 'All these questions are subordinate to, and are included in, the ruling question, Shall the word of God be recognized as a law to this nation? When it shall be so recognized then the question will arise, What does the law of God require us to do?' This, we think, is all perfectly plain, and the editor, from his premises, perfectly logical. The recognition of the Bible, as proposed, is all that is necessary. Grant this, and all other questions about what it teaches will then devolve upon Congress to apprehend and enforce. Having become the law of the land, it must be interpreted by Judge Story and other commentators, and their interpretations enforced by the Judicial Department of Government. The knotty points in theology, especially the Headship question and the doctrine of the Trinity, having found a place

in the Constitution, will all be cleared up in a legal way. The difficulties between Seceders and Covenanters and United Presbyterians will all be happily adjusted by those 'learned in the law.' Immorality will cease and iniquity will hide its head. Happy consummation!! Devoutly to be wished!!"

The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.

In the discussion of the National Reform theory of the personality of the State, in our June issue, we showed conclusively that the theory is absurd; and that in the endeavor to escape the absurd consequences of their position, the National Reform Party resort to a fallacy which involves them in the inconsistency of holding beings subject to that to which, according to the theory, they cannot be subject. But we say again that we see no ground for hope that that party will ever abandon either the fallacy or the absurdity. For, as the theory is absurd, and as they affirm that the theory is fundamental to this whole movement, it is evident that absurdity is inherent in the whole National Reform system. That is not only the logic of the question, but it is strictly in accordance with all the facts in the case.

The absurdity of the view that the State is a person distinct from the individuals that compose it, is made more apparent when we consider the obligations of a nation, or State, as such. Doctor Sloane in a speech on this subject in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, instanced the fact that "Great Britain, France, Italy, and our own country owe enormous debts." But we would inquire of the National Reform Party, Does this personality, which you call the State, of Great Britain, France, Italy, or the United States, owe this debt distinct from the people? and will it pay it distinct from the people? When Germany laid upon France the war indemnity of five milliards of francs, was it laid upon a "personality" distinct from the individuals that compose the nation? and when it was paid was it paid by such a distinct personality? To the minds of all reasonable men, to ask these questions is to answer them. These National Reform religio-political economists know as well as anybody does, that of the war indemnity exacted from France by Germany, every franc came from the people who compose the State, and not from some hypothetical "individual personality" distinct from the people. They know full well that every dollar of the national debt of our own country that has ever been paid has been paid by the people of the United States, and not a cent of it by any such theoretical absurdity as the National Reform Party defines to be the State.

Does the National Reform Party mean to say that, when it gets its iniquity framed by a law, and has thus perfected its idea of the personality of a State, it will have the State a personality so entirely distinct and separate from that of the people, that the State will pay the national debt without any help on the part of the people? No. That party itself, we do them the justice to suppose, would pronounce the idea preposterous. And so do we. But if it be so, where is the sense of all their argu-

ment about the personality of the State as distinct from the personality of the people who compose the State? If the State has a personality, an individuality of its own, and a soul of its own as distinct from that of any or all of the people who compose it, as is that of General Sherman or Mr. Blaine, then why can't it pay its debts distinct from the people, as General Sherman or Mr. Blaine pays his? The very idea is absurd.

Again, Prof. O. N. Stoddard, in the Cincinnati Convention, said:—

"If the character and liabilities of the State are not distinct from those of its individual members, then the State is punished hereafter in the persons of its subjects."

We would like Professor Stoddard or any other of the National Reformers to show where a State has ever been or ever can be punished, either here or hereafter, except in the persons of its subjects. When France was punished for its ill-advised declaration of war upon Germany, did the punishment fall upon the State distinct from the persons of its subjects? When Rome was punished for the fearfulness of her iniquities—when from the Rhine and the Danube to the deserts of Africa, and from the Black Sea and the Hellespont to the wall of Antoninus and the Atlantic Ocean, the whole empire was swept by the successive and devastating waves of savage barbarism—did these terrors afflict some such figment of a State as is conjured up by the National Reform brain? Did they not rather fall upon every age, sex, and condition of the individuals that composed the State? Again we say that but to ask the question is to answer it. But it demonstrates to all reasonable men the wild absurdity of the National Reform theory of the personality of a State. There is not, and there cannot be, any such personality of a State. And we are certain that no such thing would ever be seriously advocated in this country, were it not essential to the success of a scheme of religious bigotry and priestly despotism, whose most perfect likeness is that of the papacy.

Webster defines a State to be:—

"A political body, or *body politic*; the whole body of people united under one Government, whatever may be the form of the Government."

Chief Justice Chase defined a State as follows:—

"It describes sometimes a people or community of individuals united more or less closely in political relations, inhabiting temporarily or permanently the same country; often it denotes only the country or territorial region inhabited by such a community; not unfrequently it is applied to the Government under which the people live; at other times it represents the combined idea of people, territory, and Government. It is not difficult to see that in all these senses the primary conception is that of a people or community. The people in whatever territory dwelling, . . . constitute the State."—*Great Decisions by Great Judges*, p. 641.

Bouvier says that a State is,—

"A sufficient body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights and to do right and justice to foreigners. In this sense the State means the whole people united into one *body-politic*." "As to the persons who compose the *body-politic*, or associate themselves, they take collectively the name of 'people or nation.'"—*Law Dictionary*.

A body-politic is:—

"The collective body of a nation or State, as politically organized, or as exercising political functions; also a corporation."—*Webster*.

All this is in perfect harmony with the Scriptures. When God speaks of a nation he speaks of "the whole body of people" who form the nation. When he speaks to a State he speaks to "the people who constitute the State." When he inflicts judgments upon a State, those judgments fall upon the people who compose the State. To prove this we need no better illustration than the text which, in this connection, is doubtless more used than any other by the National Reform Party. It is this: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from *their* evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto *them*. And at what instant I speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit *them*." Jer. 18 : 7-10.

Thus it is *the people* who do the evil, and it is "unto *them*" that God pronounces to do evil; and when they "turn from *their* evil," then he turns from the evil he pronounced "to do unto *them*." In this same connection the Lord makes his own application of the principle which he has just laid down. Immediately following the text quoted, he says: "Now therefore go to, speak to *the men of Judah*, and to *the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, saying, Thus saith the Lord; Behold I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you: return ye now *every one* from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good." Verse 11. Here God "framed evil" against the house of Israel, against the nation of the Jews, against the State of Judah, and the way to avert it was for the "men of Judah," and "the inhabitants of Jerusalem" "*every one*" to turn from his evil way. It would be impossible to more plainly show that, in the mind of God, and in the contemplation of the word of God, a State or nation is the people who compose it; that it is they individually who sin; and that it is to them individually, "*every one*," to whom the Lord speaks.

When the Lord pronounced judgment against Babylon, it was thus: "A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon the liars; and they shall dote; a sword is upon her mighty men and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon her horses, and upon her chariots, and upon *all the mingled people* that are in the midst of her." "The violence done to me and to my flesh be upon Babylon, shall the inhabitant of Zion say; and my blood upon *the inhabitants of Chaldea*, shall Jerusalem say." Jer. 50 : 35-37; 51 : 35.

To present other instances from Scripture would only be superfluous; the whole Bible is consistent herewith, and but confirms the correctness of the definitions given, and the truth of the position which we maintain, that the idea of a State having a personality, a will, a soul, and a moral responsibility of its own distinct from the individuals that compose it, is

absurd. If a nation be wicked it is because the individuals who compose it are wicked; if it be righteous it is because the *people*, in their own individual moral relation to God, are righteous. When God exclaimed, "Ah, sinful nation"! it was because the *people* were "laden with iniquity." Isa. 1 : 4.

Thus it is clearly shown that the National Reform theory of a State is not only opposed to reason and common sense, but to established and authoritative definitions, and the word of God, as well.

There is, however, in connection with a State, a body-politic, or a corporation, the merest shadow of that which the National Reform Party pushes to such absurd conclusions. It is this: All bodies-politic, whether they be States, banks, railroads, or corporations of whatever kind, are, by a legal fiction and "for the advancement of justice," given a personality, but this personality "has no existence *except in a figure*." The definition is this:—

"A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and *existing only in contemplation of law*. In certain respects and for certain purposes, corporations are deemed 'persons.' . . . But a corporation *cannot be deemed a moral agent*, and, like a natural person, be subjected to personal suffering. Malice and willfulness cannot be predicated of a corporation, though they may be of its members."—*Boone's Law of Corporations*.

Such, and such only, is the true doctrine of the personality of a State. And yet this "invisible," "intangible," "artificial" thing, this legal fiction, is the fundamental proposition upon which rests the whole National Reform movement! It is this sheer abstraction which that Party proposes to push to such enormous conclusions—conclusions that are fatal to liberty, both civil and religious. Could anything possibly be more absurd?

Professor Pomeroy, the eminent law writer, says:—

"The State, as separated from the individuals who compose it, has no existence except in a figure; and to predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction *is an absurdity*."

To predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction, is exactly what the National Reform Party does; therefore the demonstration is complete, by every principle of logic and of law, that the National Reform movement is an absurdity.

And that all may understand precisely what this demonstration amounts to, we append Webster's unabridged definition of an absurdity:—

"ABSURDITY—The quality of being absurd or inconsistent with obvious truth, reason, or sound judgment." "ABSURD—Opposed to manifest truth; inconsistent with reason or the plain dictates of common sense; logically contradictory."

That is what we mean in this connection, and that is exactly what the National Reform movement is. A. T. J.

MANY a dark chapter in history confirms the truth of the following remark:—

The experience of many ages proves that men may be ready to fight to the death and to persecute without pity for a religion whose creed they do not understand, and whose precepts they habitually disobey.—*Macaulay*.

State Theology.

THE term *State* means any distinct and independent body of persons occupying a given territory and united together under some form of civil government. The governmental organization of a State for the purpose of enacting and administering law, is practically the State itself. It is such as the agent of its legal operations. By the term *theology* is meant the science of God, embracing what is assumed to be known in regard to him and consisting subjectively in human beliefs with reference to the Supreme Being. What men thus believe is their theology; and if they believe in the doctrine of God at all, the natural sequel is some form of religious worship. The combination of the ideas indicated by these terms gives a *State theology*, or a government in which the State asserts a legal doctrine or creed in regard to God, and stamps the same with its own authority. The State, then, is a theological State. Its opinions, whether in respect to God himself or the duty and mode of religious worship, form a part of its laws; and this distinguishes them from *individual* beliefs or convictions that rest merely on private judgment, and hence admit of no coercive enforcement.

The natural and, as the most ample experience shows, the sure result of State theology is either such an identification of Church and State that the two are practically the same thing, or such an intimate legal union of the two that they mutually act through each other. In the one case the State is the Church and the Church is the State; and in the other, though formally distinct as organisms, they are, nevertheless, blended in a common set of functions in respect to religion. In both cases we have the union of ecclesiastical and civil powers, and in both we have religion with the sanction of the human law impressed upon it.

Every State theology must necessarily have some *specific* character; and as to what it shall be—whether pagan or Christian, and, if the latter, whether Catholic or Protestant—the State itself must be the judge. Its opinion on this subject it expresses through the edict of a king or the vote of a legislative assembly. It does the work of a theological professor, adding thereto the power of the civil arm. It teaches by command. Its dogmas are laws. All the reasons which demand or justify a State theology at all equally demand that it should be put into effective action. If it be the right and duty of the State to have a theology, then it is its duty to be governed by it and to govern the people by it. The least that it can do is to devise the ways and means of asserting, perpetuating, and enforcing it. If it is worth anything it deserves this tribute. State patronage, State disabilities or penalties for dissenters, and State administration are the logical corollaries. To this there can be no just objection, since if the State *ought* to have a theology, then it ought to use the necessary means to maintain and administer it. It should see to it that not only the children in the public schools, but also the adult population—indeed, all the people—enjoy the benefits thereof. That would be a very queer theology which the State first adopts and legalizes and then leaves to

shirk for itself. We hold it to be the duty of the State to sustain its own theology, provided always that theology comes within its proper sphere.

This, moreover, would be practically an easy task if all the people thought exactly alike, and their common thoughts were faithfully represented by the theology of the State. Such, however, does not happen to be the case. What, then, shall be done with those who dissent from this theology, and decline to conform to its requirements? This question the State must answer, and generally does so answer as to involve the principle of proscription or persecution. It is a fact wide as the world and spread all over the records of history, that State theologies have with great uniformity been persecuting theologies. Christ and his apostles and their followers were persecuted by the State theology of the Jews. Pagan Rome had such a theology, and for three bloody centuries she wielded its power against the Christians. Constantine established Christianity as a State theology and made it a persecuting power. The State theology of the Roman Catholic and that of the Protestant show the same record. State theology drove the Puritans out of England and murdered the Huguenots in France. It made our Puritan fathers persecutors. Mohammedanism as a State theology and Paganism as such are marked by the same feature. The missionary efforts of modern times to propagate Christianity among the heathen meet with one of their most formidable obstacles in State theologies, and the same was true of like efforts in the apostolic age. It is a general fact that the moment theology allies itself with the State and commands its powers it becomes persecuting in respect to all who dissent from it, and that, too, whether it be pagan or Christian, Catholic or Protestant. History paints this fact in lurid colors.

Nor is there anything strange or unnatural in such a fact. It results from the very nature of the case. The theology of the State is a part of its organic or statute law, and, of course, it should be sustained by its authority and power. Heresy is, hence, a *crime*, as really as murder, and as such it should be punished. So the State reasons, and that, too, correctly, provided we accept the doctrine of State theology. Catholic States and Protestant States have reasoned in this way. What we call religious persecution, State theology calls punishment to prevent crime. What we call religious liberty, it calls a dangerous exercise of private judgment. Saul of Tarsus was a conscientious persecutor, regarding himself as doing God service; and it is but just to say that State theologies have generally been conscientious in their deeds of murder and blood. They have not looked upon themselves as ruffians and outlaws, but rather as the conservators of the divine honor and the true interests of souls. The thoughts of an after and a wiser age were not their thoughts when they trampled the religious rights of men into the dust and shocked Heaven, if not earth, with their cruelties. Religious zeal misdirected is a terrible passion; and all State theologies, because administered by men, are apt to have this zeal.

We present, then, the disabilities, the perse-

cutions, and the martyrdoms, which are so conspicuous in the history of State theology, as more than suggesting that there must be some radical mistake in the doctrine itself. A doctrine that can by perversion turn the mild and genial religion of Jesus into a flaming persecutor, and make it a ferocious enemy to religious liberty as vested by God in individual souls; a doctrine that undertakes to adjudicate upon questions lying exclusively between the soul and its Maker; a doctrine that substitutes carnal for spiritual weapons; a doctrine that resorts to the law of force, where nothing is pertinent except the peaceful persuasion of argument and the gentle and loving voice of entreaty; a doctrine that in practical execution becomes an abominable despotism exercised over the bodies and attempted over the souls of men—yes, such a doctrine has written upon its face in letters of light the glaring evidence of being essentially and fundamentally wrong. Judging it by its fruits, we find it difficult to use terms sufficiently intense to describe the degree of that wrong. Its pervading principle is hostile alike to God and man, although it professes to be the servant of both.

It is, moreover, a significant fact of history that Christianity has always prospered most in the true sense when it has had least to do with the State and the State has had least to do with it. For the first three centuries it was the theology of individual conviction, resting simply on its own evidence, holding no other relation to the State than that of a persecuted religion, and doing its entire work by the use of spiritual means; and then it was that it spread itself among the nations of the earth with a purity and power that have never since been exceeded. Then it was that venerable and pompous systems of Paganism yielded to the resistless energy of its moral march. Afterward it became a State theology; and then, in the hands of the State, it was not only corrupted and half-paganized, but at once assumed, and for centuries maintained, the character of a persecuting religion. All the persecutions of the Romish Church, and, indeed, all the persecutions that have existed in the name of Christianity, have had their basis in State theology. If God should be pleased to constitute a theocracy on earth, and by inspiring it guarantee its infallibility, then it would be the duty of men to bow to its authority; but until we have this fact established by appropriate evidence, the conclusion drawn from history is that the State should confine itself exclusively to things temporal, and leave theology to the individual convictions and private judgments of men. This is certainly the truth in respect to Christianity.—From "*Religion and the State*," by Samuel T. Spear, D. D.

THE State, as a political organization, has never been trusted by the Divine Founder of Christianity with the duty of its propagation. He never said to the State: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," or "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." He said these things to his apostles, and to those who through them should believe on his name. The apostleship of his word he located in his disciples and followers, and not in kings, governors nor legislative assemblies,

Publishers' Column.

OUR GENERAL AGENTS.

Australia—International Tract Society, *Bible Echo* Office, Rae and Scotchmer Sts., North Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia.
 British Guiana.—Joseph B. Brathwaite, 152 Church St., Georgetown, and Thos. E. Amsterdam, 10 Church St., New Amsterdam, B. G., S. A.
 California Tract Society—1067 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.
 Canada Tract Society—South Stukely, P. Q.
 Colorado Tract Society—441 Jay Street, Denver, Colo.
 Dakota Tract Society—Vilas, Miner Co., Dak.
 District of Columbia.—International Tract Society, 1881 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 England—*The Present Truth*, 72 Henage St., Grimsby, Eng.
 Florida Tract Society—Miss Lysle Reynolds, Secretary, Box 232, Jacksonville, Fla.
 Hawaiian Islands—International Tract Society, Honolulu, H. I.
 Idaho—Elder D. T. Fero, Boise City, Idaho.
 Illinois Tract Society—3652 Vincennes Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Indiana Tract Society—No. 32 Cherry St., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Iowa Tract Society—1315 E. Sycamore St., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Kansas Tract Society—Box 160, Ottawa, Franklin Co., Kan.
 Kentucky Tract Society—West Clifty, Grayson Co., Ky.
 Louisiana—International Tract Society, Pitt Street, between Valmont and Leontine Streets, New Orleans, La.
 Maine Tract Society—113 Pearl St., Portland, Me.
 Michigan Tract Society—Battle Creek, Mich.
 Minnesota Tract Society—2920 Nicollet Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Missouri Tract Society—321 Lamine Ave., Sedalia, Mo.
 Montana—Walter Harper, Butte City, Mont., Box 358.
 Nebraska Tract Society—Fremont, Dodge Co., Neb.
 New England—N. E. Tract Society, South Lancaster, Mass.
 New Mexico—John McMurchy, White Oaks, Lincoln County, N. M.
 New York Tract Society—Box 113, Rome, N. Y.
 New Zealand—Edward Hare, Upper Queen Street (Turner Street), Auckland, N. Z.
 North Pacific—N. P. Tract Society, Box 18, East Portland, Oregon.
 Norway—*Sundhedsbladet*, Christiania, Norway.
 Ohio Tract Society—259 Adams St., Toledo, Ohio.
 Pennsylvania Tract Society—No. 5 Madison St., Wellsville, N. Y.
 Switzerland—Elder W. C. White, 48 Weiherweg, Basel, Switzerland.
 Tennessee Tract Society—Springville, Henry Co., Tenn.
 Texas Tract Society—Mrs. Lee Gregory, Secretary, Denton, Tex.
 Upper Columbia—U. C. Tract Society, Walla Walla, W. T.
 Vancouver Island—Bernard Robb, Victoria, B. C.
 Vermont—Lizzie A. Stone, South Lancaster, Mass.
 Virginia Tract Society—New Market, Shenandoah Co., Va.
 Wisconsin Tract Society—1029 Jenifer St., Madison, Wis.
 Wyoming—J. T. Trees, Tie Siding, Albany Co., Wyo.

All of the above Agencies are authorized to receive subscriptions to the *SENTINEL*, *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, and *Pacific Health Journal and Temperance Advocate*. Catalogues of our books, pamphlets, and tracts, in English and the various foreign languages, can be obtained from them. Write to the agency nearest you.

PLEASE examine the little yellow label on your paper, and if the date opposite your name reads June 86, or July 86, then your time is out; please renew at once. Terms: Single subscription 50 cts. per year; five copies to one name and address, \$2.00; ten or more copies, 35 cts. each; thirty or more copies, to one address, 30 cts. each.

THE work of the White Cross Army is calling the attention of parents everywhere to the necessity of instructing their children respecting the dangers of vice and impurity, and giving them such information at a proper age as will be conducive to purity of morals. Doctor Kellogg's recent work, "Man, the Masterpiece," is intended by the author to give to boys and young men exactly the information they need to make the most of themselves. The work has been out of press less than three months, but several thousand copies have already been sold, and the sale is increasing rapidly. Agents are wanted in all the Western States. Descriptive circulars giving terms to agents may be obtained by addressing Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.

The Great Controversy.

THE new (1886) illustrated edition of "The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan during the Christian Dispensation," by Mrs. E. G. White, contains over 500 pages, a portrait of the author, and is illustrated by twenty-one full-page cuts. The book is printed and bound in the very best style; olive green muslin with jet and gold stamp. Over ten thousand have been sold in six months.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other.

The closing chapters give a vivid picture of the warfare of the church, her final redemption, and vividly describe the triumph of the people of God, the destruction of Satan and all his followers, and the renewing of the earth, which ends the awful controversy between the Son of God and the powers of darkness.

Earnest Christians of all classes and creeds will find in it encouragement and instruction. The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

Sent post-paid to any address in America for \$1.50, or to foreign countries 85., post free.
 Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., JULY, 1886.

A GENTLEMAN who has himself done good work in opposing the so-called "National Reform" movement, writes to know how we stand in regard to the Bible,—whether or not we accept its teachings. We have assured him that we most sincerely believe the Bible, and that without any mental reservations or "liberal" constructions. It is because we do believe the Bible that we oppose any union of Church and State, which a religious amendment to the Constitution would bring about. We do not want to see its pure doctrines brought down on a level with police regulations, or the offices of the church bought and sold, or hypocritical demagogues placed over the interests of the church. Pure and undefiled religion does not find congenial soil in a State church.

"THE powers that be are ordained of God," simply because they are existing powers, and God has ordained that men shall be subject to authority. Any government, even though it be very poor, and the ruler a base person, is better than no government at all. The first duty of the individual is to learn to obey. If he learns how to obey in the family and in the State, he can the more readily learn to obey God. Therefore it is that the man who resists authority resists God. But this by no means indicates that men should yield to the power when it makes laws that interfere with his duty to God; for then, instead of teaching its subjects obedience to God, it is teaching disobedience. Obedience to God cannot be learned by obedience to the State when the State openly teaches disobedience to God. In such a case disobedience (to the State) becomes a virtue. The less can never exceed the greater, therefore the "Higher Power" has the first claim on a man's allegiance.

In our March number we noticed the fact that certain Christians of Tennessee and Arkansas who keep the seventh-day, had been indicted for working on Sunday. We there stated that the indictments in Tennessee were quashed on technical grounds. They were afterward revived, however, and both there and in Arkansas these Christians were found guilty of working on Sunday and were fined. The cases were appealed to the Supreme Court of each State respectively, and just as we go to press we learn that both Supreme Courts have sustained the action of the lower Courts. The particulars of the Arkansas cases have not yet been learned; but there are three in Tennessee, who are each sentenced to a fine of \$20 and costs, or to an imprisonment of one day for each 25 cents. As these men will not voluntarily aid an iniquitous cause, they will be compelled to lie in jail nearly three months for not keeping Sunday. And this is "Christian" America! "If they do these things in a green tree what will they do in the dry?" If these things are done in the present order of things, what would not be done with a religious amendment to the Constitution of the Nation.

Results of Churchly Ambition.

IN his "History of the Popes," Ranke, in speaking of the fifteenth century, when, as a consequence of the policy of Gregory VII., "the Church" had become supreme, and the State was only its vassal, says:—

"But the orders also had fallen into the extreme of worldliness. What intrigues were set on foot among them for securing the higher appointments! what eagerness was displayed at elections to be rid of a rival, or of a voter believed unfavorable! The latter were sent out of the way as preachers or as inspectors of remote parishes; against the former, they did not scruple to employ the sword, or even the dagger, and many were destroyed by poison. Meanwhile the comforts men seek from religion became mere matter of sale; the mendicant friars, employed at miserably low wages, caught eagerly at all contingent means of making profit."

What caused this state of things? We claim that it was the legitimate result of the union of Church and State. It was not because people in those days were naturally any worse than people are now. Human nature is ever the same; and if the Amendmentists should succeed in their design of making "the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the Church," then the crimes that were committed in the name of Christianity in the time of Alexander VI., will be repeated. It cannot be otherwise when church positions are made the object of political ambition. Ambition is no respecter of place; it will as readily work ruin in the Church as outside of it. "By that sin fell the angels."

A National Reform Axiom.

THE *Statesman* of August 25, 1881, said:—

"The remedial dispensation in the hands of Jesus Christ is adapted to social as well as to individual maladies. To be a complete Saviour, he must be the Saviour of society as well as individual men, for social relations are an inseparable part of human nature. Unless he saves the family and the commonwealth, he does not save the race."

We suppose the party which the *Statesman* represents will never get rid of the idea that the Government is an entity, something distinct from the people who compose it. If it should give up that absurdity, it would cease to exist. But if the Government is a personality, independent of the people, it logically follows that society is a personality in no wise connected with the people who compose it, and that the family is also a person entirely distinct from the individual members of the family. In the above quotation, the *Statesman* is consistent with its own peculiar absurdity. Now then, allowing its claim for the personality of the family, of society, and of the State, and allowing that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of these hypothetical persons, as well as of beings of flesh and blood, we reach the following logical absurdities: (1) The family may be saved and one or more members of it lost; (2) Any given society may be saved, yet any number of men composing it may be lost; or, (3) The commonwealth may be saved, and some of the citizens lost. And this being admitted, as it must be if the "National Reform" theory be true, we conclude, (4) That any family, society,

or State may be saved, and at the same time a majority or even all of the individuals composing that family, society, or State, may be lost! National Reform philosophy has evolved a new axiom, namely, "The whole is distinct from any of its parts." This is, of course, not a self-evident truth, but a self-evident absurdity, and is, therefore, characteristic of National Reform. Truly, the beauty of the "National Reform" theory is the multiplicity of conclusions at which it allows one logically to arrive.

The Inevitable Result.

THE "National Reform" people disclaim any design to persecute when they shall have secured their coveted Religious Amendment. "Persecution" is too harsh a word for their ears. Very well, let us come at the matter gradually. They cannot deny that if some form of religion is incorporated into the laws of the Government, those laws must enforce conformity to that form of religion. Now when some refuse to obey those laws and adopt that religion, what will the makers of the laws do? In harmony with the sentiments which we give most of them the credit of holding at present, they will at first use mild measures to induce the unwilling to obey. And if these measures do not succeed, what then? The laws must be enforced, and consequently more stringent measures must be adopted. And if some still refuse obedience, what then? Let Gibbon answer:—

"It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime, of the offender. The fine which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severities of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 37, par. 23.

A CORRESPONDENT of one of our prominent journals, writing from England, says:—

"I saw recently twenty women standing at a bar, all drinking. I have seen drunken women clinging to lamp-posts, and one lying drunk at full length in Hyde Park. The half-holiday system which prevails quite generally is proving a curse. To obtain Saturday afternoon for recreation, the working people begin labor at six o'clock, an hour earlier than Americans. So great is the debauch of Saturday and Sunday that few works are started in full till Tuesday morning."

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME I.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 1886.

NUMBER 8.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

LEGAL CHRISTIANITY is a solecism, a contradiction of terms. When Christianity asks the aid of government beyond mere *impartial protection*, it disowns itself. Its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated the better it is for both.—*Supreme Court of Ohio.*

A STATE church cannot well avoid fostering hypocrisy and worldliness; and mere intellectual advantages, without reference to character, are apt to push men into positions for which mere intellectual qualifications are insufficient. Where appointments and advancement are dependent upon secular authorities, influences will be brought to bear upon the clerical profession which tend toward the decay, rather than the awakening, of spiritual life.—*H. H. Boyeson, in Congregationalist.*

THE Catholic *Monitor*, of San Francisco, in an article relating how Catholics were persecuted by the Orangemen, after their organization in Ulster in the last century, says:—

"And this happened under the flag of Protestant England, a little over a century ago; yet the Catholic Church is held up to the world as the *only* ecclesiastical power that ever persecuted for conscience' sake!"

Not so; we would not so single out the Catholic Church as the sole persecutor. Any ecclesiastical power, be it Protestant, Catholic, or Pagan, if joined with civil power, will persecute dissenters. It cannot be otherwise. The Catholic Church has been the greatest persecutor known in history, because it enjoyed the longest period of union with, and supremacy over, the civil power. If it had never been able to use the secular power, its persecutions would never have been heard of. The Catholic Church from the time of Constantine until the sixteenth century is the model after which the Religious Amendmentists in the United States are working; and if they shall gain their purpose, Protestant America will, from the very nature of the case, persecute dissenters as vigorously as did Catholic France or Episcopal England.

The Kingdom of Christ.

In our remarks upon the idea of the "National Reformers" concerning the "Republic of Israel," we denied their assertion that the seventy elders of Israel were a Congress, or a legislative body. We should go further, and deny that they were constituted a *body* in any sense whatever. They were inferior judges or justices, each acting separately from the others. They were no more a Congress than are the justices of the peace in any of our States. They never deliberated or acted in an associated capacity. To call them a Congress, and Israel a Republic, is an abuse of history and of language. But we know not to what these professed Reformers will not resort to make plausible their pretenses, and thus to compass their ends.

And they err as greatly in their views of the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ as they do in regard to the history of the government of Israel. Christianity was established as a national system; its redeemed will be "of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues" (Rev. 7 : 9), but no nation in the aggregate will ever be saved. Even Israel, a nation ruled directly by the Lord under inspired leaders and teachers, never developed a generation of sincere believers. In establishing the gospel, James said that God "did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." Acts 15 : 14. It was necessary to have a separate people, with its priesthood and genealogies, both to represent in types the work of Christ, and to identify him as the seed of Abraham and the son of David, in fulfillment of the promises and the prophecies. But that necessity no longer exists, and therefore Christ "hath broken down the middle wall of partition" (Eph. 2 : 14), putting no difference between Jews and Gentiles (Acts 15 : 9), ordaining that "in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10 : 35. The gospel of Christ is a gospel of faith—of personal piety. And the work of faith is a work of preparation for admittance to the kingdom of Christ; as Peter says "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us," that if they add to their faith the Christian graces, they shall never fall, "for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." See 2 Peter 1 : 1-11. It is a denial of every principle of the gospel to talk of "Christ coming into his kingdom in the United States" by means of a popular vote or a Constitutional Amendment.

But so the amendmentists talk, and for this they profess to be looking.

They seem to entirely misapprehend the present position and work of the Saviour, and the nature of the authority which he now possesses by the gift of the Father. It is a fact plainly taught in the Scriptures that the Father, at different times, confers authority of an entirely different nature upon his Son. Christ himself makes an announcement of this fact when he speaks of his occupying *two thrones* at different times, and for different objects. We refer to Rev. 3 : 21, where Jesus testifies thus to John: "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*." The differences of these thrones, and of the objects of Christ's occupying them, we will notice.

Of the Father's throne we say:—

1. It is the throne of the dominion of the whole universe. "God, the Judge of all," sits upon it, and before it must come the actions of all the subjects of the Creator, and from it must go forth the decisions which concern the eternal destinies of his creatures.

2. That throne is in Heaven above. It is not, and never was, upon this earth.

3. Upon that throne Christ sits as a priest—a mediator or intercessor for our race. In this he fulfills the type of Melchisedec, who was "king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God." Heb. 8 : 1 says: "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the Heavens." See Paul's argument in chapters 5 to 9. Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, because his priesthood is on a throne—the throne of his Father in Heaven. In this it differs from the priesthood of Aaron. And only in this sense is he a king at the present time—a priest-king. All his present rule and authority is in harmony with his office and character of a mediator or advocate. It is not the authority of an executive, or of one who punishes sinners. His authority in that respect is in the future.

4. His occupancy of that throne is limited in regard to time; his priestly kingdom he will deliver up; his advocacy or work of mediation will end. 1 Cor. 15 : 24-28.

5. We have no genealogy of Melchisedec, and, accordingly, Christ has no predecessor or successor in his priesthood. He sprang from a tribe which could have no priesthood in Israel, and he alone is priest on the throne of his Father.

6. While sitting upon the throne of his

Father in Heaven, he is expecting and waiting for a gift of power and authority of another nature. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. "After he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. 10:12, 13. His Father puts his enemies under his feet, but not till his priestly reign on the throne of Heaven ends. 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Of his own throne we may say:—

1. It is the throne—not of his Father in Heaven, but—of his father David. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." Luke 1:32. "God had sworn with an oath to him [David], that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Acts 2:30.

2. The throne of David was not in Heaven. The first dominion or rule over Israel as a nation, was from Heaven, because their government was originally a theocracy. But the throne of David was in every respect distinct from the throne of universal power whereon Christ now sits.

3. It is counted Christ's own throne, because he was born heir to it, and his genealogy from David had to be preserved in order that his claim to it might be recognized.

4. His reign upon this throne will never end. "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.

5. Jehovah promised to establish the throne and seed of David forever. "Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." Ps. 89:3, 4, 27. The Revision says: "The highest of the kings of the earth." Therefore it was prophesied of Christ, David's son, that, when the kingdom is given to him, "all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Dan. 7:14.

6. David had no priesthood, and his son and heir can have no priesthood on his throne. As has been proved, the priesthood of Christ is on the throne of his Father in Heaven. Hence his reign upon the throne of David is not a priestly reign. When he is given power over the nations, according to the promise of the Father, the fulfillment of which he has yet in expectation, he will no longer be a mediator, or Saviour of sinners.

The points of difference between the *two reigns* of Christ, and of the *two thrones* upon which he reigns, are plainly brought to view in the Scriptures. It is only by confounding the circumstances of the two reigns, and misapplying the Scriptures in reference thereto, that the "National Reformers" make their positions appear somewhat plausible.

It must be remembered that "*his enemies* are put under his feet." When the nations are subdued under him, they are his enemies still. And what will he do with them when they are given to him? The second psalm answers this question: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou

shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." And with this agree all the prophecies. Thus in Dan. 2, the kingdom of Christ is represented—not as converting the nations and incorporating them into itself, but—as breaking in pieces and destroying them. They are not brought into subjection to a mild sway of gospel grace; for there is no gospel grace offered to sinners after Christ ends his priesthood and receives his power over the nations. The kingdoms of earth will be dashed in pieces, broken, destroyed; they become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, driven away by the wind, so that "no place is found for them." To represent all this as the conversion of the nations, and their adopting the gospel of the kingdom as their "national religion" is to greatly pervert the Scriptures. It is crying "peace and safety" when destruction is impending. 1 Thess. 5:1-3.

Rev. 11:15-18 is most explicit in the same direction. The seven trumpets of this book cover this whole dispensation; the last three are called "woe trumpets" (see Rev. 8:13), because woes are upon the earth during their sounding. This dispensation closes with woes upon the nations, because "in the last days" the wicked "wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3.

We have not space in this number for a comment on Rev. 11:15-18, but will briefly notice a few of the points introduced. It is under the sounding of the seventh angel that the kingdoms of this world are given to Christ, and that his everlasting reign commences. This is yet future; for his priestly reign on the throne of his Father is not yet ended. And it is not only said that the kingdoms become Christ's, but "of *our Lord* and of *his Christ*." And thanks are ascribed to the great God, the Father, because he has taken his power to himself; which, of course, refers to the kingdoms of this world. Hitherto they have been under the sway of Satan; God deposes the great usurper, who took by stratagem the dominion given to Adam (compare Gen. 1:26 and Luke 4:5-7), and gives it to "his Christ," the second Adam, who, in turn, gives it to his people, the saints. Verse 18 tells us the condition of the nations when they were given to Christ: "And the nations were angry." The disposition of the just God toward the angry nations is also shown: "And thy wrath is come." The time is further pointed out; these things take place under the seventh trumpet, and the wrath of God is come, "and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth."

Jesus said the saints will be rewarded at the resurrection of the just. Luke 14:14. The resurrection of the just takes place when Christ himself returns to the earth. 1 Thess. 4:15-17. At the coming of Christ, the saints inherit, or enter into and possess, the kingdom. Matt. 25:31-34. And they cannot inherit it before the resurrection; for Paul says "that flesh and blood [man in a mortal state] cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption

inherit incorruption." 1 Cor. 15:50. Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, which cannot be inherited by dying people; they must first be immortalized by the resurrection or a translation. God hath "chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." James 2:5. They who are rich in faith, and love God, are now *heirs* of the kingdom, and they will *inherit* it when Jesus comes and redeems them from the bondage of corruption. See Rom. 8:23 and 2 Cor. 5:4.

At a future time we may notice more at length the prophecies of the setting up of the kingdom, and of the closing scenes of this dispensation. We trust that even this brief view will suffice to show the errors of the "National Reformers" in their application of the prophecies. They propose to set up the kingdom by a majority vote; but God will in his wrath destroy the majority and give the kingdom to a "little flock." Luke 12:32. J. H. W.

The Golden Opportunity of National Reform.

THERE is a glorious field open and white already to the harvest of National Reform. There is a tree whose fruit is so lusciously ripe for National Reform, that the tree needs but to be shaken for the fruit to fall into the mouth of the National Reform eater; and we urgently call the attention of the *Christian Statesman* to it, and through it the attention of all the National Reformers.

Rev. J. H. Pettee, of Okayama, Japan, reports in the May number of the *Missionary Herald* that Japan is so amazingly eager to become a Christian nation, that there is danger that she will adopt "some low, loose type of Christianity," and that "in a mere formal way." He says there is danger that she may adopt the Roman Catholic, or the Russo-Greek form of Christianity, because "Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, or other Protestant denominations will not, or cannot offer her a short road to" her longed-for goal—the name and place of a Christian nation. Now the National Reform Party furnishes just the short cut to the place of a Christian nation, which Japan in her heathen blindness is groping about to find. The National Reform Party, we believe, owns the right of way to this road which now Japan so long has sought, and mourned because she found it not. How can the National Reformers sit still, and lend no helping hand to poor, pleading Japan? We do not wish to interfere in any way with the internal workings of that Party, but if we might be allowed the privilege of making a suggestion, we would recommend that Rev. E. B. Graham and Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., be sent at once as National Reform missionaries to conduct Japan along the National-Reform short-cut to the place where she may stand before the world a Christian nation. Here is an opportunity for them to fairly rival St. Francis Xavier or Gregory Thaumaturgus.

We would advise them that, for the success of their particular movement in this case, delay is dangerous; for Mr. Pettee reports that "the most progressive secular paper in the sunrise

kingdom" has already "openly advocated baptizing the emperor and a few of the nobles, that Japan may be considered a Christian nation." It declares, "Christian blue is the fashionable color, and not Buddhist brown; therefore let us put on a blue coat." So if the National Reform Party would have the glory of starting Japan in the race of Christian nations, it is essential that its missionaries be sent speedily.

Let not our readers suppose for an instant that Mr. Pettee asks for any such thing as the National Reform movement would supply, or that he would indorse it. He has too much respect for Christianity for that. He rightly gives this subject the title of "A New Peril in Japan;" and declares in words of solid truth, "The last thing a true Christian desires to see in Japan is, Christianity proclaimed the State religion." So say we, in Japan or in any other country; least of all in our own. But that is exactly what the National Reform Party proposes to establish in this country, and aims to create here the identical condition of affairs as that into which Japan is about to plunge. And were its purpose accomplished, that would be the darkest day that Christianity has ever seen in America.

A. T. J.

Will "National Reformers" Persecute?

In the "National Reform" Convention held in Pittsburgh, in February, 1874, Dr. A. A. Hodge made a speech in favor of the proposed amendment, in the course of which he uttered the following words:—

"If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, in the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship; and while they may be restrained from some self-indulgence, they can be constrained to no violation of their convictions.

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose that precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences."

From this deliverance we draw the following necessary conclusions:—

The idea intended to be conveyed is that "we," the "National Reformers," are all good; "we" would not persecute anybody; but if the unbelieving minority should prevail, "we," the innocent and helpless majority, would be at their mercy. As a piece of sentimental cant, the utterance was a success; as common sense and truth, it was a failure, for minorities have never yet persecuted majorities, and the very idea of such a thing is absurd. No matter how violent a man may be, the man who has twice the power that he has is in no danger. What Dr. Hodge calls the "unbelieving minority," now occupies, according to the "National Reformers," the very ground for which they are striving. The "Reformers" claim that they want to Christianize this Government; then it must be that this "unbelieving minority" now holds the ground. And yet we have not heard of any persecution being raised against the "Christian majority." As a matter of fact, no

people have ever suffered persecution for conscience' sake, except from the hands of those who professed some form of religion.

These "National Reformers" do not agree among themselves. Dr. Hodge says that, if their project carries, infidels will be just where they have always been. But Mr. Coleman says that the success of their movement will "disfranchise every logically consistent infidel." We believe Mr. Coleman's statements, because (1) from the very nature of the case the "Reformers," if successful, must disfranchise those who dissent from their positions, and because (2) Dr. Hodge's own statement provides not only for the disfranchisement of infidels, but for the persecution of those Christians who may not agree with the majority. Note carefully the following:—

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose that precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences."

With the last clause we agree. When there is a conflict between the law of God and the law of men, the law of God must have the preference. "But," say the "National Reformers," "we propose to make the law of God the law of the land, and then there can be no persecution, because the law of men will coincide with that of God." The fallacy in this proposition lies in the assumption that they, if successful, will make the perfect law of God the law of the land, or that, if they should do so, all who revere God's law would agree with their understanding of it. They count on there being no dissenters except infidels, forgetting or ignoring the fact that there are conscientious differences of opinions even among Christians.

It is a fact that among professed Christians there is not perfect unanimity of opinion concerning the law of God. On this point the Christian world may be divided into the following classes:—

1. Those who hold that the law of God is binding upon all men.

2. Those who hold that the law was abolished at the cross, and that it now has no claims upon anybody.

The first class may be still further divided as follows:—

1. Those who hold that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday.

2. Those who believe that the fourth commandment now enjoins the observance of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

As all of those who reject the authority of God's law are agreed that Sunday is the proper rest day for mankind, it follows that the only practical controversy over the law of God is concerning the application of the fourth commandment; the great majority of professed Christians (including the National Reformers), construe it as enjoining the Sunday rest, while a small minority are positive in their conscientious conviction that it requires them to keep Saturday. Now even allowing that the majority are actually right, and that their interpre-

tation of the law of God is correct, the fact remains that a minority do not admit their interpretation. Those in the minority are conscientious in their belief that the law which the majority sustain is opposed to the law of God; and when the law of men conflicts with the law of God, Christians have no alternative but to obey the latter, and disobey the former; they must follow their convictions, and, as Dr. Hodge says, "take the consequences." That these "consequences" would be punishment for violating the law of the land, is a necessary and obvious conclusion. Dr. Hodge says in the same speech from which we have quoted:—

"The Christian minister receives the word of God as his law in the church, and interprets it for himself. The Christian magistrate receives the same word as his rule in the State, so far as it casts light upon human duties and relations involved in the functions of government, and the magistrate interprets it for himself."

Those who violate the laws, as interpreted by the magistrates, are always punished by the magistrates. It may be that the accused one has obeyed the law, according to *his own* view of it, but that does not shield him from punishment; in the eyes of the magistrate, he is a criminal. But punishment for following one's own convictions concerning the law of God, is persecution for conscience' sake. Therefore we say that if the Amendmentists succeed in carrying out their plans, there will be religious persecution just as surely as there will be conscientious Christians who dissent from their views. He who cannot see this is blind indeed. Indeed, the only ground on which they pretend that they will not persecute is that infidels have no convictions, and that all but infidels will agree with them. We are not prepared to admit that infidels have no convictions; but we are prepared to say that there are Christians who do not accept "National Reform" doctrine, and who have convictions.

E. J. W.

The Danger Real.

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that there is in this country a large and influential party whose avowed object is to "secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States" as will allow Congress to do what the first article of amendments to the Constitution now forbids it to do, many persons imagine that religious liberty is in no danger. But it is in danger; and many are blindly giving assent to a project which, if successful, will bind, not only the acts, but also the consciences of all who are not in harmony with the views of these religious-political schemers.

The avowed object of this association is thus set forth in article II of its constitution:—

"The object of this society shall be 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."

Of course this may mean a great deal; or, like other party platforms, it may mean very little; and it is decidedly objectionable, or measurably unobjectionable, to the degree that it is made to mean all or less than is really ex-

pressed in it. However, we will allow its authors to explain its meaning. We may not find perfect harmony of sentiment in all the utterances of the National Reform Party; but the preponderance of testimony shows clearly that the amendment which they propose is designed to be practical as well as ornamental. In their Convention at Cleveland, Ohio, among other resolutions they adopted the following:—

“Resolved, That we re-affirm that this religious amendment, instead of infringing on any individual's right of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of Church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens.”

That sounds well; and is admirably adapted to the purpose for which it was framed; namely, to disarm opposition and lead people to suppose that that which they propose is simply a paper reform (?). Just what they do really propose is shown by the following bit of Christian (?) sentiment expressed by Professor C. A. Blanchard in the Pittsburgh convention in 1874:—

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measure, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion.”

Of course the unavoidable inference is that Congress must make laws to punish for false religion, just as it makes laws to punish for false money, etc. And not only was this sentiment uttered in a National Reform Convention, but it was applauded by the members of that convention. But how such an amendment could possibly “form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens,” is not apparent to the average mind. And no wonder; for it is evident that were Congress to do anything of the kind it would restrict the religious liberty of all who should be in any respect outside of the religion thus established by law. For instance, the *Christian Statesman* once said of certain Congressmen who traveled on Sunday on their way to Washington:—

“Not one of those men who thus violated the Sabbath is fit to hold official position in a Christian nation. . . . Give us in the National Constitution, the simple acknowledgment of the law of God as the supreme law of nations, and all the results indicated in this note will ultimately be secured.”

That is to say, give us the proposed amendment, and the man who travels on Sunday cannot hold office! He may be a Jew or a Seventh-day Baptist who conscientiously keeps the seventh day according to the strict letter of the fourth commandment;—may he not then set off for the national capital on Sunday?—No, indeed; for by act of Congress Sunday has been declared to be the Sabbath; and so the man who has rested on the seventh day, according to the commandment, as he verily believes, must also rest the first day according to act of Congress! And thus he is restrained both as to his outward actions and as to his conscience.

But suppose that he does travel on Sunday?—Oh! he cannot hold office. And more than that he cannot vote! In short, he will be disfranchised! At least that is the way Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the principal exponents of this

new plan of providing “the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens,” puts it. In the *Statesman* of November 1, 1883, Mr. Coleman, in reply to a question, said:—

“The classes who would object [to the amendment] are . . . Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it, if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would *disfranchise* every logically consistent infidel.”

There can be no mistaking this language. For all practical purposes all who object to the amendment are to be considered as Jews and infidels and atheists, and they are all to be disfranchised! And what for? Oh, forsooth the Jew keeps his store open on Sunday; and the infidels and atheists—well, being infidels and atheists, and this being a Christian nation, they of course can have no political rights anyway! They may be all well enough as neighbors, and tax payers, but then they can't vote; for don't you see that by act of Congress this has been made a Christian nation!

But it may be urged that Jews, infidels, and atheists are disfranchised because they will not do that which the amended Constitution requires; namely, recognize Christ as the ruler of the nation; also that being Jews, infidels, and atheists they are necessarily immoral persons, and therefore should have no voice in a government whose fundamental code is the moral law. But how about the Seventh-day Baptist? He fully recognizes Christ and the moral law, in fact, he is quite a stickler for the law. What, then, will be the attitude of the National Reform Government to one who differs from it only in that he, in all good conscience, keeps the day anciently observed by the people of God? Let Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Illinois, answer. After speaking of atheists, deists, and Jews, he 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 as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. *They must be counted together.*”

Such an utterance needs no comment. This is not the sentiment of Him who said, “My kingdom is not of this world;” but it savors of the Dark Ages, and has about it the scent of the musty dungeons of the Inquisition. But history repeats itself; and why may it not do so in this as well as in other things? This Reform (?) Association is rapidly growing in numbers and influence. Their speakers are constantly in the field; and they are rapidly enlisting the sympathy and the co-operation of almost the entire ministry of our land. They are themselves ministers, and they go from place to place, visiting clergymen and securing the use of their churches in which to hold meetings.

They appeal to church people in behalf of religion; to moralists, in behalf of morality; to the temperance people, in behalf of temperance; and to laboring people in be-

half of a day of rest for workingmen. Railroad accidents are by them held up as evidence of the displeasure of God toward the railway companies for running their trains on Sunday. Cyclones and floods are represented as the judgments of God upon the Nation for its wickedness in refusing to make the decalogue (as expounded by the National Reform Party) the fundamental law of the land! In short, they appeal to any and every motive to compass their ends—and all for what? That they may multiply tenfold the number of hypocrites; that our churches may be defiled by political corruption; that religious bigotry and intolerance may spring up and flourish in our land, and that they may, like Saul of Tarsus before his conversion, enter into every house, and, haling men and women, commit to prison all who do not believe and practice as they, the National Reform Party, dictate.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

National Reformed Presbyterianism.

At its recent session at Rochester, New York, the Reformed Presbyterian Synod adopted a memorial to Congress, urging upon that body the necessity of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, advocated by the National Reform Party. The memorial “is to be signed by all adult members of the church both male and female, and laid before the National Legislature.” We have not space to print the memorial entire; suffice it to say that it presents the usual National Reform complaints about the present Constitution having in it “no acknowledgment of God nor of the moral laws of his Government;” that this “encourages the false doctrine that civil government has no moral nor religious duties to perform;” that the refusal of this nation to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as king, and to accept his law, “involves the Nation in unspeakable guilt and exposes us to the chastising and destroying judgments of God,” etc., etc., and closes with these words:—

“That we who present this petition are unable, for these reasons, to accept the Constitution as a right fundamental law for the nation, and are, therefore, debarred on conscientious grounds from participation in the Government. We can neither take office under it ourselves, nor by voting for others, lay this Constitution upon them as the rule of their official conduct.

“We pray you, therefore, to propose such an amendment to the National Constitution as shall suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority in national affairs, and so place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”

It will be seen at once that this is a regular National Reform document. Indeed, the National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics. The first step that was ever taken, the first paper that was ever presented in behalf of the National Reform movement, was by a Reformed Presbyterian, Mr. John Alexander, of Philadelphia. The leading, active workers in National Reform, called District Secretaries, are, with two exceptions, Reformed Presbyterians. Rev. W. J. Coleman, Rev. M. A. Gault, Rev. R. C.

Wylie, Rev. J. M. Foster, and Rev. N. M. Johnston, with Rev. D. McAllister and Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editors of the *Christian Statesman*, are all Reformed Presbyterians. The other two District Secretaries, Rev. J. H. Leiper and Rev. Wm. Weir, are professedly United Presbyterians, but in advocating the National Reform they clearly violate the United Presbyterian creed, and stand as avowed Reformed Presbyterians. All the arguments for National Reform are Reformed Presbyterian arguments; all the principles are Reformed Presbyterian principles. We repeat, therefore, that the National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics.

That this is the truth will be plainly apparent to any one who is acquainted with the two bodies; and the more closely the subject is studied, the more evident this truth will appear. We have room here for only a few points in proof. A catechism of the distinctive features of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, by William L. Roberts, D. D., in presenting the supposed claims of Christ as king in the civil affairs of nations, and the duties of nations to acknowledge him as civil ruler, declares this to be "a peculiar principle of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the grand doctrine of their Testimony." And "their Testimony" condemns as an error, the statement, "That there is any creature or institution which is not subject to Christ, for the good of his church."

In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, Rev. J. R. W. Sloane says of the Reformed Presbyterians:—

"The more special and distinctive principle of this Church, the one in which she differs from all others, is her practical protest against the secular character of the United States Constitution. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and that civil government is a divine ordinance, and one of the 'all things' put under him as the mediatorial ruler of the universe, and that to him the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse close incorporation with any government which does not in some form recognize those principles, and give them effective expression in its legislation. On examination of the United States Constitution, that remarkable document is found to contain no recognition of God as the source of all legitimate civil authority, nor of his law as supreme above all human laws, nor of his Son as governor among the nations. . . . The Constitution does not recognize the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, Christian morality, *Christian qualifications for civil officials*, and gives no legal basis for any Christian feature in the administration of Government. . . . They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice."

The report on National Reform in the late Synod referred to above, says:—

"It is ours to hold up the ideals of God which have originated the National Reform cause."

In the *Reformed Presbyterian* for January, 1870, James Wallace says:—

"The proposed Amendment of the Federal Constitution is an acknowledgment by the Government, that God is the author and source of all authority and power in civil government; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that his revealed will contained in the Bible is the supreme law of nations.

Now the Association for National Reform proposes to have *these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church* adopted into the Constitution of the United States, and *annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles.*"

Again he says:—

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

It is, therefore, as clear as a sunbeam that the National Reform movement is an effort to put into the Constitution of the United States and make practical there, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and that the National Reform Party is doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. And when the United Presbyterian Church, the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Prohibitionists, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, or any other church, party, or union, lends its support to the National Reform Party, it is but doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,—it is simply aiding to make of practical application in the civil affairs of this Nation, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

According to these principles, what is the duty of the State? Rev. J. M. Foster tells us:—

"The duties which the reigning mediator requires of nations," are "(1) A constitutional recognition of himself as king of nations. . . . (2) A constitutional recognition of their duty as the divinely appointed keeper of the moral law. . . . (3) A constitutional provision of moral and religious qualifications for their officers. . . . (4) An acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national covenanting with him. . . . (5) An acknowledgment and performance of the Nation's duty to guard and protect the Church—*by suppressing all public violation of the moral law; by maintaining a system of public schools, indoctrinating their youth in morality and virtue; by exempting church property from taxation; and "by providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field."*—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1884.*

Now take even the phenomenal definition given by the National Reform Party itself, as to what constitutes a union of Church and State, *i. e.*, "the selection of one church, *the endowment of such a church*, the appointment of its officers, and *the oversight of its doctrines*," and if this Reformed Presbyterian National Reform scheme does not sufficiently meet the definition, then nothing can; and if such would not be a union of Church and State, then there has never been any such union in this world.

And yet, knowing that the principles of National Reform are the peculiar principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; knowing that the distinctive point of their attack—the secular character of the Constitution—is the distinctive principle of that church, "the one in which she differs from all others;" knowing that the success of the National Reform movement will be but to make practical, in the affairs of this Government, these principles which are peculiar to the Reformed Presbyterian Church—knowing all this, Dr. McAllister, T. P. Stevenson, W. J. Coleman, M. A. Gault, R. C. Wylie, J. M. Foster, and all their Reformed Presbyterians

National Reform associates, in National Convention assembled, will stand before the intelligent people of this Nation, and "affirm" and "re-affirm" that this movement does not tend, "in the least degree," toward a union of Church and State!

A. T. J.

Government not Paternal.

It is a part of the argument of the Religious Amendment Party that government is paternal and should therefore be the great conservator of religion. This is, and has been, ever the claim of those who, like the National Reform Party, advocate the unity of religion and the State. In Macaulay's Essays,—"*Gladstone on Church and State*," and "*Southey's Colloquies*,"—there is a forcible presentation of the logic of this question. The following selection we present as being particularly appropriate to the National Reform Party; and that it may appear to the best advantage we insert the title of that party in place of the persons whom Lord Macaulay named:—

"The duties of government would be paternal, if a Government were necessarily as much superior in wisdom to a people as the most foolish father, for a time, is to the most intelligent child, and if a Government loved a people as fathers generally love their children. But there is no reason to believe that a Government will have either the paternal warmth of affection or the paternal superiority of intellect. The National Reform Party might as well say that the duties of the shoemaker are paternal, and that it is a usurpation in any man not of the craft to say that his shoes are bad and to insist on having better. The division of labor would be no blessing if those by whom a thing is done were to pay no attention to the opinion of those for whom it is done. The shoemaker, in the *Relapse*, tells Lord Foppington that his lordship is mistaken in supposing that his shoe pinches. "It does not pinch; it cannot pinch; I know my business; I never made a better shoe." This is the way in which the National Reformers would have a Government treat a people who usurp the privilege of thinking. Nay, the shoemaker of Vanbrugh has the advantage in the comparison. He contented himself with regulating his customer's shoes, about which he had peculiar means of information, and did not presume to dictate about the coat and hat. But these Reformers would have the rulers of a country prescribe opinions to the people, not only about politics, but about matters concerning which a Government has no peculiar sources of information, and concerning which any man in the streets may know as much and think as justly as the king, namely, religion and morals.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. A Government can interfere in discussion only by making it less free than it would otherwise be.

"Men are most likely to form just opinions when they have no other wish than to know the truth, and are exempt from all influence, either of hope or fear. Government, as Government, can bring nothing but the influence of hopes and fears to support its doctrines. It carries on controversy, not with reasons, but

with threats and bribes. If it employs reasons, it does so, not in virtue of any powers which belong to it as a Government. Thus, instead of a contest between argument and argument, we have a contest between argument and force. Instead of a contest in which truth, from the natural constitution of the human mind, has a decided advantage over falsehood, we have a contest in which truth can be victorious only by accident. . . . Nothing is so galling to a people not broken in from the birth, as 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. Our fathers could not bear it two hundred years ago; and we are not more patient than they."

"If the relation in which Government ought to stand to the people be a paternal relation, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that persecution is justifiable; for the right of propagating opinions by punishment is one which belongs to parents as clearly as the right to give instruction. A boy is compelled to attend family worship; he is forbidden to read irreligious books; if he will not learn his catechism, he is sent to bed without his supper; if he plays truant at church-time, a task is set him. If he should display the precocity of his talents by expressing impious opinions before his brothers and sisters, we should not much blame his father for cutting short the controversy with a horse-whip. All the reasons which lead us to think that parents are peculiarly fitted to conduct the education of their children, and that education is a principal end of the parental relation, lead us also to think that parents ought to be allowed to use punishment, if necessary, for the purpose of forcing children who are incapable of judging for themselves, to receive religious instruction and to attend religious worship. Why, then, is this prerogative of punishment, so eminently paternal, to be withheld from a paternal Government? It seems to us, also, to be the height of absurdity to employ civil disabilities for the propagation of an opinion, and then to shrink from employing other punishments for the same purpose. For nothing can be clearer than that, if you punish at all, you ought to punish enough. The pain caused by punishment is pure unmixed evil, and never ought to be inflicted, except for the sake of some good. It is mere foolish cruelty to provide penalties which torment the criminal without preventing the crime. Now it is possible, by sanguinary persecution unrelentingly inflicted, to suppress opinions. In this way the Albigenses were put down. In this way the Lollards were put down. In this way the fair promise of the Reformation was blighted in Italy and Spain.

"What reason can be given for hanging a murderer, and suffering a heresiarch to escape without even a pecuniary mulct? Is the heresiarch a less pernicious member of society than the murderer? Is not the loss of one soul a greater evil than the extinction of many lives? And the number of murders committed by the most profligate bravo that ever let out his poniard to hire in Italy, or by the most savage buccaneer that ever prowled on the Windward Station, is small indeed when compared with

the number of souls which have been caught in the snares of one dexterous heresiarch. If, then, the heresiarch causes infinitely greater evils than the murderer, why is he not as proper an object of penal legislation as the murderer? We can give a reason, a reason short, simple, decisive, and consistent. We do not extenuate the evil which the heresiarch produces; but we say that it is not evil of that sort against which it is the end of Government to guard.

"The world is full of parallel cases. An orange-woman stops up the pavement with her wheelbarrow; and a policeman takes her into custody. A miser who has amassed a million suffers an old friend and benefactor to die in a workhouse, and cannot be questioned before any tribunal for his baseness and ingratitude. Is this because legislators think the orange-woman's conduct worse than the miser's? Not at all. It is because the stopping up of the pathway is one of the evils against which it is the business of the public authorities to protect society, and heartlessness is not one of those evils. It would be the height of folly to say that the miser ought, indeed, to be punished, but that he ought to be punished less severely than the orange-woman."

An Effective Prescription.

THE leaders in the National Reform movement claim that they are disfranchised by our Constitution in its present form, and they are presenting memorials to Congress with this plea of disfranchisement. In the issue of the *Christian Statesman* of June 17, 1886, is a memorial to Congress which contains such a plea in the following words:—

"We who present this petition are unable . . . to accept this Constitution as a right fundamental law for the nation, and are therefore debarred, on conscientious grounds, from participation in the Government. We can neither take office under it ourselves, nor by voting for others, lay this Constitution upon them as the rule of their official conduct."

Now our Congressmen will have an excellent opportunity of demonstrating, in a most forcible manner, how well these National Reform men are following the golden rule, and how much brotherly love they are exercising, and also what a weighty method of reasoning these men are compelled to adopt, to defend their theory. Suppose that, for the cure of such disabilities, Congress were to recommend to them one of their own prescriptions, as given by Rev. E. B. Graham, thus:—

"If you do not like our Government and its features, you can go to some wild, desolate land; and there set up a Government modeled after your own imagination, and then, if you can stand it, stay there till you die."

And in order to make it still more effective, Congress might adopt the plan recommended by that other ardent advocate of the National Reform theory, Rev. R. C. Wylie, namely, "adopt a plan that will prevent a repetition" of any such memorials. We have not the least doubt that these memorialists would discover in a moment that that would be tyranny and terrible persecution. But if their system applied to others would be the salvation of the country, we do not see why it should not be

equally beneficial if applied to themselves. It is a poor rule that will not work well both ways, and yet we are sure that that is what they would never allow. A. H. WILL.

The Strength of the Movement.

WE here lay before our readers the list, "in part," of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. These are the names given by the *Christian Statesman*, yet it says this is the list only "in part." We ask for it a careful reading, and a wide circulation. When it is borne in mind that these are only a part of the vice-presidents of an association whose avowed purpose it is to subvert the present Constitution, so far as it relates to religious liberty; an association which counts as atheists all who oppose it; and which flatly declares that "there is nothing out of hell" that it "would not tolerate as soon" as this atheism; we are sure that whoever reads this list will confess that this thing is not being done in a corner, and that the AMERICAN SENTINEL in opposing the National Reform movement is not fighting "as one that beateth the air."

PRESIDENTS.

From 1863 to 1866:

John Alexander, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.

From 1866 to 1869:

Hon. Wm. Strong, late Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

From 1869 to the present time:

Hon. Felix R. Brunot, Pittsburgh, Pa.

VICE-PRESIDENTS. (In part.)

MAINE.

Hon. Joshua H. Drummond, LL.D., Portland.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Rev. Wm. Clark, D.D., Amherst.

VERMONT.

Hon. Ex-Governor Roswell Farnham.

MASSACHUSETTS.

President Julius H. Seelye, D.D., Amherst College.

Professor Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., Law Department of Boston University.

Rev. Edwin B. Webb, D.D., Shawmut Ave., Congregational Church, Boston.

Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Rev. Geo. H. Gould, D.D., Worcester.

Rev. Wm. R. Clarke, D.D., Lynn.

Professor J. R. Herrick, D.D., South Hadley.

Hon. J. Rockwell, Superior Court of Massachusetts.

Hon. Thos. W. Bicknell, Editor of the *Journal of Education*, Boston.

CONNECTICUT.

Hon. James Phelps, Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut.

RHODE ISLAND.

Rev. James I. Lane, Bristol.

NEW YORK.

Right Rev. F. D. Huntington, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Central New York.

Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D.D., Rochester.

Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn.

Rev. Arthur Mitchell, D.D., New York.

Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, New York.

President David H. Cochrane, Ph. D., LL.D., Collegiate and Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.

NEW JERSEY.

Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary.

Rev. J. Banvard, D.D., Paterson.

Rev. J. H. McIlvaine, D.D., Newark.

Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D., Newark.

Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D., Englewood.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John Alexander, Esq., Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. R. Nicholson, D.D., Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. David R. Kerr, D.D., United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny.
 Rev. John B. Dales, D.D., Philadelphia.
 Rev. Joseph T. Cooper, D.D., Pittsburgh.
 President Milton Valentine, D.D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburgh.
 Rev. D. Steele, D.D., Philadelphia.
 Rev. C. H. Edgar, D.D., Easton.
 President A. B. Miller, D.D., Waynesburgh College.
 Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., Lincoln University, Oxford.
 Rev. Wm. Speer, D.D., Washington.
 Rev. R. Audley Browne, D.D., Newcastle.
 Rev. A. Rittenhouse, Professor of History and English Literature, Dickinson College, Carlisle.
 Professor David B. Willson, Ref. Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny.
 Rev. W. P. Breed, D.D., Philadelphia.
 Rev. D. K. Freeman, D.D., Huntington.
 Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., LL.D., Scranton.
 Rev. H. H. George, D.D., President of Geneva College, Beaver Falls.
 Rev. Joel Swartz, D.D., Gettysburgh.
 Rev. Alex Young, D.D., Parnassus.
 Rev. E. E. Swift, D.D., Allegheny.
 Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.

NORTH CAROLINA.
 Rev. Arnold W. Miller, D.D., Charlotte.
 President Solomon Pool, D.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
 Hon. G. W. Brooks, U. S. District Court of North Carolina.

SOUTH CAROLINA.
 Rev. Henry J. Fox, D.D., Charleston.
 Rev. Ferdinand Jacobs, D.D., James Island.

GEORGIA.
 President O. L. Smith, D.D., Emory College, Oxford.

ALABAMA.
 Hon. B. F. Saffold, Supreme Court of Alabama.

MISSISSIPPI.
 Right Rev. W. M. Green, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church.
 President Walter Hillman, LL.D., Central Female Institute, Mississippi.
 Rev. Wm. K. Douglass, Warden of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Dry Grove.

LOUISIANA.
 Hon. R. K. Howell, Supreme Court of Louisiana.

TEXAS.
 Hon. N. W. Battle, Judge of the Criminal Court, Waco, Texas.

TENNESSEE.
 Vice Chancellor J. Gorgas, University of the South.
 Rev. John S. Arbuthnot, Gallatin.
 President P. M. Bartlett, D.D., Marysville College.
 Professor E. Kirby Smith, University of Nashville.

KENTUCKY.
 Brev't. Brig. Gen. James A. Ekin, Louisville.

OHIO.
 Hon. M. B. Hagans, Superior Court of Cincinnati.
 Right Rev. G. T. Bedell, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church.
 Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, President of Wooster University.
 Professor O. N. Stoddard, LL.D., Wooster University.
 Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Columbus, President of Ohio W. C. T. U.
 Rev. R. Dubs, D.D., Bishop Evangelical Association.
 Rev. George P. Hays, D.D., Cincinnati.
 Dr. George Watt, Xenia.
 Rev. F. Merrick, D.D., Ex-President of the Ohio Wesleyan University.
 Rev. W. Wishart, D.D., Ontario.
 Right Rev. Thos. A. Jaggar, Bishop of the Diocese of Southern Ohio.
 Rev. J. Weaver, D.D., Bishop of the United Brethren in Christ, Dayton.
 Rev. E. D. Morris, D.D., Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati.
 Rev. C. H. Payne, D.D., President of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.
 Rev. D. S. Gregory, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, Wooster University.
 Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, National Superintendent of the Department of Sabbath Observance, W. C. T. U.

Rev. P. H. Wylie, Macedon.
 Rev. S. A. Ort, D.D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield.
 Rev. A. B. Leonard, D.D., Springfield.
 Rev. F. M. Spencer, D.D., President of Muskingum College, New Concord.
 Rev. J. F. Morton, D.D., Cedarville.

INDIANA.
 Hon. W. H. Cumbach, Ex-Lieut.-Governor of Indiana.
 President Reuben Andrus, D.D., Indiana, Asbury University.
 President Thomas Holmes, D.D., Union Christian College, Merom.
 Rev. Milton H. Wright, Editor of the *Star*, Richmond.
 President Daniel Rice, D.D., Logansport Female College, Logansport.

ILLINOIS.
 Miss Frances E. Willard, President of the National W. C. T. U., Chicago.
 Rev. Jonathan Blanchard, Wheaton College.
 Rev. J. J. Esher, D.D., Bishop of the Evangelical Association, Chicago.
 Rev. J. Dickson, D.D., Bishop of the United Brethren in Christ, Decatur.
 Rev. Edward Sullivan, D.D., Chicago.
 Mrs. Mary A. West, President of Illinois W. C. T. U.

MISSOURI.
 Hon. J. W. McClurg, Ex-Governor of Missouri.
 Rev. Edward F. Berkeley, D.D., Kirkwood.
 Mrs. Clara Hoffman, President of Missouri W. C. T. U.

IOWA.
 Hon. C. C. Cole, LL.D., Supreme Court of Iowa.
 Hon. James Dawson, Washington.
 Rev. David McKee, Clarinda.
 Mrs. Judith Ellen Foster, President of the Iowa W. C. T. U.

WISCONSIN.
 Rev. Noyes W. Miner, D.D., Oshkosh.
 Rev. George M. Everhart, D.D., Kenosha.

MICHIGAN.
 Professor Joseph W. Ewing, Superintendent of Schools, Ionia.

MINNESOTA.
 Rev. S. Corbett, D.D., Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA.
 Hon. Robert W. Furnas, Ex-Governor of Nebraska.
 Rev. John D. Easter, D.D., Omaha.
 Rev. E. B. Graham, Omaha.
 Rev. H. P. McChurkin, D.D., Wahoo.

KANSAS.
 Right Rev. Thomas H. Vail, D.D. LL.D., Bishop of he Diocese of Kansas.

COLORADO.
 Rev. W. H. McCreery, Loveland.

NEVADA.
 Hon. A. N. Fisher, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
 Hon. Edgar W. Hillyer, U. S. District Court of Nevada.

NEW MEXICO.
 Hon. Hezekiah S. Johnson, Supreme Court of New Mexico.

WYOMING.
 Hon. J. W. Kingman, Supreme Court of Wyoming Territory.

UTAH.
 Rev. R. G. McNeice, Salt Lake City.

DAKOTA.
 Hon. George W. French, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Dakota.

CALIFORNIA.
 Right Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of California.
 Hon. Lorenzo Sawyer, U. S. Circuit Court, San Francisco.

IDAHO.
 Hon. David Noggles, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Idaho.
 Hon. Madison E. Hollister, Supreme Court of Idaho.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY.
 Hon. Roger S. Greene, Supreme Court of Washington Territory.

"THEN saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

MONEY orders, drafts, etc., should be made to "Pacific Press;" never to individuals, as they may be absent, and business thereby be delayed.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL
 AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE BI-MONTHLY, 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 affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and house-keepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by every member.
Price, 50 Cents per Year.
 Address, **PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.**

GOOD HEALTH.
 A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

GOOD HEALTH is emphatically a Family Journal, being cheap, plain, and practical, qualities which have won for it the largest circulation of any Health Journal in America. It is devoted to all reforms, but is ultra in none. It is unpartisan and unsectarian. Its only creed is nature's laws. It treats of Health, Temperance, General Literature, Science, and many other interesting and practical subjects; it is a live journal, and every way adapted to the wants of the family. There is something in it for everybody. Price, \$1.00 a year.
 Address, **GOOD HEALTH, Battle Creek, Mich.;**
 Or, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**

THE ATONEMENT:
 AN EXAMINATION OF A
**REMEDIAL SYSTEM, IN THE LIGHT OF
 NATURE AND OF REVELATION.**

BY **ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.**
 THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.
 This work is a critical and exhaustive treatise on the plan of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures, showing its harmony with the principles of justice and mercy, its consistency with reason, and its final results as affecting the destiny of the human race.
 308 pp.; cloth, \$1.00.
 Address, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**
 Or, **REVIEW AND HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.**

OUR COUNTRY'S FUTURE FORETOLD.
THE UNITED STATES IN PROPHECY.

BY **ELD. U. SMITH.**
 This is a full exposition of a portion of prophecy which applies to our own Government, showing the position the United States holds in prophecy, and the part it has to act in the closing scenes of time.
THE SUNDAY MOVEMENT,

Which is now attracting such general attention, is thoroughly canvassed, and abundant testimony is given to prove that it is fast coming to be the ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION in this country. Dealing with our own land and applying to our own time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. New edition; revised and enlarged. Cloth, 225 pp., 75c. Paper covers, new edition, condensed, 186 pp., 25c. Address, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.
 AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OF GROWING POPULARITY.

ESTABLISHED IN 1838.
 FOUR YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY, BECAUSE FOUNDED, AND MANAGED UPON SOUND PRINCIPLES.
 THOROUGH INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTS OF LEARNING IN ALL THE GRADES AND THROUGH THE CLASSICAL COURSE.
 FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS INVESTED IN BUILDINGS AND APPARATUS.
 FACULTY CONSISTS OF TWELVE INSTRUCTORS OF EXPERIENCE.
 DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.
 1. Instruction in the various trades, with two hours per day spent in active work with tools.
 2. Methods in the Class Room are such as to secure the best kind of mental discipline.
 3. A rigid parental discipline to cultivate high moral character.
 4. Expenses within the reach of all. Twenty dollars per month covers all expense of tuition, board, lodging, washing, lights, fuel, etc. The Fall Term begins August 2, 1889.
S. BROWNSBERGER, A. M., President.
 Healdsburg, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., AUGUST, 1886.

IN the *Christian Statesman* of July 15, there is a "Monthly Reading of the W. C. T. U." on "God in Government." As a specimen of woman-suffrage-religio-political-sentimentalism it is a magnificent success, and a curiosity. Get it. As a sample of its lustrous scintillations we give just this one: "Evil tends toward its own cure."

THE *Christian Statesman* is not the only organ of National Reform. The *Christian Nation*, 252 Broadway, N. Y., is another weekly paper devoted wholly to the National Reform work. The *Statesman*, however, is, we believe, the official organ. With this exception we do not see that the *Christian Nation* is in anywise second to the *Statesman*. And, by the way, the *Christian Nation* also is of Reformed Presbyterian origin and affinities.

SAYS the Father 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." Say the "National Reformers" to the Son, "We will give to thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession, although thou hast never asked it of us." Here are some "clashing voices" which Mr. Gault has evidently overlooked.

WHEN the SENTINEL first appeared, the *Christian Statesman* welcomed it with apparent evidence of pleasure because the work of National Reform, which had been languishing for want of opposition, would now be caused to prosper. But since then not a word has the *Statesman* said about the SENTINEL, nor has it made the slightest reference to us. The joy of the *Statesman* at the opposition of the SENTINEL must certainly be of that kind which may be fitly described as *unspeakable*. And we are glad.

IN a speech at the Wooster National Reform Convention, Rev. J. P. Lytle, D.D., said:—

"The national guilt contracted by the people in the affair of the Gibeonites was atoned for by hanging up unto the Lord, seven of Saul's sons."

We have not space here for argument about this exposition, only to say that it is contrary to the Scripture. But we not only complain of the exposition; we dread the application that will be made of the principle when the National Reformers obtain the power to make atonement for national sin.

THE prophet Isaiah says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon his shoulder; . . . of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end. . . . The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Strangely enough the "National Reformers" use this text as one of their arguments to prove that they are to restore the kingdom to Christ. In order to fit their case it should read, The zeal of the Na-

tional Reform Association will perform this. The reader will say that such a perversion of the text would be blasphemy. So it would; but it would be no more blasphemous than is their foolish assumption of power to do that which can be done only by the Lord of hosts.

THE report of the Committee on Resolutions at the late Wooster National Reform Convention, in mentioning the death of two eminent National Reform preachers, says they were "like the three mightiest of David's *worriers* of old." David's "three mightiest worriers" is somewhat of a puzzle to us. It is easy enough to name the two that worried him most. These were Satan and Absalom, but as for the third we cannot make him out. We rather suspect that the Committee had Joab in view, for no doubt he worried David a great deal. He took advantage of the ruler's sin to exalt himself, and so ruled the ruler with a high hand; and this is precisely what the National Reformers are aiming to do in this Government. It is just possible however, that an eccentricity of the types has made the report say "worriers" instead of *worriers*. But even in that case the eccentricity is not at all inappropriate, for if the National Reformers do not yet prove to be the mightiest of this nation's "worriers," we shall freely confess ourselves most happily deceived in them.

Model for Religious Amendmentists.

THOSE who are laboring to procure an amendment to our National Constitution, in favor of religion, strongly profess their apprehension that infidelity and even Paganism will run riot in our fair land if not restrained by the strong arm of civil law. They are not the first to indulge such fears. Two centuries ago our worthy sires of New England engaged in the same laudable work, and carried it on to considerable success in some instances, as the "heretics and malignants called Quakers," and also the Baptists, could testify, having experienced some of the "tender mercies" of those who were zealous for the honor of our long-suffering and compassionate Saviour.

But sometimes their plans miscarried, as in the following case. This letter from a very pious Puritan explains itself. It cannot fail to be of interest at this time, as a bit of history which is so nearly trying to repeat itself, as its second centennial:—

"September, 1682.

"TO YE AGED AND BELOVED JOHN HIGGINSON:—
"There be now at sea a shippe (for our friend Esias Holdcraft, of London, did advise me by the last packet that it would sail sometime in August) called ye *Welcome*, R. Greenwas, Master, which has aboard a hundred or more of ye heretics and malignants called Quakers, with W. Penn, who is ye scamp at ye head of them. Ye General Court has accordingly given secret orders to Master Malachi Huxett, of ye brig *Porpoise*, to waylaye ye said *Welcome*, as near ye coast of Codd as may be, and make captives of ye Penn and his ungodly crew, so that ye Lord may be glorified and not mocked on ye soil of this new country with ye heathen worshippes of these people. Much spoil can be made by selling ye whole lot to Barbadoes, where slaves fetch good prices in rumme and sugar; and we shall not only do ye Lord great

service by punishing ye wicked, but shall make gayne for his ministers and people.

"Yours, in ye bowels of Christ,
"COTTON MATHER."

We recommend this as a model for those ardent Christians who are so intent upon putting down, by human authority, those who presume "to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences," in this age of enlightened Christian liberty. Cotton Mather was a man of undoubted piety, zealous for the cause of God, and a fine example of what "zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge," will produce. An order to "waylaye ye ungodly scamps" of these last days who refuse to observe "ye venerable day of ye sun," would be refreshing to the senses of those whose souls long for "Christian legislation" against those Mordecais who refuse to bow to their ideas, and to accept as Christianity their own mixture of Platonism and Roman Catholicism. If there is no hope of "making gayne for ye ministers" by selling them in exchange for "rumme and sugar," they might still be made to add to the interest of religion by putting them up to be "raffled for" in a "church fair," and thus make "fun for the million," who are invited, as pleasure seekers, to fill the treasury of the Lord! We have Scripture example for this, too. Samson was used for a similar purpose; but we let each one carry out the comparison to suit his own taste.

A Disinfectant Needed.

REV. J. C. McFEETERS is a prominent National Reformer, and deposes as follows:—

"Jesus sustains a national relation to every nation. And it becomes every nation to acknowledge that national relation. But that acknowledgment is wanting. . . . The anointed Son of God shall yet be honored with this acknowledgment. . . . And if this acknowledgment come peaceably. . . if it come peaceably, we expect it to come at first through a political platform, for the platform is the living voice, or *fetid breath*, of dominant parties."—*Christian Statesman*, August 14, 1884, p. 6.

This idea of the political platform being the "fetid breath" of dominant parties set us querying somewhat after this manner: Suppose the National Reform Party were to become the dominant political party in this country. Then, according to the religio-political scheme which it proposes, would it not be what is described in Rev. 18:2, "The hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird"? Then would not the term "fetid" fitly characterize the political odor that should issue from such a "hold"? And has not Mr. McFeeters exactly hit off the sanitary condition of the platform of the National Reform Party were that Party to become dominant? Has he not "buildd better than he knew"?

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1886.

NUMBER 9.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

RELIGION is not in the purview of human government.—*Madison.*

WE take it as a fundamental principle laid down in the Scriptures, and corroborated by history in all ages, that the church of Jesus Christ, in a state of reformation, receiving the smiles of his approbation, has never sought for civil establishment. It is only when pride, ambition, and an inordinate love of popularity, have become predominant in the hearts of her leaders; or when latitudinarianism and indifference to the truth of God prevail, that the church, becoming as useless as the vine that has fallen from its trellis and become unfruitful, seeks to be sustained by the secular arm, and fondled on the knee of civil power.—*Rev. Wm. Ballantine.*

"THAT religious persecution is a greater evil than any other, is apparent, not so much from the enormous and almost incredible number of its known victims, as from the fact that the unknown must be far more numerous, and that history gives no account of those who have been spared in the body, in order that they might suffer in the mind. We hear much of martyrs and confessors—of those who were slain by the sword, or consumed in the fire; but we know little of that still larger number who, by the mere threat of persecution, have been driven into an outward abandonment of their real opinions; and who, thus forced into an apostasy the heart abhors, have passed the remainder of their lives in the practice of a constant and humiliating hypocrisy. It is this which is the real curse of religious persecution. For in this way, men being constrained to mask their thoughts, there arises a habit of securing safety by falsehood, and of purchasing impunity with deceit. In this way, fraud becomes a necessary of life; insincerity is made a daily custom; the whole tone of public feeling is vitiated, and the gross amount of vice and of error fearfully increased. Surely, then, we have reason to say, that, compared to this, all other crimes are of small account; and we may well be grateful for that increase of intellectual pursuits, which has destroyed an evil that some among us would even now willingly restore."

"Secretary Leiper" on the "American Sentinel."

THE "National Reform Association" has some paid traveling agents or lecturers who, for some reason not apparent, are called "Secretaries." Among these is Mr. J. H. Leiper. In the columns of the *Christian Statesman* he noticed the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But when he wrote his comment he had seen only the March number, and appears to have read that quite superficially; and of course he knew but little of the position of the SENTINEL, and of the arguments which it contains. In this we have a great advantage over him. We have been acquainted with the *Statesman* for a number of years. We had the opportunity of attending their National Convention in Pittsburg, Pa., in 1874, which they consider of greater interest than any other they ever held. We have watched their movement with deep interest from its very inception in 1863. Having had but little public opposition, they have considered their positions invulnerable, and themselves almost infallible and Heaven-appointed teachers of a new science of Christian Government. It is this feeling of self-complacency or self-conceit that leads Mr. Leiper to say of the position of the SENTINEL that it grows out of "voluntary darkness or willful infidelity." We think the *Statesman* or its correspondents (the *Statesman* itself noticed us courteously) will find it much easier to bring such "railing accusations" against the SENTINEL than to refute its arguments. This first effort, that of Mr. Leiper, is a sad failure to refute our positions, and even to comprehend them.

Mr. Leiper quotes from the SENTINEL wherein it was shown that "if a question arises as to what is or what is not Christian law, usage, or institution, it must be determined by a court of justice. There is no disputing this conclusion, and yet it is a conclusion which ought to startle every one who contemplates such a change in our Government as would make such a proceeding possible." Now we still believe that the idea of settling religious questions in the courts of our States and Nation is, and should be, startling to all who have a just regard for our civil and religious liberties. Mr. Leiper does not attempt to show that our conclusion is unjust; he does not question the propriety of settling religious disputes in our civil courts; but he attempts to justify their efforts to bring about such a state of things, and uses the following language:—

"What a startling thing it must have been for Nehemiah, the governor, to undertake to teach the traffickers in wines, grapes, and figs,

etc., a lesson based on the Fourth Commandment. . . . What a crank Jonah was to undertake the audacious folly of preaching politics," etc.

We think it has been sufficiently shown in the SENTINEL, that the theocratic Government of Israel, with its necessary union of Church and State (for a theocracy must be a religious government), is no model for any government since that dispensation. Does Mr. Leiper consider that, if the amendment is adopted, they will elect men to the position occupied by Nehemiah? Do these "reformers" think that, in the Government of their choice, they will occupy the position of the prophets of old? If they affect such a thing they will have to give such evidences of their calling as they have never yet shown. If they do not intend to assume the office and position of the prophets, why do they make such references as this of Mr. Leiper? There is more of arrogance than argument in such words as those he uses.

And Jonah did not "preach politics." He did not attempt to remodel the Government of Nineveh, nor did he seek for any place or office in its administration. He received a message directly from the Lord; he gave that, and that only, without any personal interference with the affairs of the Government. We fail to see any parallel to the work of the self-styled National Reformers, in that of Jonah. And we do not think they can show that any parallel exists. Such references may be captivating to those who but superficially examine these subjects, but they contain no argument whatever.

We have a lesson to read to the National Reformers which we learned from the action of the church authorities, controlling the civil power, in Salem, Mass. If they had read this lesson of history to any purpose they would cease to refer, for a warrant, to those whose position and circumstances were so different from their own.

RELIGION WITHOUT THE CHURCH.

This point is a hobby with the Amendmentists. Concerning it Mr. Leiper says:—

"If the SENTINEL and many others had the wisdom to distinguish between the church and religion—between protection and usurpation, it might avoid many of its blunders."

This is said in the effort to ward off the just charge that they are trying to unite the Church and the State. They say; not the State and the Church, but, the State and religion. But this distinction does not exist in fact, and is not regarded by Mr. Leiper and the party which he represents. This we will now prove. He speaks of our writing as follows:—

"J. H. W. stumbles at an utterance of Rev.

J. M. Foster in *Christian Statesman*, of March, 1884: 'According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the Church.' This statement J. H. W. emphatically denies. As a believer in the Bible, how will he undertake to expound Isa. 49 : 23 and 60 : 12, in accord with his views of the relation of Church and State? Does he know how to read history?" etc.

With expositions of prophecy we have not now to do. We have shown, and will continue to show, that this "Reform" party entirely misapprehends the difference between the past and present dispensations. In the above quotation it will be seen that Mr. Leiper, following Rev. J. M. Foster, utterly ignores the distinction which he says we have not the wisdom to distinguish; and he reveals the "true inwardness" of the National Reform movement. Mark, they do not say the State exists to serve the interests of religion; but, "the State exists for the sake of and to serve the interests of THE CHURCH."

The truth is that religion and the Church are inseparably connected. Religion cannot exist without religious people. Christianity cannot exist where there are no Christians; and Christians, wherever found, constitute the Christian Church. If the Nation is to serve the cause of religion, it must by some means determine *what* religion or *whose* religion shall be enforced by the State. Will the Amendment party have the Nation set aside the churches, and adopt a religion to suit the people outside of the churches? Will they consent to thus distinguish between religion and the Church, in the action of the Government? Let the *Statesman* answer. In its issue of March 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan uses the following language:—

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

But the very life and essence of religion is found in church doctrines, ordinances, and laws. None but a Jesuit would pretend to distinguish between the true religion and the doctrines, ordinances, and laws of the true Church. In the above extract we have the plan of our future Government outlined by the Amendmentists themselves. The State must uphold or enforce the true religion—always noting the distinction between religion and the Church, but—"the churches must settle these questions" of theology, or define the religion which the State must enforce! It is the sphere of the State to serve the interests of the Church, and to "adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," the churches always deciding what is the true religion. This is no union of Church and State—oh, no. There is a wide distinction; the State is only the servant of the Church, and it is the office of the Church to dictate to the State what "usages, laws, and institutions" of religion it must maintain! How wonderful is the logical acumen of the Religious Amendmentists! What a nice distinction they can trace, which none but themselves have "the

wisdom to distinguish"! We do not accuse Mr. Leiper of intending to deceive his readers. We believe that he himself is deceived by the deceitfulness of the theory which he is endeavoring to maintain.

And to make more full proof of his blindness he says that we do not distinguish "between protection and usurpation." But this is the very distinction we have made, and to which we have tried to call the attention of the Amendmentists. In the May number of the SENTINEL we said of them: "They are not asking for protection, for this they now have most fully; they are seeking for power." The truth is that protection is now assured by our Government to these religionists, but with this they are not satisfied; they are not content to have the Government protect them in their religious convictions and practices; they must needs *usurp* authority over the convictions and consciences of those who do not agree with them. The Amendmentists are the very ones who utterly ignore the distinction between protection and usurpation. But we plead for *protection for all*; and this they vigorously oppose, because they cannot bear the idea of seeing others equally favored with themselves.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL.

Mr. Leiper continues his notice of us in the following language:—

"But see how he stultifies himself in answer to the following question sent him: 'Can laws which guard religious rights and protect religious privileges be considered oppressive to non-religionists?' His answer is: 'By no means.' But the laws which have already created a hue and cry among the ranks of non-religionists are those that are designed to give rest to all citizens on the Sabbath, and the privilege to Christian people of worshiping God undisturbed in their homes or churches."

We must differ with Mr. L. in his judgment of our answer. We are willing to trust the decision of every candid reader that we did not stultify ourself; in our answer we said:—

"It is the duty of every Government to guard all rights, and to protect in the exercise of all privileges which may lawfully be exercised. This is not oppressive to the non-religionists. But religion is a *voluntary* matter; under coercion it is worthless and a mockery. That which is a privilege to one, being a matter of conscience, is no privilege to another whose conscience is not exercised in the same manner. A law to compel the non-religionist to observe religious rites and rules because they are privileges to his religious neighbor, is oppressive. It is injustice to the man and an injury to religion.

"The duty of the Government is not exhausted when it has protected the rights of the religious. Governments are not established for the benefit of any one class of their subjects. It is no more the duty of the Government to protect the religionist, than it is its duty to protect the non-religionist. The non-religionist . . . has no right to disturb his neighbor, or hinder him from living out his religion; and his religious neighbor has no right to disturb him in the peaceful possession of his home because he is not religious; he has no right to compel him to observe religious rites in which he does not believe. Neither has any class of religionists any right to disturb others because they profess a religion different from their own. And it is equally the duty of the Government to protect them *all*, whatever their religion may be, or whether or not they have any at all."

Dare Mr. Leiper or the *Statesman* copy this reply and deny our conclusion before its readers? We doubt; they may evade, and accuse us of self-stultification, by keeping our position from their readers. Our answer must commend itself to all who have any regard for *the rights of others*; who even approach to the moral duty of loving their neighbors as themselves. But it seems very plain that in this class the National Reformers are not included.

It seems impossible to make these self-styled reformers recognize the difference between morality and religion. In argument for "religious legislation" Mr. Leiper says:—

"Such legislation will, as it should, provide for the protection of the family. But this implies marriage and divorce laws. Where would J. H. W. have us go for a safe guide in such legislation? The family is the nursery of the State, hence no laws of greater importance or farther reaching are enacted by any Government. . . . And has our objector not yet learned that the race is indebted to the religion of Christ for the pure blessing of the family?"

No, we have not learned it; and we invite Mr. Leiper to give evidence to that effect if he has it to give. We say, as we have before said, that it is the duty of the Government to enact marriage and divorce laws, because *marriage is not a Christian institution*. It antedates the fall of man and the introduction of a gospel system. Mr. Leiper is altogether at fault on the question. He really stands with the Catholics, who make marriage a Christian or Church ordinance. To be consistent he must deny that marriage is valid outside the Church. His position would deprive infidels and unbelievers of the privilege of marriage, for such have no right to the benefit of the ordinances of Christianity. But we dissent. It was an institution given to *the father of the race* before the fall, and belongs to the race without regard to their relation to Christianity. Speaking of our assertion that a civil government cannot enforce laws on a purely moral basis, Mr. Leiper says:—

"Monogamy is a law of Christianity. Is it impossible to enforce it?"

This remark is both irrelevant and untrue. The Saviour, in his answer concerning divorce, placed the marriage institution on *its original basis*. He enacted nothing new in regard to it. He said: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. Matt. 19 : 8. In verses 4, 5, he shows to what this refers. He there says: "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh?" Where had they "read" these statements? In Gen. 1 : 27, and 2 : 24. "In the beginning" God made them male and female—not male and females. They two—not they three or they five—shall be one flesh. A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife—not to his wives. Monogamy was embraced in the original marriage institution. It is not a law of Christianity; but the Saviour freed the law from the errors of tradition and restored it to its original position.

Mr. Leiper thinks that we evince wondrous ignorance of the origin and basis of civil gov-

ernment, and that we "ignore the plainly taught Bible principle that civil government is a divine ordinance." If he had read the several numbers of the SENTINEL he would know the truth of that concerning which he is sadly ignorant. There is not a sentiment expressed or a word spoken in the SENTINEL which at all implies that we ignore that fact. Besides frequent reference to the fact, at least two articles have been published on that subject. But Mr. Leiper and his *confreres* do evince great ignorance of the true principles of civil government, and of its relation to religion. We remember that Paul said, "There is no power but of God;" and that he and those to whom he wrote, and whom he exhorted to yield subjection to "the higher powers," were the subjects of a king, and not citizens of a republic; and that this king was a Pagan and not a Christian ruler. And Peter said: "Honor the king." We know all this; but this does not prove the correctness of the conclusions of the National Reformers. They openly refuse to honor, and deny the authority of, the civil Government unless it is molded and modeled to their peculiar notions. There is not a word in the New Testament to justify their position.

We have here noticed the main points of Mr. Leiper's comments on the SENTINEL. Some other assertions of his we may notice in the future.

J. H. W.

Significant Facts.

THE *Christian Statesman* reports that the Church of the United Brethren has put a National Reform preacher into the field, Rev. R. Rock by name, and will support him; and that a preacher, Rev. J. P. Mills by name, from the Methodist Episcopal Church, will enter upon the National Reform work, on the same terms, about Sept. 1, 1886.

The late General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, by its Committee on National Reform, expressed its gratification "to learn that the presentation of the Christian theory of civil government by the advocates of National Reform, is educating the people to recognize that civil government is an ordinance of God; . . . that Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, is . . . the Ruler of nations, and has laid down in his word the fundamental enactments by which the enactments of our civil code are to be tested; and that *this word ought to be recognized as the fundamental law of the Nation*, and be incorporated into its very Constitution." It regards "the continued advocacy of this Reform as imperatively necessary;" and by resolution commends "to the generous financial support of our people the secretaries and advocates of this movement."

The Ocean Grove Assembly set apart Wednesday, July 21, as National Reform Day, which, says the *Statesman*, "will afford a fine audience of the best people, without effort or cost on the part of the friends of the cause." Likewise the Chautauqua Assembly management granted the morning and afternoon sessions of Friday, July 23, to National Reform. This the *Statesman* correctly called "another magnificent opportunity for the presentation of the principles of the National Reform Association."

Nor is this all. For more than a year the National Reform party has been specially and assiduously courting the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and it has succeeded in so far rhyming itself into these ladies' favor that we are quite certain it will never reason itself out again. Joint conventions are now being held by the two bodies, and we see their vital union virtually consummated. Already in their joint convention held at Cansonsburg, Pa., May 19, an address of welcome was delivered "by Mrs. Rev. J. F. Hill, in which the oneness of the two organizations was very ably set forth." Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. West, and Mrs. Hoffman, are all Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association. Mrs. Woodbridge made a straight-out National Reform speech both at Ocean Grove and at Chautauqua, on the occasions referred to above.

Besides this Mrs. Woodbridge was appointed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to carry to the Cleveland Convention of the Knights of Labor, last May, "the salutations of the Union, and a brief argument in behalf of the cause of temperance"; but the lady allowed her National Reform zeal to carry her beyond her appointed mission and she closed her speech to the Assembly with these words:—

"Thus would the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union join hands with the Knights of Labor in placing this 'Government upon the shoulders of Him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' and in crowning Christ, our Lord, as the Ruler of nations."

This the *Christian Statesman* pronounces a "cause for rejoicing," and "an especial gratification to the friends of National Reform."—See *Statesman June 3, 1886*.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done noble work, in which we have rejoiced and should ever rejoice, while she kept in the line of her legitimate and chartered work. But just as soon as she proposes to sell herself to work the iniquity of lifting the National Reform party into power in its union of Church and State, and the establishment of its hierarchy in this country, then we are prepared to write of her, "The glory is departed."

The Prohibition Party also is coming up to the work. The New Jersey Prohibition Convention, and that of Washington County, Pa., adopted resolutions which the *Statesman* says read like the resolutions of a National Reform Convention. The Maine Prohibitionists declare that "we aim, in a word, at the application of Christian principles to political life. . . . The application of Christian principles to politics would secure an equal voice, without regard to sex, in making laws which all must alike obey." The Illinois platform declares that, "We reverently recognize the supreme authority of Almighty God. . . . We regard the Christian Sabbath as a boon so valuable to humanity, that the State cannot be true to its trusts which neglects to guard it from desecration."

The Reformed Presbyterian Church, which from the beginning has borne the National Reform party upon her sides and dandled it upon her knees, contributed to the work last

year "almost \$7,000;" and at its late Synod, held at Rochester, New York, it recommended "that the sum of \$10,000 be raised for the treasury of the National Reform Association, by the churches under the care of this Synod," the coming year.

Besides all these distinct organizations, the churches, as such, almost all favor it; and the National Reformers are willing, if not anxious, to make advances even to the Catholic Church to gain her favor—and they will get it. Now we say: With the general breaking up of parties, and the casting about for new issues upon which to catch the votes of the multitude, let this movement be agitated for but a very few years at most, and then brought to a vote upon some one leading question under which can be veiled the real issue, and we should like to see the one who can show what is to hinder the success of the National Reform movement, and in that the union of Church and State with all that that involves as the ultimate result.

In view of these facts, which simply show the fast-growing power, and the wide-spreading influence of the National Reform movement, we submit to any candid mind whether the AMERICAN SENTINEL has not a mission, in its determined opposition to that movement. Do we not well to expose the fallacies, to lay bare the sophistries, and to uncover the insidious iniquity of this scheme of Church and State? Do we not well to call the attention of the American people to this menace to human liberty and human right? We know precisely what it is about which we are talking. We know exactly what we are doing. But we very much fear that the American people will not realize till it is too late, the danger that lies in the National Reform movement. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but Americans have forgotten it. May God help the people to awake and be vigilant.

A. T. J.

National Reform and the Jews.

THAT such persons as Jews, and others with ourselves, who do not believe the doctrine of Covenanters on the headship of Christ, would be eliminated from the enjoyment of civil communion, so far as actual citizenship—the use of the elective franchise—holding office, etc., is concerned, by the insertion of the second amendment, is not only our inference, but that of Reformers themselves. Hear what a Reformer said in a public speech at Zanesville, Ohio, Oct. 1, 1872. After recounting the conscientious difference between the Jew and himself in reference to religion, especially relative to Christ, he says in regard to the Jew:—

"Well, what have been the consequences of following the lead of such a conscience?—This—that God has said the Jew shall not be a nation longer; he shall not have power to make a civil government; he shall not constitute a majority anywhere. He shall have no king but Cæsar. Now, then, if God will not allow the Jew to make civil governments, or to exist in a national capacity, and this, too, for his sin against the Author of Christianity, shall the Christians go to him to learn how to make a constitution, what to put in it, and what to leave out? As for the Jew, when our Christian Amendment is adopted, he can sit in his store, and buy and sell, and make himself rich. He can enjoy all the comforts of domestic relations,

and will be protected by the law in all his rights as a citizen, and if he chooses to swear support to a constitution which he does not like (as some monarchists in principle do now, but which I would not advise him to do) he can also hold office, if he can find enough people to think him worthy of it."

We cannot help stopping in the midst of this extract, and exclaiming, Magnanimous, *very!* Put the Jew under civil disabilities, and then suggest he can violate his conscience if he deems proper, and under these auspicious (?) circumstances why, "if he can find enough people to think him worthy he can also hold office!" Glorious privilege, indeed! Excellent exhibition of Christian charity for the conversion of the Jew! But we are not done with the extract. He says further:—

"And if he does not choose to vote or hold office under a Christian Constitution, he can abstain, and it will not hurt him nor injure any one else. He will then be merely where God has put him, without power to exercise civil authority."

We had thought that the arguments to sustain African slavery were dead and buried. But, to our amazement, we have them here resurrected, and animated with new life and vigor, and sent forth on a new mission. Before the trumpet of the American jubilee sounded in the ears of Africa's sable sons, were they not where God put them? Was not the Bible ransacked to find some *sin* of their ancestors that would justify the infliction of the *wrongs* of slavery? Was not the origin of the race burdened by the Scottish bard,

"How graceless Ham laughed at his dad,
Which made Canaan a nigger,"

The only argument in the mouths of thousands, to justify the enslaving of colored men, the supposed descendants of Canaan the son of Ham? These arguments were again and again torn to shreds by a common-sense logic, that the humiliation of a people, though foretold in Scriptures, would never justify others in the infliction of wrong, unless they were the divinely constituted executioners of Heaven's vengeance. Strange indeed, that these same arguments should become potent again in the mind of any one to justify the imposition of civil disabilities upon the Jew, because his ancestors, some nearly two thousand years ago, in religious frenzy, crucified the promised Messiah! Did the unnatural act of Jacob's sons in selling their young brother, justify the Egyptians in treating their descendants cruelly? God's terrible judgments on that nation contain the answer. We rejoice that our national escutcheon is not stained, like that of old England, with the persecution of the Jew. Here he is treated as a man, and offered the same privileges as others.

From the above we take it as an admitted fact—admitted by the advocates of the measure themselves, that were the amendments inserted, some would either have to violate their conscience, or surrender their civil privileges.—*Rev. Wm. Ballantine.*

THE creation of a national and uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which disgraced their English persecutors, and Laud was justified by the men whom he wronged."—*Bancroft.*

"National Reformers" the Enemies of American Institutions.

THE readers of the SENTINEL must know that in its opposition to the so-called National Reform movement it is actuated by no personal feelings whatever. Although frequent reference is made to the men and papers that are working for the amendment, it is not done with the design of impugning their motives or calling especial attention to them, but because the only way we can show the errors of the National Reform movement is by quoting what its supporters say for it. We believe that many if not all of the leaders in the movement are honest in their motives, but they have become blinded by a selfish ambition which they mistake for religious zeal. To show that the movement is directly contrary to the spirit of the golden rule, we quote from an article by Rev. J. J. McCarrell, entitled "The Civil Sabbath," in the *Christian Nation* of June 9. He says:—

"Those who have come from afar, and find life a burden here, knew the character of our institutions before they came. If they have helped to develop our resources and fight our battles, we are not slow to recognize the full value of those services. We accord to them the full rights of citizenship, and all the blessings of preserved nationality, the common reward of all alike. But we decline to accept the doctrine that those services confer upon them the privilege of bringing upon our beloved land a worse scourge and destruction than those averted by the civil war. If any of our citizens find our institutions intolerable, our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, our attempts to secure sobriety, quietness, and decency, too great a burden for their freedom-loving souls, there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are just as wide as our gates of ingress. They are three thousand miles broad, and are shut neither by day nor by night. If these oppressed and over-burdened souls wish to seek a better country under the sun, the way is open, and not a tongue will ever wag dissent."

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we would be second to none in upholding "American institutions" against any attempt on the part of "those who have come from afar," to overthrow them. With anarchy and Anarchists we have no sympathy. When men combine to overthrow the laws that protect the rights of men we would oppose them in every lawful way. But we have no more objection to this kind of work when done by "those who come from afar" than when done by those born in the land. Now let us notice the inconsistency and the selfishness and disregard of the rights of others, that is manifested in the above paragraph.

The writer says that foreigners who do not choose to conform to our customs and usages should leave; and the keeping of Sunday presumably on the authority of the fourth commandment, is regarded as one of those usages. If men do not want to keep Sunday according to the strict law of Pennsylvania, they have no business here. Now we would like to know how the Amendmentists can harmonize such a position with the position which they take on the Chinese question. The Chinese are heathen; they do not acknowledge God, but bow down to the most disgusting idols, thus breaking the first and second commandments; they know

and care nothing about Jesus Christ; like all heathen, they think it no wrong to defraud or steal, if they are not detected; and they pay not the slightest regard to Sunday, and know no rest-day but their New Year Holiday. Many American citizens are endeavoring to have these Chinese driven from our country, and have succeeded in securing laws prohibiting their further immigration. But the Amendmentists utterly condemn all such proceedings. They claim that such a course is unjust. Now we ask how they can harmonize their wish to drive off the man who objects to their strict Sunday laws, with their objection to driving off the Chinaman who not only disregards Sunday, but who openly and repulsively violates all the commandments? The application of National Reform principles to-day, or ten years from to-day, would make it necessary to press every ocean steamer into the service of carrying Chinamen back to their native land. It would exclude the Chinese from this country as effectually as would the wildest scheme ever advocated by Kearney or O'Donnell. So we say that National Reformers are inconsistent.

Now as to their selfishness. This country was settled by those who came here that they might worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, free from oppression for opinion's sake. The principle of religious freedom is the principle on which this Government was founded. It is the first and best of our "American institutions." Now the error of the National Reformers is in regarding the particular beliefs and practices of the pilgrim fathers as American institutions, which must be upheld at all hazards, forgetting that the principle of liberty, both civil and religious, is the only distinctive American institution. They say, "Our fathers, who settled this country, venerated the 'Christian Sabbath'; they have bequeathed it to us as an American institution; and if we would not be false to their memory we must see that the Sunday is kept by all men, and kept as they kept it." But in that very resolution they are false to the memory of our fathers who bequeathed to us the principles of liberty which we possess. True loyalty to American institutions would be to say, "Here are some who do not hold as we do on some points of religious faith and practice; now we will not only allow them to hold and carry out their ideas, but will protect them in so doing, just as we ourselves would like to be protected in our opinions." This would not only be in accordance with American institutions, but it would be in harmony with the golden rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Of course it is always understood that in guaranteeing all men liberty of thought and action, the Government stipulates that no one shall disturb others in the exercise of their rights. Nothing less than this would be liberty to all. But the further error of the National Reformers is in supposing that all who differ with them are infringing on their rights. Mr. McCarrell of Pennsylvania, together with enough other Pennsylvanians to make a strict Sunday law, imagine that because they want to keep Sunday strictly everybody else must do the same. It may be that their neighbor

does not believe that Sunday ought to be observed; he may be a strict and conscientious observer of Saturday; but that makes no difference; "we are the people, and you must do as we do; if you don't like our ways, you may go somewhere else." And this they call upholding American liberty! Surely, American history has been written to no purpose, so far as National Reformers are concerned.

But Mr. McCarrell and his fellow Amendmentists, in their selfish blindness, forget that some of those who differ with them have not, like the Chinaman, some other place to go to. Says he, "If any of our citizens . . . find our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, . . . there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are just as wide as our gates of ingress." Does he not know that there are in this country thousands of native-born Americans, many of whom can trace their ancestry even to the *Mayflower*, who strenuously and conscientiously object to these strict Sunday laws which oblige them to rest on Sunday after having devoted the preceding day to rest and sacred worship? Where shall these go? The gate of ingress through which they entered this country was that of birth, and if they are to return whence they came, annihilation awaits them.

If we happen to differ with these National Reformers, they certainly differ with us to the same extent; then why should we leave the country any more than they? This is our country as much as it is theirs. We will not attempt to characterize the proposal of Mr. McCarrell as it deserves, but will simply quote a few words from the speech of Mr. Blaine in regard to a similar proposal by Lord Salisbury concerning the Irish: "Lord Salisbury gives the remedy. He says, if the Irish do not want to be governed by the British they should leave. But the Irish have been in Ireland quite as long as Lord Salisbury's ancestors have been in England. . . . Therefore we have to say that Lord Salisbury may be called impudent. We would not transgress courtesy if we called him insolent. We would not transgress truth if we called him brutal." We can only add, We would not be uncharitable if we substituted "the National Reformers" for "Lord Salisbury," and applied Mr. Blaine's language to them.

Now we claim that these conscientious observers of the seventh day, have the same right to protection that the strict observers of Sunday have. The "American institution" of equal liberty for all, grants each party the right to worship on the day which they regard holy, and forbids either party to interfere with the worship of the other. It also guarantees to the non-religionist the privilege of observing no day at all, but forbids him to disturb those who conscientiously rest.

We submit to any candid, unprejudiced person that the liberty that is guaranteed by our Constitution as it now stands, is all that can be asked by any consistent follower of the golden rule; and that they who ask for a religious amendment to the Constitution, are seeking to overthrow the only distinctive institution which America has; and if all who are seeking to overthrow American institutions should be banished, the National Reformers should be the first to go.

E. J. W.

The Principles of National Reform.

IN our August number we showed by indubitable proofs that the National Reform movement is nothing but an effort to place this Government on a foundation of Reformed Presbyterianism, and to subject it to the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. We showed in their own words that, "National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the Nation."

Now the Reformed Presbyterian Church claims to be the direct and only lineal descendant of the Covenanters, and prides itself upon being the modern representative, and the sole conservator, of genuine Covenanter principles. Therefore by studying Covenanter principles, and their practical application, we may form some idea of what the result would be if the National Reform party should succeed in making "practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian [Covenanter] Church" in this Nation. We have not space for one-twentieth, no not one-one-hundredth, part of the evidence that might easily be given in illustration of the "practical application" of these principles. Our quotations must be few and brief. The best summary on the subject of these principles, that we have seen, is an article by "A Presbyterian Minister" in the *New York Independent* of Nov. 11, 1880, entitled "Is It Right—A Protest." And the best summary of the application of the principles, that perhaps anybody has ever seen, is chapter V. of Buckle's "History of Civilization." It is the principles rather than their application which we shall here discuss; for in reading these it can readily enough be seen what their application would be in the hands of the National Reformers, when clothed with power to make the application.

The Covenants which embody the principles of the Covenanters, and, per force, of the National Reformers, are entitled "The National Covenant or Confession of Faith," and the "Solemn League and Covenant," and are both of Scotch Presbyterian origin. The first of these, "The National Covenant or Confession of Faith," was "first subscribed in 1580; again, by all persons of all ranks in 1581; again, in 1590; again, in the language of its title, 'subscribed by Barons, Nobles, Burgesses, Ministers, and Commons, in 1638, approved by the General Assembly, 1638 and 1639; and subscribed again by persons of all ranks and qualities in the year 1639, by an ordinance of Council, upon the supplication of the General Assembly, an act of the General Assembly, certified by an act of Parliament 1640;' and, finally, in compliance with the urgent demands of Scottish Presbyterians, subscribed by Charles II., in 1650 and 1651, as being, along with the Solemn League and Covenant, the one prime and only condition of their restoring him to power."

Among many other like things, that Covenant declares, in approval of various acts of the Scottish Parliament, in these words:—

" . . . do condemn all erroneous books and writs concerning erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies papistical, . . . and ordains the home-bringers of them

to be punished . . . and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault as idolaters."

The religion "presently professed," remember, was the Covenant—the National Reform—religion. And note, all opposition to that religion, in doctrine or in worship, in books or in rites, was to be punished for the second fault as idolatry. What then was the punishment for idolatry? John Knox had already laid down the law on this point, and here it is in his own words and in his own spelling:—

"None provoking the people to idolatrie ought to be exempted from the punishment of death. . . . The whole tribes did in verie dede execute that sharp judgement against the tribe of Benjamin for a lesse offense than for idolatrie. And the same ought to be done wheresoever Christ Jesus and his Evangill [Gospel] is so received in any realme province or citie that the magistrates and people have solemnly avowed and promised to defend the same, as under King Edward [VI.] of late days was done in England. In such places, I say, it is not only lawful to punish to the death such as labor to subvert the true religion, but the magistrates and people are bound to do so unless they will provoke the wrath of God against themselves."—See "*Knox's Works, Laing's edition, vol. IV., pp. 500-515;*" or "*Lecky's History of Rationalism,*" vol. II., pp. 50, 51, note 6.

For the protection of the religion "presently professed" the Covenant further declares of it:—

"Which by manifold acts of Parliament, all within this realm are bound to profess, to subscribe the articles thereof, to recant all doctrine and errors repugnant to any of the said articles, . . . and all magistrates, sheriffs, etc., . . . are ordained to search, apprehend, and punish all contraveners; . . . that none shall be reputed loyal and faithful subjects to our sovereign Lord or his authority, but be punishable as rebellers and gainstanders of the same, who shall not give their confession and make their profession of the said true religion."

Again the Covenant declares that it is the duty of the magistrates to—

"Maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus."—"And that they should be careful to root out of their empire all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God who shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the aforesaid crimes."

So much for the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith;" but by this may be understood the National Reform declaration that the duty of the Nation is, "an acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national Covenanting with" God.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.

The "Solemn League and Covenant" is of the same tenor, and came about in this way: In the trouble between the English Nation and King Charles I., Presbyterianism arose to power in England, and they called on their Covenanter co-religionists of Scotland to help them out of the trouble. This the Covenanters would do only upon the English complying with the "imperative demand of the Scot's Parliament that the religious system of Scotland should be adopted as that of England." The Covenanters of course proposed the Covenant, but Vane, the chief negotiator for England, "stipulated for a *League*," as well as a Covenant, and so was formed the "*Solemn League and Covenant*."—*Knight's England, chap. 92.* This, as the basis of union and of action, was entered into in 1643, and was to be "the perpetual bond of union" between the kingdoms. In it, it was declared:—

"That we shall, in like manner, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness."

As to how that should be done the following will show. In 1639 there had been passed an "Act Ordaining by Ecclesiastical Authority the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration," in which this is found:—

"And having, withal, supplicated His Majesty's high commissioner and the lords of His Majesty's honorable Privy Council to *enjoin* by act of council all the lieges in time coming to subscribe to the Confession of Faith and Covenant."

The way in which it was to be enjoined, was this:—

"And in all humility supplicate His Majesty's high commissioner and the honorable estates of Parliament by their authority to ratify and enjoin the same, *under all civil pains*."

In compliance with these humble supplications the Edinburgh Parliament, in June 1640, passed an act to—

"Ordain and command the said Confession and Covenant to be subscribed by all His Majesty's subjects, of what rank and quality soever, *under all civil pains*."

"All civil pains" includes everything that a government can inflict, even to death itself. These were ordinances of the Scotch Parliament, but the English Parliament during the Covenanter régime, was not one whit behind.

Under the "Solemn League and Covenant," the Presbyterian Parliament of England dealt "the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received."

"An 'Ordinance for the Suppression of Blasphemies and Heresies,' which Vane and Cromwell had long held at bay, was passed by triumphant majorities. Any man—ran this terrible statute—denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of Scripture are the 'word of God,' or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of Judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his heresy, 'shall suffer the pain of death.' Any man declaring (among a long list of other errors) 'that man by nature hath free will to turn to God,' that there is a purgatory, that images are lawful, that infant baptism is unlawful; any one denying the obligation of observing the Lord's day, or asserting 'that the church government by presbytery is anti-Christian or unlawful,' shall, on refusal to renounce his errors, 'be commanded to prison.'"—*Green's Larger History of England, book VII., chap. 10, par. 11.*

The execution of Charles I. severed the League, and Charles II. was immediately proclaimed in Scotland, with the proviso, however, that "before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant." This was made known to Charles in Holland, but he refused to accede to it. The next year however, 1650, he sailed to Scotland and before landing he accepted the terms, consented to subscribe to the Covenants, and received the test. But all the while he was devising schemes for the subversion of the Covenants and the whole Covenanter system, of which the whole history of his reign, as well as of that of his brother James II., is but a dreadful illustration.

When James II. had deprived himself of all allegiance of his subjects, and William and Mary came to the English and Scotch thrones in his stead, Presbyterianism was finally established as the religion of Scotland. But it was Presbyterianism without the enforcement of the Covenants, for honest William declared in memorable words that "so long as he reigned there should be no persecution for conscience' sake." Said he:—

"We never could be of that mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party."—*Green's England, book VIII., chap. 3, par. 36.*

And when William and Mary were inaugurated as sovereigns of Scotland, when it came to taking the oath of office, William refused to swear to the persecuting part of it.

"A splendid circle of English nobles and statesmen stood round the throne; but the sword of State was committed to a Scotch lord; and the oath of office was administered after the Scotch fashion. Argyle recited the words slowly. The royal pair, holding up their hands towards Heaven, repeated after him till they came to the last clause. There William paused. That clause contained a promise that he would root out all heretics and all enemies of the true worship of God; and it was notorious that, in the opinion of many Scotchmen, not only all Roman Catholics, but all Protestant Episcopalians, all Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, all Lutherans, nay all British Presbyterians who did not hold themselves bound by the Solemn League and Covenant, were enemies of the true worship of God. The king had apprised the commissioners that he could not take this part of the oath without a distinct and public explanation; and they had been authorized by the convention to give such an explanation as would satisfy him. 'I will not,' he now said, 'lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor.' 'Neither the words of this oath,' said one of the commissioners, 'nor the laws of Scotland, lay any such obligation on Your Majesty.' 'In that sense, then, I swear,' said William, 'and I desire you all, my lords and gentlemen, to witness that I do so.'"—*Macaulay's England, chap. 13, par. 63.*

As the acts of settlement adopted under William, and the oaths taken by him, not only failed to adopt and enforce the Covenant, but were in express contradiction to it, the Covenanters, "accordingly, occupied an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William, and acted on by the church," that is by the great body of the Scotch Church, which accepted the principles of William and the acts of settlement. "They maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both" the church and the sovereign from the principles and the obligations of the Covenant, and, says Macaulay, many of them "would rather have been fired upon by musketeers, or tied to stakes within low water mark, than have uttered a prayer that God would bless William and Mary."—*Id., par. 64.*

The Covenanters then standing as dissenters from the church and the Government that would not adopt the Covenant, and as the sole defenders of the doctrines of the Covenants, adopted the name of "Reformed Presbyterians." Thus the Covenanters are the Reformed Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterianism is National Reform. The principles of the

Covenants and the Covenanters, which we have here set forth, are the "distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church," and for the spread of which that church is set; and "National Reform is simply the practical application" of these principles "for the reformation of the Nation." These are the literal, solid facts in the case, and we ask the American people whether they are ready just yet to be "reformed" by "the practical application" of such principles?

A. T. J.

Civil Government and Religion.

ALL civil governments act authoritatively and sustain their authority by the compulsory law of force. They grant to the subject no discretion. They assume their own infallibility, as against the right of the individual practically to dispute it. They put their opinions into execution, if necessary, by the sword. Where, then; is there any proper place in things spiritual—things that have their center in God and refer mainly to the interests of the after-life—for any merely human government to exercise its authoritative power over the individual will? Shall it adopt a creed for the people, and thus decide what creed they shall adopt? Shall it regulate their mode of worship? Shall it tax them for the support of a religion which it thinks to be true, but which some of them may think to be false? Shall it make its conscience the law for their conscience? There is no religious belief and no religious duty to which it can add the civil sanction without invading the inalienable rights of the individual conscience; and, at the same time, assuming an authority which belongs to God only. It may justly require that no one shall make his religion an excuse for crime against the temporal good order and safety of society, and so it may protect every one in the free and peaceable exercise of his religion; but beyond these two points it cannot go without taking the fatal step which logically involves the whole principle of State religion.

Concede religion to be one of the ends for the attainment of which governments exist among men, and all laws necessary and proper for carrying this end into effect follow as a matter of course, and this is in its very nature the essence of religious despotism. Every step in this direction places the religious liberty of the individual at the pleasure of the government, armed with the whole power of society to enforce that pleasure. If government may tax him to support and teach religion, then it may establish for him a religion which he must observe whether he believes it or not. The only escape from this result is that theory of civil government which limits it to things temporal, and denies to it any jurisdiction or any duties beyond impartial protection in the sphere of things spiritual. This, and this only, secures religious liberty, as against any oppression by the civil power.

The correctness of this theory is strongly confirmed by the general fact of history, that when religion and civil government are legally united, neither derives any benefit from the union, but both are seriously damaged by it. The most characteristic feature of such a union

is that of a bad religion and a bad government at the same time, each being harmed by the other. Let it be remembered that the governments of the world have almost always been wrong on the subject of religion; that the majority of them have been opposed to the religion of the Bible, and quite often persecuted it; that they have generally used religion for selfish and ambitious purposes; that by uniting it with the State they have corrupted both; and that, for a rule, their religious propagandism has been mainly that of error, rather than truth.

These facts prove most conclusively that civil government is a failure when it attempts to administer and regulate religion; and, hence, in the interests of pure religion, as well as those of good government, every Christian, every statesman, and every citizen should protest against any theory that carries even a single drop of State religion in its veins. We cannot import rulers from the skies or impart to earthly rulers the inspiration and infallibility of the skies. Governments must be managed by men; and, if history proves anything, it proves that men are very poor managers when they exercise the civil power in relation to religion. Their positions make them despots in theory, and in practice they often become demons incarnate, treading under foot the rights of conscience with a ferocity as reckless as it is cruel.

The theory which unites government and religion and makes the latter one of the ends to be pursued by the former, if good at all, is equally good for all governments—for "the powers that be" in Turkey, Japan, and China, as really as for those of these United States. Apply the theory in China, and it means State power employed to sustain, propagate, and enforce Buddhism and idolatry. Apply it in Turkey, and it means the same power thus employed in the interests of Mohammedanism. It so happens that the world is fruitful in religious systems; and, unless we adopt the doctrine that all these systems are equally true or equally false, the theory, as thus applied, would lead to the most opposite results, and entirely confound the distinction between the true and the false. If when applied to Christianity it would promote the truth, it would, with equal certainty, promote the grossest superstition and error when applied to Paganism. A change of circumstances often gives one a view of things otherwise not so readily taken.

Let us then suppose a Protestant to transfer his residence to China and to become subject to the government of that country. While in this country, we will further suppose, he belonged to the class demanding that religion shall be included in the educational régime of the public schools, and was horrified at the idea of not having King James's version of the sacred Scriptures read in these schools for religious purposes. How does he reason when the principle comes to be applied to him in China? The Chinese Emperor agrees with him in his principle, and proposes to tax him, not to support and teach Protestant Christianity, but to support and teach the religion of China, which he regards as an abominable idolatry. This would probably open his eyes to the nature of his own doctrine. Yet, if it is the right of

one government to enter the province of things spiritual, and tax the people to support and propagate religion, then it is the right of all governments to do so.

The principle, if valid at all, is just as valid for Paganism as it is for Christianity, for idolatry as it is for the purest worship, for the most superstitious form of Roman Catholicism as it is for the most enlightened Protestantism. No Protestant would ask for its application in any other than a Protestant country; and this is a good reason why he should not ask for it there. If it is not good in China or Catholic Spain, it is no better in these United States. The principle is the same, no matter to what religion it is applied, or whether Pagans or Christians, Catholics or Protestants form the majority of the people. It is the principle of State religion, good everywhere or good nowhere. If Protestants were in the minority in this country and Catholics in the majority, the former certainly would not advocate a public school system, to be supported by general taxation, in which Catholicism should be taught.

The conclusion from this line of thought is that civil government, though the best possible machinery to secure certain ends connected with our temporal interests, is not a contrivance adapted to secure the ends that relate to our spiritual welfare. "Surely," says Macaulay, "if experience shows that a certain machine, when used to produce a certain effect, does not produce that effect once in a thousand times, but produces in the vast majority of cases an effect directly contrary, we cannot be wrong in saying it is not a machine of which the principal end is to be so used."

The learned essayist might justly have said that it is not a machine properly adapted to this end at all. The notorious and world-wide failures of civil government to make itself useful in the department of things spiritual, when attempting to manage and conduct them, furnish the most complete demonstration that, however useful it may be elsewhere, it is not suited to this purpose. A sledge-hammer is a very good instrument with which to break a rock, but a very poor tool with which to mend a watch or perform a delicate operation in surgery. So civil government is a very good agency within certain limits and for certain objects; but beyond these limits and objects it has no function to perform, and when its powers are extended beyond them they are found in practice to be immensely more injurious than beneficial to the very interests they seek to serve.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D., in Religion and the State.*

The *Christian Statesman* says that at Chautauqua Dr. Vincent, Chancellor of Chautauqua University, "intimated his dissent from the views of National Reformers." That only shows Dr. Vincent's wisdom and love of human right. The difficulty with us is to see how any one who has any regard for the principles of Christianity, or for natural right, can do anything but "dissent from the views of National Reformers."

"WHETHER it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Acts 4:19.

**OUR COUNTRY,
THE MARVEL OF NATIONS:
ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, AND WHAT THE
SCRIPTURES SAY OF IT.**

By U. SMITH.
Author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and Other Popular Works.

This is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a

HISTORICAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a

CHAIN OF PROPHECY,

Of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the Prophet of God, hundreds of years ago. The SUNDAY QUESTION, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND NATIONAL REFORM are prominent among the topics ably discussed in this work.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type and elegantly bound. Price \$1.00.

The publishers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of "The Marvel of Nations" whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with their paper, one year, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1859 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

CHRIST AND SATAN FROM THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE END OF TIME.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE,

Author of "The Life of Christ," "Sketches from the Life of Paul," "Bible Sanctification," and other popular works.

PRINTED AND BOUND IN THE VERY BEST STYLE. OVER TEN THOUSAND SOLD IN SIX MONTHS.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other. Beginning with our Lord's great prophecy given while viewing Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, in which he outlines the history of the whole dispensation, it sketches the fulfillment. It pictures the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Temple. It calls our attention to the bitter persecutions of the Christians in the first centuries, and notes the rise and growth of the Papacy. It gives a clear conception of the character and influence of the Waldenses, who, through centuries of persecution, maintained the purity of their faith, and by their missionary efforts prepared the nations of Europe for the Reformation.

Brief and lifelike sketches are given of the works, the successes, and the persecutions of Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale, Huss, Jerome, Knox, and other reformers and martyrs.

Considerable space is given to the life, work, and influence of later reformers and great religious leaders, such as George Whitefield, the Wesleys, and William Miller, and this is followed by chapters treating upon The Origin of Evil, The Agency of Evil Spirits, The Snares of Satan, and the Judgment.

The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all

Over 500 pages; 22 full-page cuts. Price, \$1.50

To foreign countries, post-paid, 85c

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.,
Or the nearest Agent or Book Depository.

A MINE OF INFORMATION.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

By ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.

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

EVERY TEXT OF SCRIPTURE concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length; and the COMPLETE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS in regard to the Sabbath and first day is given. The comparative merits of the seventh and the first-day Sabbaths are fully shown. A copious index enables the reader to find any text, or the statement of any historian.

Should be read by everybody. 528 pp. Price, \$1.25.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

THE HOME OF THE SAVED.

By ELDER J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

GIVES the Bible evidence upon the interesting topic of the earth made new, as the inheritance of the saints. 82 pp. Price, 10 cents. SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., SEPTEMBER, 1886.

EX-GOVERNOR ST. JOHN said to a National Reform Secretary the other day:—

"We are putting your National Reform idea of God's supremacy in Government, into our Prohibition platforms every time, and we are never going back on it."

And so they go, and the cause grows.

A FRIEND in an Eastern State writes:—

"I am more and more satisfied with the AMERICAN SENTINEL. Some fears were entertained that it might not be kept up to the standing of its first numbers, but all such fears are dispelled. The July number is fully equal to the preceding ones. I wish it all success, for it cannot fail to do much good."

AS EVIDENCE of the favor with which the SENTINEL is being received we may mention that from the beginning there have been printed ten thousand copies of each number, all of which have been taken, and to supply further demand we have been obliged to print one thousand copies extra of each of the back numbers. So send in the orders. Back numbers from Number One to the present can be furnished in any quantity desired. Nearly one hundred thousand copies of the SENTINEL used in nine months represents an influence, and an amount of work, that is truly gratifying to the friends of the cause in defense of which it was established.

NOW THAT the women, especially the leaders in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are making themselves especially prominent in the advocacy of the National Reform movement, we shall be compelled in opposing it, to oppose them *so far as they are connected with it*, but no farther. We are sorry to have to do even this much, for it seems almost ungentle, but by their actions necessity is laid upon us. We shall, however, always remember that they are ladies, and treat them as such; while, at the same time, condemning *in toto* the National Reform doctrines and their support of them, and opposing, by all honorable means, all effort for the advancement of that cause.

In the political world it is votes that count. The man who can "control" votes is always in demand, and is always sure of office so long as his "influence" lasts. The man who can control the largest number of votes, can get the largest office. So it will be in the "new dispensation," which the National Reformers propose to bring in. Since religion will be upheld by the State, in accordance, not with the will of the people, but, with the will of those who "control" the votes of the people, position in the church, as in the State, will be determined by one's ability to "influence" votes. Imagine Peter asking the leaders of the "National Reform" party, "What shall we have?" The reply, unspoken, perhaps, would necessarily be something like this: "That depends upon your success as a politician; if you can control 300 votes you may have a clerkship; if you can

control 700 votes you may be pastor of a city church with the privilege of going to Congress; and if you can control 10,000 votes you may be bishop, and brevet-corrector of heretics?" Perhaps we have not the correct scale, for we don't know how such service is usually paid, but the principle is there.

An Evidence of Impending Ruin.

CANON FARRAR is a man of extensive and varied knowledge, and as he is himself a dignitary of the Church of England, anything he says that would militate against the principle of Church and State union must have double weight. In his "Early Days of Christianity," chapter 1, paragraph 9, in speaking of the condition of the world about the time of the Christian era, he says:—

"It is certain that the old Paganism was—except in country places—practically dead. The very fact that it was necessary to prop it up by the buttress of political interference shows how hollow and ruinous the structure of classic Polytheism had become."

There is the whole principle in a nutshell. Every man knows that when one power seeks an alliance with another, the party seeking the alliance, by that act confesses either that she is the weaker power, or that unaided she is not able to do what she designs to do. Is it any wonder, then, that the effort which the National Reform party is so strenuously making, should be in the mouths of infidels an argument against Christianity? Can it be wondered at if they say, "You claim that Christianity is to conquer the world, but you are forced to admit that she has not the power"? What else could they be expected to say? Thus the "National Reformers" are forging a weapon for the enemies of Christianity.

We do not for a moment admit that the above infidel argument against Christianity is a just one, because Christianity is not seeking an alliance with any power. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and he persistently repelled all efforts to connect him and his work with secular authority. He further showed how distinct in character Christianity is from civil power, by saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." We believe and know that the gospel, unaided by secular power, is able to do, and will do, all that God designed that it should accomplish.

The effort for a religious amendment to the Constitution has nothing to do with Christianity, except to lower it in the estimation of non-believers, and, indeed, of all who accept National Reform theories. These National Reformers, as has been intimated, are not seeking to ally Christianity with the State, but to prop up their peculiar ideas of Christianity by an alliance with the civil power. And the fact that they are seeking political aid, shows, as Canon Farrar said of the old Paganism under similar circumstances, how weak is the phase of Protestantism which they represent. Let it be well understood, then, that whenever "the church," so-called, seeks the aid of the civil power, it thereby proclaims its inherent weakness because of the absence of the vivifying principles of pure Christianity.

Some More Clashing Voices.

WE here present some more matter for the "Clashing Voices" column of the *Christian Statesman*. In the Pittsburgh National Reform Convention, Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., said:—

"If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, in the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship."

And yet Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the District Secretaries of the National Reform Association, says:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

And Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, in speaking of the results of the Amendment, to infidels, says:—

"The worst result would be to disfranchise them."

In the New York Convention Rev. John Hogg said:—

"Jesus said, 'Whosoever believeth in me shall never die,' and what is true of an individual is also true of a nation. The nation that takes hold upon God and the Lord Jesus shall never die. (Applause.) . . . If we mean to live, we must have it [the Constitution] imbued with a divine life. . . . Let us acknowledge God as our Father, and Sovereign, and Source of all good, and his blessing will be upon us. Crime and corruption will come to an end, and the benign reign of Jesus, our rightful Lord, will be established. (Applause.)"

In the same convention Rev. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Becoming a kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, we shall fill the earth and endure forever."

And yet in the *Christian Statesman* of July 15, here comes Rev. J. P. Lytle, D. D., in the Convention at Wooster, Ohio, the very latest, and says:—

"Nations are not chosen to everlasting life; . . . they have no spiritual union with Christ; and they shall all eventually go down to the 'sides of the pit' of destruction, and 'hell will be moved to meet them at their coming,' as it was for Egypt, and Babylon, and Tyrus, and Assyria."

We wish Rev. M. A. Gault, who manages the "Clashing Voices" business, would turn his attention to these. We should like very much to know how all these men can be telling the truth. Or, are we to understand that the National Reformers adopt the maxim of Mahomet, that "all contradiction is removed by the rule that any text is abrogated or modified by any subsequent passage"?

"THEN Peter and the apostles said, We ought to obey God rather than men."

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

TERMS.

SINGLE COPY, per year, 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1886.

NUMBER 10.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

Result of the Constitutional Amendment.

THE method of the National Association is antagonistic to the spirit of American civil liberty. Every argument which has been or can be used in favor of the theological amendment of the Constitution, has been used a thousand times, just as logically, for the union of Church and State. Moreover, every one of these arguments would justify prosecution in the courts of the land for opinion's sake. Suppose that you have carried your amendment. Instantly you have revolutionized the civil spirit of this Republic. From the moment of your victory, you make the holding of certain theological opinions, different from your own, an offense indictable in our courts and punishable in our prisons. When you have gained so much, what have you left of American liberty?

Both as Christians and as patriots, therefore, we solemnly protest against the measure now in agitation. It is a measure in every way evil. Its success would be fatal at once to religion and to freedom in America.—*Christian Union.*

"If this great movement [Protestantism] had been allowed to proceed without interruption, it would, in the course of a few generations, have overthrown the old superstition, and established in its place a simpler and less troublesome creed; the rapidity with which this was done, being, of course, proportioned to the intellectual activity of the different countries. But, unfortunately, the European governments, who are always meddling in matters with which they have no concern, thought it their duty to protect the religious interests of the people; and, making common cause with the Catholic clergy, they, in many instances, forcibly stopped the heresy, and thus arrested the natural development of the age. During almost a hundred and fifty years, Europe was afflicted by religious wars, religious massacres, and religious persecutions; not one of which would have risen, if the great truth had been recognized, that the State has no concern with the opinions of men, and no right to interfere, even in the slightest degree, with the form of worship which they may choose to adopt.—*Buckle.*

The Salem Witchcraft.

A LESSON FOR OUR TIMES.

THE movers for the Religious Amendment of our National Constitution constantly refer to the action of the prophets, priests, and rulers of Israel, as precedents for the course they wish to pursue. Thus Mr. Leiper, in his strictures on the AMERICAN SENTINEL, cited the case of Nehemiah as a warrant for their proposed action. We deny the relevancy of his citation, and will strengthen our denial with facts and a very forcible illustration.

A "Christian Government," one in which the "usages, laws, and institutions" of Christianity are placed on "a legal basis," must of necessity be "a corrector of heretics." It is useless for the Amendmentists to say that they "will not interfere with the religion of any as long as their actions are not contrary to the law," for if a man's religion does not regulate his actions and show itself in his life, it is not worth defending or possessing.

There is a law in the Scriptures which reads as follows: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Ex. 22:18. And again: "A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones." Lev. 20:27. It may not be said that this is obsolete if it be that we are to take the Scripture regulations in full as our guide in *civil government*; for witchcraft is declared to be an abomination to the Lord in both the Old and the New Testament. Compare Deut. 18:9-12; Gal. 5:19-21, and Rev. 22:14, 15. It was in obedience to this law that Saul "put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land." 1 Sam. 28:3.

And now the question arises, If witchcraft is an abomination to the Lord, and if he required that witches and wizards be put to death, and if the rulers of the people were required to carry out this order of the Lord, why should not the rulers of the people *now* put this order into effect? "The powers that be" are ordained of God at this time as truly as in any other. God does not change; and the rulers of to-day bear the same responsibility to do the will of God that they did in olden time. If, then, the rulers acknowledge their responsibility to God, and if they desire to put the expressed will of God into effect, as our rulers ought to do, will they not obey this order, and destroy out of the land all them that have familiar spirits?

These statements and queries are based upon the position assumed by the Religious Amend-

ment Party; and if their positions are tenable, then these questions must be answered in the affirmative; no other answer is admissible. And this is precisely the manner in which the Puritans of New England reasoned two centuries ago. But all history attests that they made a most miserable failure in their efforts to act upon the principles which they laid down. They verily thought they were doing God service, but they stand condemned for their folly, and for the wanton violence which they did to the plainest principles of morality. If God holds the movers in those terrible scenes responsible for the lives that were sacrificed, then indeed are they to be pitied.

But what was the cause of their sad failure? And what is the defect in the reasonings and conclusions of the Religious Amendmentists? The answer to one of these questions is the answer to the other. Cotton Mather and his bigoted associates taught that the "interests of the church," and the maintenance of "the true religion," demanded that these rulers should put the accused persons to death. For this demand they pleaded the warrant of a law of the Bible, and the precedent of Saul and other rulers of the theocracy or kingdom of Israel.

The answer to the above questions is found in the fact which we have repeatedly urged upon the attention of the National Reformers, namely, that we are in a different dispensation, and that there has not been, is not, and never will be upon earth, by divine sanction, a human or civil government the counterpart of that of Israel. That was a theocracy, and afterward a theocratic kingdom, such as cannot exist under the gospel. The antitype of that will be the kingdom of Christ which the God of Heaven will set up, but which will not be set up during the Saviour's priesthood, but when the time comes for him to take vengeance on his foes (2 Thess. 1:7, 8), and destroy all the kingdoms of this world. Dan. 2:44. The error into which Mr. Leiper ran in his strictures, and into which all his associates run, in referring to the action of Nehemiah and others, is in confounding things utterly unlike. It is not enough in a theocracy that the laws be given to the people, and that kings and governors be required to rule in accordance therewith, but divinely-appointed and inspired teachers must be sent from time to time, to instruct them in the laws, to reprove them for their departures from the laws—sometimes unintentional—and to lead them in emergencies where all human wisdom is at fault. But such a state of things cannot exist in a republic. A theocratic and republican government in one is an impossibility. In

a republic the people elect all their rulers, and the rulers are responsible to the people who elect them. Even if the people err in their judgment, and the ideas of the rulers are correct, the people must learn their errors by their own experience; to deprive them of their right of choice is to subvert the republic.

In the Government of Israel no such choice existed. Moses was chosen for their leader, not by the people, but by the Lord. Over and over they essayed to reject Moses, but the Lord interposed by his power. Once they decided to choose a leader in his stead, with the avowed purpose of having one who would carry out their will. And this they would have done if they had had a republican form of government. If the Lord had given them the right to choose their rulers, they could have elected a leader in the place of Moses without incurring any guilt—without rebelling against God's authority. Nehemiah was divinely appointed to his office, and divinely inspired to his work, as were all the rulers and prophets of Israel.

The disastrous failure of the Puritans of Salem, in their efforts to enforce the law for the suppression of witchcraft, was owing to the fact that they had no Heaven-appointed and divinely-inspired leader to direct them. They judged according to their own judgment—according to human wisdom. They were led by their own feelings and impressions, and mistook these for the mind of the Lord. They thought to bring the land under subjection to the will of God, but instead they brought upon it a lasting reproach. They essayed to model their Government after the theocracy of Israel, when God had neither instituted nor given any warrant for a theocracy.

And just so in the efforts of the National Reformers. They point to the example of prophets, priests, and kings as the precedent for their proposed action, when they have no prophets, priests, nor kings to follow the example. But without these they have no right to act as they propose, for none but prophets, priests, and kings have any right or authority to fill the offices and endeavor to discharge the duties which the Lord assigned to prophets, priests, and kings. If men without any special ordination or inspiration essay to fill these offices, they become guilty of the foulest usurpation. Here is a sufficient reason why every Christian should oppose the machinations of these self-styled reformers.

And, as if purposely to give the most full proof of their duplicity, or of their ignorance of the principles of government, they assert that they do not propose to make any radical change in the form of our Government; that they desire to retain its republican form of representation; yet they propose to take for their pattern a Government which had not a single feature of a republic, and copy the acts of those who did not represent the people, who were not in any wise responsible to the people for their official acts. But their plans are chimerical. It is impossible, as every one must own, to follow the precedents presented in the theocracy or kingdom of Israel and still retain our republican form of government. And their own writings show that they do not expect to have

leaders of the same order as those who declared the will of God to Israel, or who will receive their messages from Heaven in the same manner that those did. Thus it was said in the *Christian Statesman*:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do in shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points. And it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decisions of most points will be developed there."

Mark this well. The final decisions on civil and moral points, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, will be made in the churches and the pulpits. But the final decisions are not made at the beginning of discussions and agitations. How do they propose to reach the desired point? Hear the *Statesman* again:—

"But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

And thus the "final decisions" will be developed in the churches after the "framework of Bible legislation" has been canvassed by Congress, by Legislatures, in the civil courts, and by lawyers and citizens generally, which will carry the discussions of Bible legislation into party caucuses, beer halls, and dram-shops! for the *habitués* of the dens of vice will each have a vote on the settlement of questions of Bible legislation; and at the polls each such vote will carry as much weight as that of the president of the National Reform Association. And when the will of the majority—good, bad, or indifferent—is expressed, and their decisions are legally enforced, then our model "reformers" will justify such transactions by pointing us to the example of Nehemiah and other inspired teachers and rulers! Was ever arrogance so arrogant, or self-conceit so assuming?

And why will there be an "almost universal gathering" of the people around the churches? Because religious tests will then be required as qualifications for office, and as Dr. Browne said in their Pittsburg National Convention, the office-seekers will be the firm friends of this movement as soon as they are assured of its success. And as Dr. Hays said in the same Convention, politicians who are now afraid of it, "will bawl themselves hoarse in applause" when they become convinced that it must succeed. Ah, yes; this is the very thing to look for when the way to office is through the church! And such is the means by which they propose to elevate "the true religion," and to honor the institutions of Christianity.

Here we will reproduce a short extract which was published in the July number of the *SENTINEL*. The editor of the *Cincinnati Gazette* is a Christian, and a man of acknowledged ability. In an article on the subject of the proposed amendment he said:—

"The Government will continue to be administered by men of ordinary passions, such as are elected by the average intelligence and virtue, and the average ignorance and corruption of the voting population. Viciousness, and ignorance, and corruption will continue to

be powers in the body politic the same as before, and these will continue to elect legislators, executives, and judges of their own sort."

This must be so if our republican form of government is retained; and any effort to enforce the laws, usages, and institutions of religion in such a Government, will reproduce the horrors enacted at Salem. It will arouse and intensify all the passions of the people. The rights of the minority will be trampled under foot, because bigotry and misguided zeal will pervert the judgment and drown the reason of those who may for the time have power in their hands.

Religious usages and institutions are *for the church*, and not at all *for the civil Government*. It is the duty of the church to keep witchcraft and every other abomination from its midst; but the civil Government has no right to act in such matters. Had the Puritans regarded this distinction, they would not have stained their hands with blood. And if our modern "National Reformers" would regard this distinction, they would not strive to so change our Government as to cause the follies and crimes of Salem to be re-enacted throughout our land. "We are not better than our fathers." They who clamor for power which they have no right to use, will be sure to use it when it is obtained. And when the flood-gates of persecution are once opened, no power can stay the current until it has left desolation and ruin in its course.

From the course pursued by the Amendmentists, and their unwillingness to candidly examine reasons, and weigh the consequences which must follow their schemes, we fear they will not be warned to desist from their work. But if they do succeed, we are fully determined that the wrong shall not lie at our door. We shall continue to sound the alarm whether they will hear or forbear.

J. H. W.

A Political Gospel.

MRS. MARY A. WOODBRIDGE, recording secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and vice-president of the National Reform Association, made the principal National Reform speech, at Chautauqua Assembly on National Reform Day, July 23. Among many other such like things in her speech we find the following:—

"Shall we not amend our National Constitution, that the world shall know that we acknowledge Christ as Ruler? as the Head of our Nation? and in his name, and for his glory, shall not 'We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union, thus 'ordain'? While we render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, shall we not render unto God the things that are God's?"

To render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's, is eminently sound and practical Christian doctrine. But the practice of that principle is not at all what the National Reformers want the people of this Nation to do. The National Reformers not only want us to render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, but they want to *compel* us to render to Cæsar that which is God's. This we, under Christ, deny their right to do; and by his help, it is what we will never submit to do.

In these words Christ established a clear dis-

inction between Cæsar and God, between that which is Cæsar's and that which is God's; that is, between the civil and the religious power, and between what we owe to the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. We owe to Cæsar, the civil power, that which is civil: we owe to God, the religious power, that which is religious. This is the distinction which God, in Christ, has absolutely fixed. Whoever seeks to confound this distinction is against God and against Christ; to join, or to seek to join, the religious with the civil power is to confound the distinction; and to join the religious with the civil power is precisely what the National Reform party proposes to do. The logical conclusion from this is clear, and we do not hesitate to say that it is strictly according to Scripture and, therefore, perfectly true.

For the State to enforce religious duties it thereby demands that to Cæsar shall be rendered that which is God's, and therefore it usurps the place of God, and so far as it is obeyed, it destroys the true worship of God. We know the claim that these men make, as of all of their kind in the dreadful history of persecution everywhere, that is, that it is the true worship of God and of Christ which they ask that the civil power shall enforce, and this according to the Bible. But no such thing can be done. Christ did not say that we should render to Cæsar that which is God's; neither did he say that we should render to God *by Cæsar* that which is God's. That which is God's is his, and we are to render it to him direct, without any of the meddling mediumship of Cæsar. When we have rendered to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, we have rendered to Cæsar all his due and he has no right to demand any more. And when he has so received his just due on all his proper claims, then what business is it of Cæsar's how we render to God that which is God's or whether we render it at all or not?—It is just none of his business. And when he seeks to make it his business he is meddling with that which in no wise concerns him. One of the unbecoming and irreverent results of such action is well expressed by Gibbon, in speaking of Constantine and his sons:—

"Those princes presumed to extend their despotism over the faith, as well as over the lives and fortunes of their subjects; and the prerogatives of the King of Heaven were settled, or changed, or modified, in the cabinet of an earthly monarch."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 21, par. 16.*

Could anything possibly be more incongruous! It is just such incongruity that these words of Christ are intended forever to prevent. Yet history is full of it, and, while our own Government has escaped it so far, now the National Reform party seeks by the subversion of the Constitution to inflict it upon this great Nation.

Whenever the civil power steps between a man and God and proposes to regulate just what shall be rendered to God and just how it shall be rendered, then Cæsar is entirely out of his place. George Washington was a man for whose opinions we suppose there is yet remaining some respect on the part of Americans, and he said:—

"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."

We say again, that in the words, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's," Matt. 22:21, Christ separated forever the civil from the religious power. And the National Reform party in its endeavor to join them, clearly sets itself against the word of Christ.

But the National Reform idea of the work of the gospel is as crude as its idea of the relation of the civil and the religious power. Mrs. Woodbridge says further:—

"An amendment to the National Constitution requires the endorsement of two-thirds of the States, to become law. Although the action must be taken by State Legislative bodies, let such an amendment be submitted, and it would become the paramount issue at the election of legislators, and thus God would be in the thought, and his name upon the lip of every man. May not this be the way opened to us? How to bring the gospel of Christ to the masses, has been, and is, the vexing problem of the church. Would not the problem be solved? . . . In considering the submission of such an amendment, we may use the very argument used by Moses, in his song containing these words of Jehovah, 'For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life: and through this thing ye shall prolong your days in the land.' How prayerfulness would be stimulated! Conscience would press the words, 'If the Lord be God, follow him, but if Baal, then follow him.' Then would there be searchings of heart, as David's, of which we learn in the fifty-first Psalm. Prayer would bring faith and the power of the Spirit: and when such power shall rest upon the children of God, there *will* be added to the church daily such as shall be saved."

Oh yes! to be sure! What a most excellent method of bringing the gospel (?) to the masses! Most assuredly the problem would be solved. This scheme has been tried, and the problem solved, before, and in much the same way. By making the subject of the Trinitarian controversy a national and governmental issue the name of God and of Christ was "upon every lip," clubs, stones, or military weapons, in the hands, and murder in the heart, of every man. Thus the gospel was brought to the masses, and so there *was* added to the church daily such as should be ———. Especially in the city of Rome, by this means, the masses became so devout, that in the most exciting and decisive moment of a horse-race, the whole multitude in the vast circus could in an instant turn their minds to the gospel (?) and shout "One God, One Christ, One Bishop." And, by the way, the women were among the leaders, and were the main help in bringing about this triumph of the gospel among the masses at a horse-race in the Roman circus. Thus, in that age, was the gospel brought to the masses; thus, then, was the problem solved. And "history repeats itself," even to the part the women play in the political project of bringing the gospel to the masses.—See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall, chap. 21, par. 35.*

But illustrations are hardly needed to show how entirely foreign to the gospel of Christ are

such propositions and such arguments as we here present from the Chautauqua National Reform Speech.

Such stuff needs but to be read to be condemned utterly by every one who has any respect for the gospel or for its Author. But if the reading of this is not enough to condemn both it and the cause in behalf of which it must be used, then we shall insert just one more sentence from the very midst of whence these are copied. Immediately following the words, "Would not the problem be solved?" are these:—

"Yea, Christ would then be lifted up, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and would we not have right to claim the fulfillment of the promise, that 'He will draw all men unto himself?'"

To think of a political campaign managed by ambitious clerics, political hypocrites, ward politicians, and city bosses, and call that bringing the gospel of Christ to the masses, and the means of adding to the church daily such as shall be saved, is certainly a conception of the gospel of Christ which is degrading enough in all conscience. But when to cap such a conception, it is avowed that such would be the lifting up of Christ, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and the fulfillment of the promise that he will draw all men unto him, the whole idea becomes one that is vastly nearer to open blasphemy than it is to the proper conception of the gospel of Christ. But such, and of such, is the gospel of National Reform. A. T. J.

The American Constitution.

THE following magnificent tribute to the Constitution of our country is from Bancroft's "History of the Formation of the Constitution." And this is the charter of human liberty and natural right with which the National Reformers are displeased, and which they are determined to subvert. Such a wish can spring from nothing else than a desire to exercise a power that is in violation of the natural rights of mankind:—

"The Constitution establishes nothing that interferes with equality and individuality. It knows nothing of differences by descent, or opinions of favored classes, or legalized religion, or the political power of property. It leaves the individual alongside of the individual. No nationality of character could take form, except on the principle of individuality, so that the mind might be free, and every faculty have the unlimited opportunity for its development and culture. As the sea is made up of drops, American society is composed of separate, free, and constantly moving atoms, ever in reciprocal action, advancing, receding, crossing, struggling against each other and with each other; so that the institutions and laws of the country rise out of the masses of individual thought, which, like the waters of the ocean, are rolling evermore.

"The rule of individuality was extended as never before. The Synod of the Presbyterians of New York and Philadelphia, a denomination inflexibly devoted to its own creed, in their

pastoral letter of May, 1783, published their joy that "the rights of conscience are inalienably secured and interwoven with the very Constitutions of the several States." Religion was become avowedly the attribute of man and not of a corporation. In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and of these protectors one after another might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian war grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation—the least defiled with the barren scuffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest form—when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."

THE word God was not accidentally left out of the Constitution. It was most reverentially left out of it by the God-fearing men who drew the instrument, because it had no business there. It was the purpose of the founders of our Government to make it purely secular. It was a mere federation or union of States for purely worldly purposes. It did not claim to have any divine authority or sanction, but only the consent of the people. It did not establish any religion, because it guaranteed entire religious freedom. The word God has no more business in the Constitution than it has in articles of co-partnership, or in a promissory note. A promissory note would not be a whit more negotiable if it should contain a "recognition of God." This should be equally true of the State Government or of the United States Government. Entire religious freedom requires it; for as soon as the word God enters the organic law of a State, there is the necessary implica-

tion that the State has religious authority, and this is incompatible with absolute freedom of conscience.—*Baltimore American.*

State Recognition of Christianity.

THE advocates of the so-called "National Reform" claim that we do them injustice by asserting that they are working for a union of Church and State, and that if their movement shall succeed they will persecute people for conscience' sake. They say that we either misunderstand the principles of "National Reform" or else we willfully misrepresent them. We claim that we do neither. We get our ideas of the "National Reform" movement from its official organs, and give the people the utterances of its advocates just as we find them published. True, they deny that they are working for a union of Church and State, and we publish their denial; but unfortunately for them their arguments go to show that Church and State union is the real object of their ambition.

In the *Christian Nation* for July 7 and 14, 1886, we find an article bearing the same title as the one at the head of this article. It is by the late Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and is edited from the original manuscript by the Rev. R. M. Sommerville, New York. The *Christian Nation* is devoted to the interests of the "National Reform" movement, and was indorsed by the Annual Convention of the National Reform Association, Pittsburg, Pa., April, 1885; consequently whatever we find in it may be regarded as official.

The article in question starts out with the statements that the Bible is a revelation from God; that it will make wise unto salvation all who receive it; that no one can know by intuition what the Scriptures teach, but that they must be searched, and that the obligation to search the Scriptures rests upon all men. To these propositions we give a most hearty assent. We also agree with Mr. Sommerville that there are "great difficulties to be encountered in the study of the divine word," and that for these difficulties the word itself is not responsible, but that they arise from education, from the current of public sentiment, from its bearing on our worldly interests and prospects, and from a determination to find in it what it was never intended to teach. We also believe that "the great difficulty, and that from which all others derive their existence or their force, is the depravity of the human heart, and our natural enmity to God. There is the reluctance to submit the judgment, the every thought, to the teachings of the Spirit. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

These propositions are sound, but the conclusion which Mr. Sommerville presumes to draw from them is unsound to the same degree. He says:—

"This consideration suggests the imperative obligation to place men who have the Spirit at the political helm. Those who are expected correctly to apply the word of the Spirit are such as have the Spirit. The seventy elders

who are called to assist Moses in the government of Israel, are made partakers of the Spirit of the Lord, by whose directions they are brought forward. When Moses asks a successor, he is directed to take Joshua, a man in whom was the Spirit, and to lay his hands upon him, and to set him before all the people. Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.' The recognized minister of God must, in all cases, be one who has the Spirit of God."

Let us be sure that we do not misunderstand this matter. It is imperatively necessary that only men who have the Spirit should be placed at the political helm. If this were carried out, it would involve the striking out of the last clause of Article Six of the United States Constitution, which reads, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Now since religion and the church are inseparable it follows that what Mr. Sommerville considers an "imperative obligation" is nothing less than the union of Church and State.

Indeed, the latter part of the paragraph which we have quoted would indicate so close a union of Church and State that they will be identical. He would have the civil rulers correspond to the seventy leaders appointed to assist Moses in the government of Israel. But the Government of Israel was a theocracy, and in a theocracy the Government is the church. Among the Jews there were not two distinct organizations, the Church and the State, but every circumcised Jew was a member of the church, and circumcision was the badge of nationality. What Mr. Sommerville here implies, other national reformers openly assert, namely, that this Government ought to be modeled after the Jewish Government, and that this will be the case when their movement succeeds. Mr. Sommerville says, "Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.'" Remember that he is not giving a homily on the early Christian church, but is writing about State recognition of Christianity; and if the sentence which we have just quoted has anything to do with his subject, it means that the civil rulers of the United States should be regarded simply as ministers to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. And this agrees exactly with what Mr. Foster says in a *Statesman of March, 1884*: "The State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church." If this does not imply union of Church and State we would like to have the National Reformers tell us what in their estimation would constitute such a union.

We would not be understood as implying that there was anything wrong in the Government of Israel. That form of government was instituted by the Lord himself. He chose the Jews as his peculiar people, and constituted himself their sole ruler. The men who were directly over the people were not chosen by the people, but were appointed by the Lord, and they received directly from the mouth of the Lord instruction as to how the people should be governed. But none of these things can be paralleled in the United States, even though the

National Reformers succeed in changing the Constitution to suit their own ideas; for the Lord has nowhere stated that he has chosen the people of the United States as his own peculiar people. On the contrary, we are told that he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Moreover the National Reformers themselves do not claim that in the proposed new order of government God will himself appoint the rulers, for they expect that the rulers will be elected by the people, just as they are now. And they certainly are not so wild as to suppose that the rulers whom they may elect will be in personal connection with Heaven. Therefore while their proposed amendment will indeed be a union of Church and State, the union will not have the sanction of God, but will be an unlawful union. It will be in his sight adultery. By that unlawful union the church will be in the condition described in Rev. 18:1-3.

But Mr. Sommerville continues:—

"Civil rulers, then, are not sent to Rome or to Geneva, to Canterbury or Edinburgh, for information whether an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws, is to be accepted; but, with all confidence, to the Word. There is no more difficulty pressing on the magistrate than on any other individual in determining what is to be his course, that he may honor the Sovereign at the head of his body, the church."

This is in perfect accord with his idea that the State and the Church are to be identical, for he would have "an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws" accepted by the civil rulers. True he says that the rulers should go to the Bible to determine the proper creed, form of worship, and laws of the church that should be accepted by them, and says that the magistrate would have no more difficulty in determining his course in such a matter than any other individual; but when we consider how many differences of opinion there are on these points, even among those who profess to be led by the Spirit; we can see only one way in which a magistrate could solve the problem with ease, and that would be to accept and uphold the creed, form of worship, and laws of that association which elected him to his position.

Mr. Sommerville proceeds: "Knowing then, the church, what is his [the magistrate's] duty respecting it?" and answers his question as follows:—

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

This answer is plain enough even if it is not grammatically expressed. Civil rulers are to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. This recognition, moreover, is not simply an acknowledgement of the church's existence, but is to take the form of a statutory arrangement to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church "in conformity with its Constitution and object." The meaning of this is

made still more clear by the writer. He says further in the same article:—

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

And then he adds:—

"But shall we take—is it right to take—public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed? Most certainly. The gospel from its very nature is aggressive, contemplates the rectification of corrupt, disorderly, and degraded human nature, casts down every high thing that would exalt itself against the knowledge of God, and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

The latter part of this last paragraph is eminently true. The gospel is indeed designed to purify corrupted, disorderly, and degraded human nature, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And the church is the channel through which the design of the gospel is to be effected. But Mr. Sommerville says, as quoted above, that it is the duty of civil rulers to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church in conformity with its Constitution and object; which is equivalent to saying that it is the duty of the State to compel men to accept the gospel. In other words, what the church ought to do by persuasion, Mr. Sommerville would have the State do by force.

Note carefully the first part of the paragraph last quoted. Mr. Sommerville says that it is most certainly right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed. This can mean nothing less than that according to National Reform principles it is right to compel people to accept customs to which they are conscientiously opposed, and to make them contribute the means for this purpose. For he does not say simply, that it is right to take public money to *teach* principles to which many members of the community may be conscientiously opposed; that might be endured; but he says that the State may *enforce* church laws and customs, in opposition to the conscientious convictions of some of the citizens, provided, of course, it is only the minority that are thus opposed. But in any government the laws are enforced not upon one class of citizens but upon all; the law knows no difference in persons. Therefore we are justified in concluding that if Mr. Sommerville and the *Christian Nation* are competent exponents of National Reform doctrine, that doctrine contemplates nothing less than the *compelling* of every individual in the United States to conform to one certain set of religious laws, customs, and usages. This cannot be endured by freemen.

If in this article we have in any way misrepresented "National Reform" we shall esteem it a favor if some of its devotees will tell us wherein. If we have not, then it is as clear as the noonday sun that "National Reform" means a union of Church and State. National Reformers cannot deny this conclusion without recalling their indorsement of the *Christian Nation*.

E. J. W.

A Precursor of National Reform.

THE matter is stated in few words and is as follows: It seems that some Seventh-day Adventists were holding meetings in Chicago. One of their preachers, Elder R. M. Kilgore delivered a sermon on the National Reform movement, taking the same position in regard to it that the SENTINEL does—that persecution for conscience' sake will inevitably follow the success of National Reform. In proof of this Mr. Kilgore states that already in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, there has been persecution, even to fine and imprisonment, of members of that denomination for working on Sunday after having conscientiously and religiously observed the seventh day according to the commandment of God. The sermon was printed in the *Inter Ocean*.

Now the *Christian Cynosure* is also printed in Chicago, and its editor, President Blanchard, of Wheaton College, is one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. The *Cynosure* found the sermon in the *Inter Ocean*, and as the preacher, it seems, had struck pretty close to home, the *Cynosure*, making the slight mistake of thinking the preacher a Seventh-day Baptist, commented upon the subject as follows, under the title of "A Sad Mistake Somewhere":—

"Elder R. M. Kilgore (Seventh-day Baptist) is thus reported in the *Inter Ocean*, July 19: 'What is the significance of the National-Reform movement which is agitating our country from center to circumference? What is the aim of this great party? It is to unite Church and State. It is to change our Constitution so as to restrict the rights of conscience.' And further on: 'Already persecution has broken out in Arkansas, Tennessee and Pennsylvania, and those who worship God according to the teachings of God's word are suffering under this [Sabbath] law.'

"The president of the National Reform Association is Felix R. Brunot, understood to be an Episcopalian. There are some one hundred vice-presidents, more or less, of whom the editor of the *Cynosure* is one. Bishop Huntington is, and the late Bishop Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal church was another, and one hundred men could not be selected in the United States to whom the idea of 'Church and State,' the coercing of conscience by the civil law, would be more abhorrent than to the list of vice-presidents which have for years been published in the organ of that body, which seeks a recognition of God as the author of civil government. And if there are Seventh-day Baptists now in jail, or fined, because, having kept Saturday as their Sabbath, they have refused to keep Sunday also, their names and the jails where they are confined should be published at once.

"The American people have for years gone the length of tolerating Mormon Danites and polygamists, who practiced polygamy and assassination and called that religion; and will they punish, by fine and imprisonment, civil, orderly Christians who only differ from them as to the hours of Sabbath rest? Nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than such persecution."

When the *Cynosure* was issued which contained this, Mr. Kilgore happened to be in Arkansas, and he immediately answered the call of the *Cynosure* for names, etc., as follows, and his letter was printed in the *Cynosure* of August 12, 1886:—

"EDITOR *Christian Cynosure*: In your issue of

July 29, 1886, you refer to the sermon given by myself, as reported in the *Inter Ocean*, July 19, in which it was stated that 'the aim of the National Reform Association was to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States, thereby making our Nation a Christian nation, thus forming a union of Church and State, and restricting the rights of conscience; that already persecution has broken out in Arkansas, Tennessee, etc., and those who worship God according to the teachings of God's word, are suffering under this Sunday law.'

"This article is called forth in response to your statement, that 'if there are Seventh-day Baptists now in jail or fined because, having kept Saturday as their Sabbath, they have refused to keep Sunday also, their names and the jails where they are confined should be published at once.'

"We are Seventh-day Adventists not Seventh-day Baptists, and as I am now on the ground where our brethren are feeling the effects of this bitter spirit of persecution, I am glad to give you and your readers the desired information.

"Two years ago a church of Seventh-day Adventists was raised up in this place (Springdale, Ark.). Last fall they erected a house of worship, and for painting, one Sunday, on the rear of the house, unseen from the road, Elder J. W. Scoles was indicted by the Grand Jury at Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark., tried, convicted, and fined by the Circuit Court. An appeal was taken, and the case is now pending the action of the Supreme Court of the State. James Poole, of the same county, a conscientious Sabbath-keeper, for pulling weeds in his garden on Sunday morning, was indicted by the Grand Jury and fined by the same court, though he had attended public worship in the forenoon and afternoon, four miles from his home. William Martin was indicted by the same jury for sowing oats, and tried before the Circuit Court, but the jury disagreed. J. M. Davis was indicted by the Grand Jury for 'harrowing oats on the Christian Sabbath or Sunday,' and tried before the Circuit Court, but failing to sustain the charge, the court picked up a man who swore that he saw Mr. Davis hauling wood on Sunday, and without even an indictment for said offense, the court fined him and taxed him the costs. F. M. Elmore, for three minutes' labor on Sunday, was indicted, convicted, and fined in the Circuit Court of this county. The second arrest of J. A. Armstrong, of Springdale, was effected July 9, for digging potatoes on Sunday for the table. In four hours after his arrest he was on his way to jail at Fayetteville, where he was kept five days to commute the fine imposed upon him, which he refused to pay, and thus honor an unjust law and a partial administration which oppressed the conscientious observers of the Fourth Commandment, while others who observed neither day were permitted to go unmolested. The railroad cars could rattle, and carry their heavy burdens, and the loud voice of the locomotive could be heard more than once every Sunday, and yet go unrebuked. The factory could ply its vocation and keep its servants at work every Sunday; the hotels could send their runners to each train soliciting patronage and collect their fees for labor performed on Sunday without a word of censure from the authorities. Other citizens could drive their hogs to market; livery teams could be hired to pleasure-seekers and money exchanged for such service, and no one was disturbed enough to take cognizance of the matter, and report it to the Grand Jury; and when the jury was told of these breaches of the law, by a Sabbath-keeper who was summoned to testify against a brother, no notice was taken of them, while the brother was arrested and fined for wielding, quietly, a paint-

brush, after he had conscientiously observed the day before as the Sabbath, according to the commandment of God.

"Allen Meek, of Star of the West, Pike County, was indicted by the Grand Jury for planting potatoes on Sunday morning, on the testimony forced from a friend who was visiting him. While the case was pending in the court he was cited to appear on Monday morning twenty-five miles distant. The road being rough he was compelled to repair the break in his wagon on Sunday. He was again indicted and fined for that offense, on the testimony of a man who came to see him on *business*. The man who came on business could go home free after causing the arrest of the Sabbath-keeper. Others with whom I am personally acquainted in this same county, and whose names I could give, have also been arrested and fined in this same manner.

"Any one can see that it is not because the Sunday law is broken, or that these good and conscientious Sabbath-keepers make more noise or disturbance than others; but the strong arm of the law is the best argument that can be wielded against their faith and practice. However 'abhorrent to our Constitution such persecution' may appear to the editor of the *Cynosure*, we are now realizing its effects."

It is true that "nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution" than is such persecution; but it is the purpose of the National Reform party to *subvert our Constitution* so that such persecution, instead of being merely local and perhaps temporary, may be made national and permanent.

But see the infamous meanness of this Arkansas iniquity—even to the forcing from a guest, evidence by which to convict the one whose hospitality he had enjoyed. And all this not for any "matter of wrong or of wicked lewdness;"—if it were that, like Gallio of old, reason would that it should be borne with,—but for simply pulling a few weeds in the garden, or digging a few potatoes for dinner, and this too not only after having religiously kept one day, but after having attended public worship twice on the same day. If there is anybody in the United States who wants to see in free America anything more like to the Inquisition than is this, just let him work for National Reform.

If it be true, as the *Cynosure* says, that this persecution is "abhorrent" to President Brunot, the editor of the *Cynosure* and the one hundred or more other vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, then it is high time for them to take their names from the list of officers, and separate themselves from the work, of that Association. To force all people in these United States, without any distinction at all, to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, is the purpose of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution and the laws that shall be enacted under it. And that is simply to make possible in all this Nation the enactment of such scenes as these which have been enacted in Arkansas. That President Brunot and his associate officers in that association would abhor such persecution, does not help the matter a particle. They are doing their very best to establish a system of government and laws under which it will be possible for such persecution to be inflicted by those who do not abhor it, but who on the contrary are bigoted and fanatical enough to enjoy it.

Admit that these men are so humane that they would shrink from the enforcement of such laws, such consideration does not in the least relieve them from the responsibility so long as they persist in doing their utmost to make it possible for the fanatic or the savage to enforce the laws which they put into his hands. George Bancroft truly says: "As the humane ever decline to enforce the laws dictated by bigotry, the office devolves on the fanatic or the savage. Hence the severity of their execution usually surpasses the intention of their authors." Doubtless there are people in Arkansas who favored the enactment of these laws, who are now shocked at such an enforcement of them. But that does not relieve them of the responsibility, they had no business, much less had they any right, to enact such laws. So we say of these men who favor the National Reform movement. It matters not how humane, nor how eminent for Christian character, they may be, they are but playing into the hands of the fanatic and the man of savage disposition. If they so abhor persecution just let them withhold from such characters as these the power to persecute. It certainly is not too much to ask President Brunot and his associates to deny themselves this luxury, but we know it is more than they will deny themselves. Only a few years ago, there was introduced into the Pennsylvania Legislature a bill to exempt Seventh-day Baptists from the rigors of such laws as these in Arkansas, and the most active man in Pennsylvania for the defeat of that bill was Felix R. Brunot, in his official capacity as president of the National Reform Association: *and the bill was defeated*. So it would fairly seem that so far as he is concerned the statement of the *Cynosure* is entirely gratuitous, and we very much fear that it is so also, of the majority of the one hundred or more of his associate officers of the National Reform Association.

Again we say, It is true that nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than is such persecution. But it is the purpose of the National Reform party to subvert the Constitution so that such persecution shall become national. And that is why we abhor the principles and the work of the National Reform Association. And they ought to be abhorred by all men who love liberty and human right.

A. T. J.

To PRETEND to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God; by the nature of things the power of sovereigns is confined to practical government; they have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace; the most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.—*Theodoric the Ostrogoth*, A. D. 500.

RELIGION is essentially distinct from human government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both. There are causes in the human breast which insure the perpetuity of religion without the aid of the law.—*Madison*.

Religious Teaching by the State.

CONCEDE the principle that religion, either as an end or a means, falls properly within the administrative agency of the State, and the inference is irresistible that the State must have a religion to administer; that it must determine what that religion shall be; and that it must and should appoint suitable persons to do the executive part of the work. We have no difficulty with the natural and necessary modes of making the principle effective—none whatever—since they result from it by inevitable sequence. Nor have we any scruples about the so-called rights of dissentient minorities, since there are no such rights, provided the principle be a sound one. They have no right to be talking about the rights of conscience against the just exercise of the powers of the State. They are by the very terms of the case mere grumblers. The administration of religion being one of the functions of the State, then the State must, of course, follow its own conscience, just as it does when it hangs a murderer; and the individual who, on the score of his private conscience, gets in the way of the State conscience, must get out of the way or be crushed by it. He has no right to arrest or control the action of the State conscience with his private judgment, since the former is only exercising its legitimate powers and discharging its duty. It is a mere farce to talk about the rights of an individual and unofficial conscience against the operations of a government that is acting within the scope of its appropriate powers. There can be no such rights in consistency with the existence of government. Where a government has jurisdiction it must judge of its own duties. Grant that religion comes within this jurisdiction, and that is the end of the question. The procedures in asserting and exercising it follow as a matter of course.

Our great difficulty with the doctrine of those who demand that the State shall become a religious propagandist in its school system, is with the principle that lies at its bottom, and not at all with the details of its execution, however stringent or seemingly severe, provided they are necessary to the end. Their doctrine logically commits them to the principle of State jurisdiction and State duties in respect to things spiritual; and if they refuse to accept the consequences, no matter whether they are Protestants or Catholics, then they are afraid of their own creed. If, on the other hand, they carry out the principle and make it a living and operative power, and not a mere sham for the sake of appearances, then, alas! for the real rights of conscience and the liberties of men, they land us, body and soul, into the system of *State religion*—namely, religion defined by the State, taught by the State, supported as a charge upon its treasury, and, if necessary, penally enforced by the State. This is all very well for *them*, since they always assume their religion and that of the State to be identical. How would it be if the fact were just the reverse? This question, bigotry, whether in a Catholic or a Protestant bosom, seldom has time to consider. When Protestant and Puritan New England hung witches and persecuted Quakers, and when Roger Williams was ban-

ished from his home on pain of death, things moved along very finely for the religionists in power; but not as smoothly with the victims of their mistaken and maddened zeal. The principle upon which these religionists acted, being conceded and developed, with no limitations except those furnished by itself, sets the State to doing a thing which does not belong to it and which, if it be true to its own position, will be sure to make it a persecuting power.

Macaulay well says that "the experience of many ages proves that men may be ready to fight to the death and to persecute without pity for a religion whose creed they do not understand, and whose precepts they habitually disobey." Many a dark chapter in history confirms the truth of this remark. The moment religion is in any way armed with the civil power the fatal step is taken.

We deny the rightfulness of the power in this connection by entering a universal demurrer to its action. We deny that the State has the right to tax the Jew to propagate Christianity, or to make infidels help to liquidate the expense account of a religion which they repudiate. We place this denial on the broad ground that religion in itself, in its very nature, in the processes of its culture and promotion, in its relations to God and the interests of another life, lies above and beyond the jurisdiction of the State, unless God himself has constituted that State. The State is not an exhorter, or a persuader, or a debating club, but a positive law power for secular purposes; and, hence, when it attempts to administer religion it must of necessity give to it the law force, deciding what religion is true and by what methods it shall be promoted. There is no escape from this result if we admit the principle from which it springs; and, the principle being true, then the result is right. If religious teaching is really one of the proper functions of the State, then all that is necessary to the end, of which the State itself must be the judge, is included therein. Moreover, the implications of the function need only to be fully drawn out to cover the whole ground of State religion, with all its ways and means.

To the authority of the State when acting within its appropriate sphere every citizen should cheerfully bow, supporting it, if necessary, by the sword. If it be a democratic State, the will of the majority, legally expressed, should be the rule for the whole. But when the State engages in the work of religious teaching, whether in the public school or elsewhere, and does the things which must be done to realize the end, then it not only disowns the elementary principles of a democratic government, but is guilty of a legal usurpation, against which every lover of liberty, be he saint or sinner, Protestant or Catholic, ought to protest in thunder-notes.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

NATIONS have sincere piety only in those countries where one may love God and the Christian religion with one's whole soul without losing, and especially without obtaining, any worldly advantage by the manifestation of that sentiment.—*Madame De Staël.*

WHY do the people imagine a vain thing?

OXFORD TEACHERS' BIBLES.

PRICES AND STYLES OF BINDING.

Pearl 16mo. (Size 4x5½x1¼ inches.)

(Page for Page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
500.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.25
501.	French Morocco, circuit.....	1.40
502.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	1.35
509.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	2.15
513.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	2.50
514.	As No. 513, with round corners.....	2.60
510.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.20
511½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.35
512.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	2.70
515.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined.....	4.00
515½.	As No. 515, with round corners.....	4.15

Postage, 10 cents extra.

Pearl 16mo. India paper edition. (Size 4x5½x1 inches.)

The smallest Teachers' Bible in the World.

NOS.		
514x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$3.25
515½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	5.50

Postage, 8 cents extra.

Ruby 16mo. (Size 4¼x6½x1½ inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
550.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.90
551.	French Morocco, circuit.....	2.30
552.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.20
559.	Persian Seal, solid covers, round corners.....	3.00
563.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	3.15
564.	As No. 563, with round corners.....	3.30
560.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.70
561½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.85
562.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	3.75
565.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	4.65
565½.	As No. 565, with round corners.....	4.80
566.	As No. 565½, Brown Levant.....	4.30
571.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	7.00

Postage, 12 cents extra.

Ruby 16mo. India paper edition. (Size 4¼x6½x1 inches.)

NOS.		
564x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$4.50
561½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	4.50
565½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	6.50
566x.	As No. 565½x, Brown Levant.....	6.50
571x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.50

Postage, 9 cents extra.

Nonpareil 8vo. (Size 4¼x7x1¼ inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
664.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, round corners.....	\$4.00
660.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.00
661½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.15
662.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	5.00
665.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.35
665½.	As No. 665, with round corners.....	5.50
666.	As No. 665½, Brown Levant.....	5.50
671.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	8.00

Postage, 16 cents extra.

Nonpareil 8vo. Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7x1¼ inches.)

NOS.		
664x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$5.75
661½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	5.50
665½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
666x.	As No. 665½x, Brown Levant.....	7.75
671x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.50

Postage, 11 cents extra.

Minion 8vo. (Size 5x7¼x1½ inches.)

NOS.		
707.	Persian Seal, limp, round corners.....	\$ 4.30
709.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	5.00
713.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit.....	4.70
714.	As No. 713, with round corners.....	4.85
710.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.50
711½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.65
715.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.70
715½.	As No. 715, with round corners.....	5.85
716.	As No. 715½, Brown Levant.....	5.85
721.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	9.00
722.	Seal Skin, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold solid edges, round corners.....	11.00

Postage, 18 cents extra.

Minion 8vo. Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7¼x1 inches.)

The S. S. Superintendents' Edition.

NOS.		
714x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$ 7.00
711½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	6.75
715½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.00
716x.	As No. 715½x, Brown Levant.....	9.00
721x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	12.00

Postage, 13 cents extra.

Minion small 4to. (Size 7x9½x1¼ inches.)

With Wide Margin for MSS. Notes.

NOS.		
905.	Persian Morocco, limp.....	\$ 7.50
911.	Turkey Morocco, limp.....	8.75
915½.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	12.50

Postage, 32 cents extra.

Brevier 8vo. (Size 5¼x8½x1½ inches.)

NOS.		
810.	Turkey Morocco, boards, family register.....	\$ 7.00
811.	Turkey Morocco, limp, family register.....	7.00
814.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
815½.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	10.25

Postage, 28 cents extra.

Any books from the foregoing list can be had with Denison's Patent Index. Price, \$1.25 extra.
When ordering Bibles be sure to give the numbers of those you wish sent.

Address all orders to PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., OCTOBER, 1886.

SAYS Rev. C. E. Walker in the *Christian Nation*:—

"As a nation we have suffered judgments, and will suffer yet more, far more, unless the people return to God as directed by the *National Reform Association*."

We are to understand then, we suppose, that in the matter of the Nation's returning to God, the sole direction is committed to the National Reform Association. For our part we choose to follow the directions of the word of God.

Enemies of Religious Liberty.

PRESIDENT BRUNOT says that the sixth article of the Constitution, which declares that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and the First Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," are "essential to the preservation of religious liberty, and with it, an effective guard against 'a union of Church and State.'"

Now the National Reform party proposes to change Article Six of the Constitution so that a religious test shall be required not only as a qualification to office or public trust, but to citizenship as well. That party likewise proposes to change the First Amendment to the Constitution so that Congress shall make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore the National Reformers in working for the destruction of that which is an effective guard against a union of Church and State, show themselves in favor of a union of Church and State; and in working for the destruction of that which is essential to the preservation of religious liberty, they show themselves the enemies of religious liberty.

"Reformed" Political Methods.

THE National Reformers claim that the passage of the religious amendment will thoroughly reform politics; indeed, some have gone so far as to claim that its enforcement would solve the problem of how to reach the masses with the gospel, for at the polls every voter would learn of it. Accordingly we anxiously look for the indications of reform, and the first thing that comes to our notice is that in a convention recently held in Mattoon, Ill., to secure the passage of a Sunday law, one minister stated that he could "control" 700 votes, and two other ministers stated that they could each "control" 300 votes. We conclude that the man who is able to "control" the most votes will be accounted the most successful minister of the "gospel." If they can only imbue some New York politicians with National Reform ideas, what zealous evangelists they would make! Their experience in ward politics would prove such an aid to them in this new method of preaching the gospel, since they so well know how to "control" votes. This is the kind of

"reform" that "National Reform" will give. In any unholy alliance the union takes the character of the baser party. When the church adopts the methods of the world, it must necessarily become like the world. This "reform" is a backward one. The world reforms the church according to its own model. "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned? Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned?"

Recognition of Christianity Demanded.

UNDER the above heading the *Watchman* (Baptist) of Boston, gives the following report of a National Reform meeting at Saratoga:—

"In spite of the hard rain on Monday evening, August 16, a large meeting was held at the First Presbyterian Church at Saratoga, N. Y., in the interest of the National Reform Association, the purpose of which is to extend the Christian features in our Government, and particularly to introduce the name of God and of Christ into the Constitution of the United States. Rev. W. R. Terrett, of Saratoga Springs, presided, and the vice-presidents included Rev. Drs. Herrick Johnson of Chicago; B. L. Agnew of Philadelphia, and other distinguished clergymen and laymen from all parts of the country. Addresses were made by Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, and Rev. Dr. J. P. Stevenson, of New Jersey. A letter was also read from Rev. Joseph Cook, expressing his strong sympathy with the movement, and quoting a passage from Daniel Webster's great argument in the Stephen Girard will case, in which he said that Christianity was a part of the common law of the land."

An Epistle "in Love."

IN an article on another page of this paper, we have given some facts in relation to the way in which American citizens are treated in the State of Arkansas, when they choose to keep Saturday as the Sabbath. Much the same thing has been repeated in Tennessee, and as the following will show, certain persons in Alabama, are anxious that that State shall follow suit. There are some Seventh-day Baptists down there, who properly enough go quietly about their own business on Sunday after having kept what they conscientiously believe to be the Sabbath. This has stirred up a certain "Professor T. E. Hudson," to write to the *Pick and Shovel*, a weekly paper published at Attalla, Alabama. From Mr. Hudson's contribution we clip the following:—

"Remember you are guilty when you furnish land, stock, and work to a people who habitually violate this sacred day. If they conscientiously believe Saturday to be the day of rest, let them go where that day is observed. If they cannot conform to the decision of the large majority of this Christian people, I ask, in the name of all that is sacred and good, shall we conform to the wicked decision of this hopeless few?"

And then to this exhibition of Christian charity (?) he has the exceeding abundant grace to subscribe himself "In love." But then we remember that it was entirely "in love" to their souls that for ages the Inquisition tormented men to death.

The Editor of the *Pick and Shovel* heartily indorses the very loving "Professor" as follows:—

"Prof. T. E. Hudson, in the above article, expresses our sentiments in regard to giving employment to the two or three Sabbath-breakers in our community. The men who rent them land or give them other employment, and allow them to do that work on Sunday are in a measure responsible to God.—EDITOR."

And all this because "two or three" men in a large community, choose to conscientiously disagree with the majority in a matter entirely religious, and in which they infringe upon no civil right whatever. If there is any one who thinks the spirit of Romanism and the Inquisition is dead, they would do well to look into the current Protestant literature on the Sunday question.

Study the Constitution.

A SHORT time ago the Young Men's Christian Association held a reception at their hall in San Francisco. Judge Sawyer of the United States Circuit Court "made a few introductory remarks in which he endeavored to impress upon the Bible students the necessity of studying the political creed of their country as summed up in the Constitution of the United States."

Now Judge Sawyer is one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, whose purpose it is to obtain such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall declare that this is a Christian nation, and which will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government upon an undeniable legal basis in this charter of our Government, and to introduce "into the body of the Constitution such changes with respect to the oath of office and all other matters as may be necessary to give effect to this amendment." Whether or not Judge Sawyer desired to impress upon his audience the necessity of studying the Constitution as it now is, for the purpose of discovering wherein it will have to be changed to conform to the National Reform idea which he supports, we cannot say. But if, as that party declares, our Constitution is atheistical and only represents the atheistical idea in government, it would scarcely be appropriate or consistent for Christians and Bible students to study it with any other end in view. We, too, would impress upon the people in this Nation the necessity of studying the practical creed of our country as summed up in the Constitution as it is, so far as religion is concerned. And we would also impress upon them the necessity of studying it with especial reference to the subversive doctrines of the National Reform party of which Judge Sawyer is an officer.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1886.

NUMBER 11.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

NEXT year the one hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, will be held in Philadelphia. The *Christian Statesman* is calling for a National Reform Convention, to be held at the same time, to consider means for altering that charter of American liberty, so as to overthrow all that was done by the revolutionary fathers.

DURING many centuries, every Government thought it was its bounden duty to encourage religious truth, and discourage religious error. The mischief this has produced is incalculable. Putting aside all other considerations, it is enough to mention its two leading consequences; which are, the increase of hypocrisy, and the increase of perjury. The increase of hypocrisy is the inevitable result of connecting any description of penalty with the profession of particular opinions. Whatever may be the case with individuals, it is certain that the majority of men find an extreme difficulty in long resisting constant temptation. And when the temptation comes to them in the shape of honor and emolument, they are too often ready to profess the dominant opinions, and abandon, not indeed their belief, but the external marks by which that belief is made public. Every man who takes this step is a hypocrite; and every Government which encourages this step to be taken, is an abettor of hypocrisy and a creator of hypocrites. Well, therefore, may we say, that when a Government holds out as a bait, that those who profess certain opinions shall enjoy certain privileges, it plays the part of the tempter of old, and, like the evil one, basely offers the good things of this world to him who will change his worship and deny his faith. At the same time, and as a part of this system, the increase of perjury has accompanied the increase of hypocrisy. For legislators, plainly seeing that proselytes thus obtained could not be relied upon, have met the danger by the most extraordinary precautions; and compelling men to confirm their belief by repeated oaths, have thus sought to protect the old creed against the new converts.—*Buckle.*

IN proportion as the ecclesiastics became legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.—*Dean Milman.*

Religious Legislation.

THERE is an old saying that "there are none so blind as those who will not see." It seems impossible to impress upon the minds of the National Reformers the distinction between religion and morality, or, even, that there is a difference between religion and crime. Legislation against crime is not religious legislation. It is, indeed, legislation on moral questions, but it is legislation on morality purely on a civil basis. It has been abundantly shown in the *SENTINEL* that civil Government cannot, if it would, enforce morals on a moral basis. It takes cognizance of overt actions only. It cannot sway the convictions; it cannot reform the conscience, it cannot renew the heart. If it attempts to coerce the conscience it usurps authority which belongs only to God, the *Supreme Moral Governor*. In its attempts to do so, it may persecute; it may make a class of its citizens act the hypocrite, but it cannot reach the heart on matters of morality, and much less on those of religion.

The demand of these professed reformers is that the Government shall legislate upon and decide religious questions, as well as civil. Yet the *Statesman* has the effrontery to place in its prospectus the declaration that it is opposed to a union of Church and State. This reminds us of the declaration of certain professed reformers (all change is reform with some people), who were accused of trying to destroy the marriage relation. They denied the charge, saying they believed in marriage, that is, they believed in "a heart union of two persons, marriage without the aid of judge or minister; and that when the union of heart ceased, the marriage is annulled, without the aid of a court to divorce them"! To that kind of marriage they were not opposed, neither is the vilest libertine that walks the earth, because it imposes no restraint on his passions. But that is not marriage. If such a practice obtained, the institution of marriage, and family relations, would be broken down.

And so with the Religious Amendmentists. They give the expression, "Church and State," a signification to suit their purpose, and theoretically oppose that, while they zealously advocate exactly that state of things which existed in the Old World in which Church and State were closely united. The relation of the State toward the Church in the time of Constantine, which all denominations recognize as the union of Church and State, was exactly the relation for which they are now pleading. Later, under the Popes of Rome, the full result

of Constantine's arrangement was realized, and we challenge the Amendmentists to show that the same result will not follow the arrangement for which they plead. Such a result is the natural outgrowth of their proposed arrangement.

It is always unsafe to intrust the control of civil Government to the Church—to any church—because it is contrary to the institution of the Head of the church. It is an unauthorized, and, therefore, an unhealthy, combination. It leads to churchly worldliness and worldly ambition. It is subversive of true piety and spirituality in church service. They demand that the pulpits and the churches shall make "the final decisions" in matters both *civil and religious*. We have proved this, by their own language. But that would be churchly usurpation. The highest office that Christ ever bestowed upon his servants is that of "ambassadors;" 2 Cor. 5: 18-20, and this only in regard to the gospel proclamation. We challenge the *Statesman*, and all its partisans, to produce a single sentence in the teachings of Christ and his apostles which will warrant them in taking upon themselves the offices of legislators and executives, to which they aspire. They are clamoring to have the church exercise usurped authority, and profess that it is for the honor of Christianity. We object to their demands because they are dangerous to the institutions of our Government, and to the liberties, both civil and religious, of the people.

In the *Statesman* of September 16 there is a quotation and comment as follows:—

"If Congress does not find in our Constitution a basis for Sabbath legislation, then let us elect a Congress who will find such a basis."—*Hon. John Cole, Tingly, Iowa.*

"You are more unreasonable than the Egyptians, for they did not compel the Hebrews to hunt straw where there was none, but you would require Congress to find in the Constitution what is not there, a basis for Sabbath legislation. The Constitution puts the true religion on the same level with all false religions, by prohibiting the establishment of religion or any interference with its free exercise. How can polygamy be suppressed without prohibiting a certain form of religion."

Here is considerable "food for reflection," and several points worthy of careful consideration.

1. Mr. Brunot, President of the National Reform Association, publicly declared that the Sixth Article and the First Amendment of the Constitution are necessary as safeguards against a union of Church and State. But the *Statesman*, and the entire body of workers in behalf of the proposed Religious Amendment, are unceasing in their opposition to these two pro-

visions of our Constitution. They go so far as to say (and very foolishly, too) that the First Amendment forbids the suppression of polygamy! And therefore, according to the showing of their president, they are trying to break down the barriers against a union of Church and State. And this is just what we have affirmed; they are opening the way for such a union, and when it is opened we may read the result in the history of the papacy.

2. They demand that the Constitution shall put a difference between the true religion and all false religions. But in order to do this it must first decide *what is* the true religion. This, as we have before shown, would take religion out of the domain of individual judgment, of conviction, of conscience, and decide for every individual, and that *authoritatively*, what is the religion that he must accept! They demand that the civil Government shall interfere in the free exercise of religion. But they say they want to enforce the religion of the Bible, against all false religions, or those not of the Bible. But there are several hundred religions professedly based on the Bible. Which shall be enforced as the true one? Whose religion shall be suppressed? The Mormons profess to base their entire system, polygamy included, on the Bible. To carry out such schemes, it will not be sufficient to declare that the Bible shall be adopted as the source of the only religion of the commonwealth. Such a declaration would determine no disputes on religion; would settle nothing. As we have before said, so we now say, Not the Bible, but *somebody's construction of the Bible*, will be adopted as the religion of the land. It will be a religion based altogether on human judgment and human authority, and not at all on the authority of the word of God.

To this they may not reply that all religion is based on human judgment, inasmuch as, with the largest liberty, every one depends upon his own judgment as to what the Bible teaches. That is just as it should be, for religion is a matter of the conscience, and rests between a man—every man—and his Maker. Because a man is fallible and liable to err in regard to the teachings of the Bible, shall he therefore bow to the authoritative decisions of somebody who is also fallible, and equally liable to err? According to the teachings of the Amendmentists we must answer, Yes, he shall. But when that answer is made, we have passed entirely over to the position and the teachings of the Church of Rome. We have then no recourse but to accept the infallibility of fallible men. And the Amendmentists cannot evade these conclusions of their doctrines.

3. But our model reformers profess the intention to retain the Republican features of our Government. The majority will elect the officers, and they will then, as now, elect those who will carry out their will on all public questions. The majority will always have it in their power to decide *what religion* shall be enforced by the Government. They may cause the religion of the nation to be changed at their pleasure. *The religion of the nation will then be put upon the market at every general election*, for there will then be religio-political parties; and as political questions are now can-

vassed on the stump, in the saloon, and on the street, so will religious questions then be canvassed. Our Reformers talk as if they could maintain the republic, and yet settle the religion of the country once for all time. Is there a single question of religion that has ever been settled, that remained settled in the minds of the people? Are not the people changing in regard to religion as well as to political questions? Would not candidates be put up on this and that religious issue? By such an arrangement, religion would become contemptible, and one of two things would follow: Religion would be cast out of the Government, as an obnoxious thing, and sink lower in the public esteem than it has ever stood; or, a tribunal would be instituted, analogous to the Pope and his Cardinals, who should decide all questions for the people, and their decisions would have to be taken as final. In a word, the outcome would be, a public repudiation of religion, or the adoption of a second papal system.

4. The Amendmentists persist in their affirmation that polygamy is "a certain form of religion." We affirm that it is an immorality—"a certain form" of crime. We think it has been fully proved in the SENTINEL, that polygamy is, and always was, contrary to God's original institution of marriage; that it originated with wicked men; that it was tolerated but never approved by the Lord; that Christ gave no place to it in his comment on the original marriage institution. It is subversive of that institution—a denial of the terms in which the institution was given. It is subversive of the family and of society. Marriage is not a "Christian institution," but is of original obligation—given before the fall of man, and, of course, would have always existed if man had not fallen; if the system of Christianity had never been required. It is, therefore, an institution which the Government ought to defend and maintain. Most of the States—perhaps all—have had laws against bigamy and polygamy; but it remained for the wise men of the "National Reform Association" to discover that these laws are contrary to the Constitution!

5. But we need not argue that these self-styled Reformers ignore all distinctions of crime and religion. When the SENTINEL was first placed before the public, we did argue that question. If any think that our argument was not conclusive, our proof not sufficient, we invite their attention to the following words found in the same number of the *Statesman*, September 16, 1886:—

"If Government cannot deal with religious questions, it cannot deal with the crime of murder, adultery, or theft, for these are religious questions."

We have no language at command to express our astonishment that men in this age, with every opportunity to be educated upon ethics, will put on record such declarations. And more especially men who pretend to a knowledge of Christianity. Is it possible that these people really believe that all laws against crime, against murder, adultery, and theft, are religious laws, and unconstitutional under our present Constitution? Such is their teaching. If these are religious questions, and if enacting a law against murder, is "religious legislation,"

then we must look again for conclusions. We must conclude, then, that the Constitution does not need amending, because it now warrants, and always has warranted religious legislation, because it has warranted laws against murder. Or, otherwise, our Constitution does need amending, in order that we may legally punish for the crime of murder; because laws against murder are religious laws, and those now existing are unconstitutional, because our Constitution prohibits religious legislation!

Must we, indeed, inquire if there is any distinction between crime and religion? Is there no limit to liberty short of licentiousness? Are men truly sane who demand a Religious Amendment of the Constitution, and demand the abolition of the First Amendment of the Constitution, which forbids interference in questions of religion, in order that murder, adultery, or theft may be legally restrained, or punished? These people are so wedded to a theory that they will put forth the most preposterous propositions, and expect the people to accept them without questioning.

There is one thing in regard to which we think all must agree: When men ignore the most evident and well-established *principles*, they are not safe administrators of the laws which rest upon or grow out of these principles. And there is no association of men of the present age—we will not except those who entirely deny the Bible—who toy with principles, and make them subject to their caprices, more than do the National Reformers. We have reason to hope that we shall never see their wild schemes adopted by the American people. We consider it only our duty to do all in our power to warn the people, if, by any means, such a calamity may be averted. J. H. W.

A Pernicious Fallacy.

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI—"The voice of the people is the voice of God,"—is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give "the people" a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan's lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in his word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what "the people" say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads "the people" to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done." This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.

Within a thousand years after the creation,

God saw that "the people" had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was "right in his own eyes" was destroyed by the flood.

It was "the people" who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for himself, who should honor him and keep the knowledge of his will alive in the earth, he found only one man, Abraham, whom he could select as the father of his people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people." Deut. 7:7. The majority of "the people" ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God and had in consequence been rejected by him, we find that "the people" whom God chose as his own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with him. It was "the people who said to Aaron, 'Make us gods, which shall go before us;'" and when the golden calf was made, "the people" worshiped it. It was "the people" who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt;" and it was "the people" who time and again murmured against the Lord's chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.

In the days when Christ was on earth it was his own people to whom he came, who rejected him. When he was accused before the Roman Governor, it was "the people" of Israel—God's own chosen people—who cried, "Crucify him!"

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with "the people" who constituted the State Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that "the people" were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterward made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor. "And 'the people' gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man." In this case "the voice of the people" was immediately shown to be *not* the voice of God, for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.

Still later we find that "the people" whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State "recognition." In the great empire of Rome, which filled the world, the "Christians" were so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So "the church" was "recognized" by the civil power, to the extent that "its ordinances and its laws" were enforced by "a statutory arrangement." The State undertook to "regulate the administration" of the ordinances, customs, and laws of the church "in conformity with its [the church's] constitution and object." Thus the sect which in the days of Paul was "everywhere spoken against," now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See Isa. 2:2, 3. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for "the world," was a "Christian nation." Mark you, this had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of "the people," but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of "the people"—the church—was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (2 Thess. 2:1-8), and which culminated in the establishment of the Papacy, that "man of sin," "the son of perdition," who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The falsity of that claim is shown by the fact that "the people" who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is his, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of his coming.

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the "National Reformers" use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed Amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church; so was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an Amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of

the sentiment of the Christian people of the country; all Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of "the Christian people" of the empire. Say the "Reformers," "The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation; that is what Rome became. Say they, *We will never persecute*; so said "Christian" Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.

"Woe unto you, . . . because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Matt. 23:29-32.

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called "National Reform" take heed and beware.

E. J. W.

The Principles of National Reform and of the Turk.

REV. JULIUS H. SEELYE, D. D., is President of Amherst College, one of the leading scholars and educators of the United States, and a Vice-President of the National Reform Association. In a late number of the *Forum* he discussed the question, "Should the State Teach Religion?" in which he presented the following as sound doctrine on that question:—

"Religion is not an *end* to the State. It is simply a *means* to the advancement of the State, and is to be used like any other means. To the individual person the sole question about a religion is, whether it is true; but the State only inquires whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming. From this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and religious intolerance. What kind of a religion it should employ, and how far it should carry religious instruction in its schools, is a grave question of statesmanship, respecting which Governments may very easily make mistakes—very grave mistakes. . . . But the greatest mistake any Government is likely to commit respecting religious instruction is to have none. And faith for a people is better than no faith. What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters; and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*. . . . If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and, if it is wise, it will not falter."

If a State is to adopt a religion at all, it is impossible to see how it could adopt any but the religion of the majority. Because, mark the rule, the State is not to inquire whether the religion is true, but only, "whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." Religion therefore being to the State a mere matter of policy, the religion adopted by the State must be the religion of the majority. And in that case the State is brought to the inevitable alternative, either to change its religion with every change of the majority, or else to exert its power to keep the religion which it has adopted, the religion of the majority. Where-

fore it is a most curiously interesting problem to know just how that "from this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and from religious intolerance"? And further, if this rule be such a safe preservative, how happens it that of all the States that have been on this earth, that have acted upon the Professor's theory, not one has been preserved from religious intolerance?

The fact is, that under this theory, preservation from religious intolerance is impossible. The impossibility is inherent in the theory. Of this no better proof is needed than is furnished in President Seelye's own words. He says, "To the individual person the sole question about a religion is whether it is true;" this is very properly said as to the individual, but to the State, whether a religion is true or not does not enter into the case. With the State the sole question concerning a religion is, Can it be used? Is it politic to adopt it? This at once sets the mere *policy* of the State against the *conscience* of the individual, and this too upon the very point, and the only point, where conscience or principle is or can be involved. With the State the question is not one of conscience nor of principle, but of policy solely; while with the individual the question is solely one of conscience, and of principle. And when the State goes about to set itself thus against the individual upon a question, about the truth of which it is not to inquire at all but which is to be the sole inquiry of the individual, then says Mr. Seelye:—

"What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters, and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *the law cares not for the few*."

And then, as though to prevent all possibility of a misunderstanding of his doctrine, he adds:—

"If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and if it is wise, it will not falter."

Was ever persecution or oppression for conscience' sake more plainly argued or more coolly stated?

But there is no better way of putting a theory to the test than to see it in actual practice, and this theory is now in practice in Turkey; not to the perfection, however, that it would be in this country if the National Reform party should succeed; but all it lacks is the energy of the officials whose duty it is to enforce the law. In the New York *Independent* of September 2, 1886, is a clear account of the "Turkish policy toward the Christian schools" in which we find the following practical illustration of Professor Seelye's theory:—

"It has enforced upon its Christian subjects the tax for the support of public schools, and it has opened a great number of primary and high schools for Moslems in all parts of the empire. But it has not opened a single school for Christians as provided by the law, so that the funds raised from the Christians, by taxation, go to the support of the Moslem schools of the empire. If a Christian wishes to send his children to one of the Government primary schools, he finds that the course of study consists mainly of the Koran and the biography of Mohammed;

or, in case of a high school, he finds in addition to these some elementary sciences and a little history, carefully emasculated to avoid any impression on the mind of the pupil, that there is or can be any country in the world so glorious, or so peaceful and generally happy, as the empire of Turkey. He finds also that his children must give up the study of their own native language, and must be content to study Turkish and Arabic. If, with these drawbacks, he still wishes to profit by the schools which are supported by his taxes, he finds that, except in two or three of the largest cities, no Christian will be allowed to study in a Moslem primary or high school, because the Moslems feel that it is wrong for infidels to read so holy a work as the Koran, which is the chief textbook in these schools."

Now we should like for President Seelye, in accordance with his theory, to point out any wrong in this action of the Government of Turkey. In the Government of Turkey the Koran embodies the religion which it has settled as the one which "is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." The Christians are taxed for the support and propagation of that religion. And if children of the Christian are to receive any benefit from the taxes which he is forced to pay, they must receive it from the Koran in the schools where the Koran and its religion is taught. Now the conscience of no Christian subject, there nor anywhere else, will approve of such a system in Turkey thus enforced upon Christians. But the State of Turkey is "courageous," it does not "falter," and therefore upon Mr. Seelye's theory it must be "wise." If the few Christians there, or anywhere in behalf of those who are there, lift up their voices against this practice, then the Turkish Government may say in Mr. Seelye's own words, "We keep in view here the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*." And what reply can be made by Mr. Seelye or those who favor the National Reform movement in this country?

Now, if this theory is wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? But the practical working of this theory is precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to establish in this country. Are the Americans ready for it? To what is this country coming when such monstrous doctrines are so plainly avowed by such men as Professor Seelye? Is America ready to copy after the "unspeakable Turk"? A. T. J.

American Romanism.

THE *Catholic Mirror* of September 18 contains a letter from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he announces to the clergy that Pope Leo XIII. has formulated certain prayers which are henceforth to be "said" after every Low Mass, instead of those now in use. These prayers are to be "said kneeling in all the churches of the world after the celebration of Low Mass." Such is the *order* of the Pope. We do not know the nature of the prayers that are now declared to be out of date, nor why it is that they have lost their efficacy; but we have the text of the prayers which are now declared to be official, and we will favor our readers with them. The first is as follows:—

"O God, our refuge and our strength, graciously look upon thy people who cry to thee; and through the intercession of the glori-

ous and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, of Blessed Joseph, her Spouse, and of thy holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, in thy mercy and kindness hear the prayers which we pour forth for the conversion of sinners, and for the freedom and exaltation of Holy Mother the Church. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

The reader will notice that in this prayer Christ is not altogether ignored. After "the faithful" have implored the intercession of Mary, Joseph, Peter, and Paul, "and all the saints," they are permitted to close with a reference to the name of Christ. It requires no great discernment to see that among Catholics the name of Christ is not considered to be "above every name."

The second prayer is as follows:—

"Holy Michael, the Archangel, defend us in the battle; be our protection against the wickedness and snares of the devil. Rebuke him, O God, we suppliantly beseech thee; and do thou, O Prince of the heavenly host, by the divine power drive into hell Satan and the other evil spirits who wander through the world seeking the ruin of souls. Amen."

Among the "other evil spirits" who are thus charitably consigned to hell are, of course, all those who oppose the Catholic Church; for "the church" regards all souls as ruined, who reject her dogmas and ceremonies. The two prayers, taken together, coming as they do from the Pope himself, afford a fair view of Catholicism at its best. But this is not all. The Cardinal closes with the following announcement:—

"His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. grants to all who recite these prayers, as aforesaid, 300 days' indulgence."

Here we have the veritable antichrist itself revealed. The granting of indulgences fitly accompanies the rejection of Christ as sole Mediator. Here we find the Pope promulgating, as a matter of course, the very things which aroused the holy zeal of Luther, and against which the Reformation was directed; yet to-day not one Protestant in ten thousand will give the matter a second thought. Professed Protestants now regard Catholicism as a "branch" or grand division of the Christian church, and the National Reformers urge the necessity of courting its favor, and even of submitting to repeated rebuffs if in the end they can but secure the alliance of the Catholic Church. When we consider the increased civilized population of the world in the last four hundred years, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Rome has already more than regained that which she lost by the Reformation. We think we are warranted in drawing the following conclusions:—

1. The Roman Catholic Church is the same to-day that it was four hundred years ago. The general diffusion of knowledge has caused her to change her tactics, but she still works for the same ends as then, and secures them. What she accomplished then by force she now gains by flattery. But her doctrines and principles have not changed in the least, and she is just as ready to use force now, when she can, as she was then.

2. Protestantism is now little more than a name. "Protestants" as a class have ceased to "protest." They are content with the

knowledge of the fact that they are the descendants of those who did protest, and they view with indifference the rapidity with which the Church of Rome is extending its conquests over the world.

3. This indifference must arise from the fact that "Protestantism," so-called, has degenerated until it is very like Catholicism. If men were actuated by the spirit of the Reformers, they would as strongly protest against the evils of "the church" to-day, as those noble men did. The Reformation has been deformed, and that which the Reformers regarded as the enemy of the truth, their children are ready to embrace as the conservator of truth. Since "Rome never changes," Protestantism must have changed, in order to bring about this state of things.

4. "National Reform" is Romanism under a different title. The Reformers withdrew from Rome, because Rome and they were antagonistic. If there had been oneness of thought and purpose, instead of antagonism, they would not have separated from Rome. But National Reformers are now seeking an alliance with Rome, and so anxious are they for this alliance that they are determined to press their suit even though they may be repeatedly rejected. If the separation of the true Reformers from Rome indicated their antagonism to her, certainly the desired union of the National Reformers indicates their likeness to her.

5. If professed Protestants are so nearly like the Catholics that they cannot see any menace to the liberty of our country in the insidious advances of the Papacy; and if a degenerate Protestantism is anxious to ally itself with Catholicism, that both "branches" of "the church" may be thereby strengthened,—then when this degenerate Protestantism, under the name of "National Reform," shall have succeeded in its purposes, it will certainly adopt the *tactics*, as it already has the *principles*, of Rome, and will not scruple to persecute those who cannot be won to its support by milder measures. Indeed, the National Reformers themselves concede this point, for Mr. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation*, says that it is most certainly right "to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed." Papal Rome, in her highest period of exaltation, never did more than this. When a Government or power of any kind enforces laws and customs against the conscientious convictions of upright citizens, it is persecution for conscience' sake. The National Reformers make no secret of their adherence to principles like this.

Therefore we say that when National Reformers shall have succeeded in their designs, they will have nothing other than an exact image of the Papacy. Scripture is not silent upon this point. The leopard beast of Rev. 13:1-8 is quite generally admitted to represent the Papacy; if any doubt this, their doubts may easily be silenced by the most convincing proof. The power brought to view in the verses following is said to "make an image" to this papal beast, and that image we now see in process of construction. Once men predicted

from this prophecy just such an image to the Papacy, in this country; now they do not need to refer to the prophecy to be aware of the fact. It certainly is time for all who value civil and religious liberty to sound the alarm. And the urgent necessity of warning the people against the adoption of papal principles, whether under the name of Romanism or National Reform, is made still more evident by the following announcement of divine wrath upon all who take any part in such iniquitous alliances:—

"If any man worship *the beast and his image*, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14:9-11.—*Signs of the Times*.

Some Features of the Reformed Constitution.

We propose to give the American people a view of our Constitution as it will appear when amended to conform to the views of the National Reformers. This is a matter that concerns every one, and will do so more and more, as the National Reform party grows in influence and power. In this matter of reforming the Constitution, and thereby the nation, these National Reformers begin with the Preamble. At the first National Convention ever held by the National Reformers—Alleghany City, Pa., January 27, 28, 1864—a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking the United States Senate and House of Representatives to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in substance as follows, the Amendment in brackets:—

THE PREAMBLE.

"We, the people of the United States [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian Government], and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It will be seen at a glance that this work of "reforming" the Constitution, cannot stop with the Preamble. For as the amended Preamble demands "a Christian Government," it follows that the whole Constitution will have to be made to conform to this idea. This is exactly the aim of the Reformers. In that same memorial to Congress, immediately following the reformed Preamble as above quoted, is the following:—

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and all other matters, should be introduced *into the body of the Constitution* as may be necessary to give effect to these Amendments in the Preamble."

To present some of these changes, which will be necessary to make the body of the Constitution conform to the reformed Preamble, is the purpose of this article. As the purpose of this reformed Preamble is declared to be "to constitute a Christian Government," it necessarily follows that all who are to have any part or lot in the Government must be Christians. Therefore Section 1 of Article XIV of Amendments to the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read thus:—

All *Christian* persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside, etc.

This then being a "Christian Government," all officials in the Government will have to be Christians. Therefore Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read as follows:—

No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, *be a Christian*, and an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Section 3 of the same Article will have to read the same way in regard to Senators, thus:—

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, *be a Christian*, and an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

In relation to the President, Section 1, Article II, will have to read about as follows:—

No person except a *Christian*, and natural-born citizen of the United States, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years resident within the United States.

In the matter of the oath this same Section will have to be reformed so as to read something like this:—

Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath of office: I do solemnly swear "*in the presence of the eternal God, that during the whole term of my office I will serve the same eternal God to the utmost of my power, according as he hath required in his most holy word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and according to the same word, will maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus; AND SHALL ABOLISH ALL FALSE RELIGION CONTRARY TO THE SAME; and shall rule the people committed to my charge according to the will and command of God revealed in his word; and shall procure to the utmost of my power to the Church of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace;*" and that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This is a genuine National Reform oath, and is strictly according to the doctrines which that Association preaches. To accord with this, Article VI will have to be reformed about as follows:—

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by *the aforesaid oath, substituting in each case the title of his own office for the words "President of the United States;"*

AND THE TEST OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION SHALL be required as a qualification to every office or public trust under the United States.

This will necessitate the reform of Article I of Amendments to the Constitution, so that its first clause shall read thus:—

Congress shall make laws respecting the establishment of the Christian religion; prohibiting the free exercise of all other religion and of all irreligion; and abridging the freedom of speech and of the press in religious matters.

It is certain that all these changes in the body of the Constitution will not be made without universal and almost endless controversy. To say nothing of the open and confirmed opposition that there will be, it is evident that among those who would favor the changes, there will be great differences of opinion upon the exact shape and wording in which the changed Articles shall be couched. Nor will the controversy be confined simply to the called-for changes in the Constitution. As the reformed Preamble declares the "revealed will" of Christ to be the "supreme law," the changes in the Constitution will be but the culmination of a grand national discussion as to what is the revealed will of Christ, and just how it is to be made applicable in national affairs. This is only what the National Reformers expect. In the *Christian Statesman* February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan writes on this subject, as follows:—

"The changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole frame-work of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens; an outpouring of the Spirit might soon secure it."

But that the National Reformers expect such a condition of affairs as this, is not all. They are doing, and will do, their very best to create it; not out of love for the Bible, nor for Christianity, but for their own self-aggrandizement. This is clearly revealed by Mr. Milligan in words immediately following the passage just quoted. He continues:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decision of most points will be developed there. 'Many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion.'"

Exactly! the churches are "Zion," and "the law shall go forth of Zion." Therefore in the national canvass of "the whole frame-work of Bible legislation," when it comes to the changes in the body of the Constitution, and thus the culmination of the discussion, in the form of law, then Congress, the State Legislatures, and the Supreme Courts will have to receive that law from the churches and pulpits, and the law in its final form will have to be according to the mould or the indorsement of the "leaders and teachers" in the churches, for "the law shall go forth of Zion, and the final decision will be developed there." And then after this august de-

liverance the Rev. Mr. Milligan straightens himself up and admiringly pats himself, and all his fellows, upon the back, after this style:—

"There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy, than the leaders and teachers in our churches."

In connection with these words are certain scriptures which we would commend to Mr. Milligan's consideration: "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Prov. 27:2. "For men to search their own glory is not glory." Prov. 25:27. "Not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." 2 Cor. 10:18. But whether they will heed these scriptures or not there is one thing certain: that is, by the evidences here presented, it is perfectly clear that the direct aim of the leaders in the National Reform movement is the exaltation of themselves into a hierarchy as absolute as is that of Mormonism, or as was that of the Papacy in the supremest hours of the Dark Ages. They deliberately propose to make themselves the arbiters in every controversy, and the interpreters of Scripture on all points, moral, civil, theological, and ecclesiastical. And mark, their decision, it is plainly declared, will be "final." There can be no appeal, for there is none higher than they. There can be no appeal to God, for is not the Lord King in Zion? and don't they represent Zion? and isn't the law to go forth of Zion? Thus they would make themselves the vicegerents of the Lord, and the fountain of all law. And just now, and in view of these propositions of the National Reformers, the American people would do well to remember the truth stated by Dean Milman in relation to what is simply a matter of fact in all history: "In proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments."

Upon the surface, some of the changes in the Constitution, which we have marked, appear very innocent. It is only when we go below the surface that the real iniquity of the thing appears. When the real purpose of the movement is discovered, it is found that the Christianity that is to become national, is just what this hierarchy shall declare to be Christianity; that the "revealed will" which is to be the supreme law of the land, is what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will; it is seen that in submitting to the proposed test of the Christian religion, it is not such a view of that religion as a man's own conscience approves, but such a view as the hierarchy approves; that in submitting to this proposed revealed will as the supreme law, it is not to that revealed will as a man may read it in the Scripture and interpret it by the best light of his own conscience, but to what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will, as interpreted by their own will. Then there is no more the liberty of every man worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but all must worship (?) according to the dictates of the hierarchy.

Then when these "intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy leaders in our churches" shall have succeeded in thus placing themselves in the position of supreme arbiter of all controversies,

and supreme interpreter in all points of the revealed will of Christ, it will be necessary to reform Section 7 of Article I of the Constitution, so that it shall read about as follows:—

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the President, shall, before it become a law, be presented to "the leaders and teachers in our churches," whose "decision" shall be "final."

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President, and to "the churches and pulpits" of the United States, and the "decision" of "the leaders and teachers in our churches" shall be "final."

There, fellow-citizens, are some of the features that our Constitution will present, when it shall have been reformed according to the doctrines of the National Reform party. We do not say that the work is at all complete, but this is all that we have space to present at this time. We have not forced a single point, for every change which we have marked, we can sustain by the writings of the National Reformers themselves. We have simply presented the logic of the National Reform propositions. If the National Reformers object to our conclusions, they will have to lay down different propositions. If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask them to wait till the next issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, when we promise, if the Lord will, to present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt.

A. T. J.

National Christianity in America.

THE following is an article under the above heading, which was written by President T. G. Apple, D. D., LL.D., of Franklin and Marshall College, and printed in the *New York Independent*, August 5, 1886. We insert the article entire, not for the purpose of indorsing it, for the position of the SENTINEL on this subject is well known, but to show the rapidly growing tendency among "leaders of theological thought," toward a national religion. We are free to say that we seriously apprehend the danger of which Mr. Apple grants the possibility, that is, that "such an organization" would "become, in the end, tyrannical," and we are sure that all who love true liberty will do well to share with us the apprehension. We derive no comfort at all from President Apple's doubt that the "danger would ever become realized." The danger has been too often fearfully realized.

"The United States has taken the lead in the establishment of a great free republic. It now remains to organize a national Christianity in this great republic. The history of Christianity clearly reveals its tendency to nationalize itself. Whilst it is catholic in spirit—an interest that will, in the end, bind all nations in one common brotherhood—yet in working out this result it adapts itself to the order of human

life. As nationality is one of the integral forms in which humanity comes to expression in history, Christianity becomes national in Christianizing the nations. Even in those ages when the centralizing tendency of the Roman hierarchy was in the ascendancy, a decentralizing tendency manifested itself in the national churches of modern Europe. This was one of the factors that wrought against the Hildebrandian theory of a consolidated theocracy that tended to crush out the autonomy of national life itself. It appeared most conspicuously in the rise of Gallicanism in the time of Charlemagne, which reappeared in the reforming councils, and was not suppressed until it yielded, for a time at least, in its struggle with Ultramontanism in the late Vatican Council. But it appeared as a strong factor in the other nationalities of Europe in the general revolt against the papacy in the sixteenth century.

"This tendency found expression in the establishment of national churches in modern Europe, in which the pendulum swung over from the one extreme of the Church asserting undue authority over the State to the opposite extreme of the State exercising undue authority over the Church. In America, when a new nation came to its birth through the confederation of the colonies, history moved on without an established national Church. This separation of Church and State came about, in part, by a preconcerted plan, but mainly, we think, by reason of actual necessity. In the minds of some, doubtless, it means that Church and State shall move forward entirely separate from each other, on parallel planes; but it has become already apparent that the two must stand in very intimate relationship as vital interests that have to do with one common life. The question now is, whether we cannot have a national Christianity without a national Church in the strict sense of the term—that is, a form of organization in which Christianity shall exert its full moulding power upon the national life without the entangling alliances that accompany the union of Church and State in the Old World.

"If this is to be reached, in our judgment, the organization required must conform, more or less, to our political organization; for it will be found, we think, that this law has also ruled in the history of Christianity, that in its outward adaptation to the national life it follows the general features of the civil Government, thus in a good sense becoming all things to all men. Our Government is neither a consolidated democracy nor a consolidated monarchy, but a federal republic. What is there to hinder the Christian churches of this nation from forming a federal union, conforming in its main features to our civil national Government? Let the churches organize a general representative body, composed of delegates appointed by the different denominations, for the purpose of mutual co-operation, and the consideration of such questions as pertain to the common interests of Christianity in its relation to the nation. Let it be an advisory body merely, without legislative functions, to meet at stated times or as occasion calls for it. There are questions upon which a deliverance is already urgently called for. It is high time, for in-

stance, for the churches of this country to express a judgment on the subject of marriage and divorce, on the observance of the Sabbath, and other matters of a similar character, which pertain to both Church and State. Other questions would arise that pertain more especially to the Church itself, such as co-operation in the work of foreign missions, evangelization in our large cities, meeting the attacks of infidelity, etc., etc.

"Such an organization may have to come, perhaps, through initiatory stages and steps. Such movements are setting in all around us, movements that look to a closer union of churches of kindred types, the American Congress of Churches, etc. But it seems to us the times are ripe for a more general movement. History is moving very rapidly in this age; and the danger is that the other factors of our national life may advance more rapidly, and gain a better advanced vantage-ground, than Christianity. We believe a beginning could be made by a voluntary free conference of one or two leading men from each of the different religious bodies of the nation, who might successfully discuss a plan of union. There would doubtless be difficulties in the way, one of the greatest of which would be as to what bodies should be included in such a free union, but these would soon disappear.

"Dangers also would be apprehended. The chief of these, perhaps, would be that such an organization, like our national Government, would tend to increasing influence and power, and become, in the end, tyrannical. But we do not believe this danger would ever become realized. Freedom has made such progress in history that we are not much disturbed by the fear of our national Government usurping tyrannical power, and there would be even more watchful care in reference to such a central organization of the churches. If, however, such a fear should prevail, let the experiment be made of an occasional congress, conference, or council. Possibly it might be found that, like the councils in the Roman Church, which has learned wisdom by long experience, or the associations and consociations in our earlier and later Puritan history, such occasional councils would meet the wants in the case.

"At any rate there is a widespread sense of the want of some such union of our American churches as shall give utterance to a national Christianity in America, and for this reason we have here given expression to a few thoughts which, though not at all new, may aid, if but a little, in keeping the general subject before the Christian public through the widely-read columns of the *Independent*."

THE doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.—*Macaulay*.

Publishers' Column.

ACTIVE AGENTS WANTED

—:IN:—
Montana, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Washington,
Oregon, Nevada, California, and the
Islands of the Pacific,

—:FOR:— FAST-SELLING SUBSCRIPTION BOOKS,

—SUCH AS—
THE GREAT CONTROVERSY
Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation,
ILLUSTRATED BY 21 FULL-PAGE CUTS,
Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation,
Man's Nature and Destiny,
The Marvel of Nations,
Plain Facts for Old and Young,
Man, the Masterpiece,
Home Hand Book,
In the Heart of the Sierras,
The Yo Semite Valley, the Big Tree Groves, Etc., Illustrated,
Breakfast, Dinner, and Supper,
Parsons' Hand Book,
Sunshine at Home,
AND OTHER FAST-SELLING BOOKS.

Liberal Commissions Paid. Exclusive Territory Given.

SEND STAMP FOR DESCRIPTIVE CIRCULARS,
TERMS TO AGENTS, ETC.
Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,**
TWELFTH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

PLAIN FACTS FOR OLD AND YOUNG

—EMBRACING—
**NATURAL HISTORY AND HYGIENE OF
ORGANIC LIFE,**
BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,
*Member of the British and American Associations for the Advance
ment of Science, Editor of "Good Health," and Author
of Various Works on Health.*

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED,
CONTAINING OVER 600 OCTAVO PAGES.

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

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

100 CHOICE HEALTH THOUGHTS.
"Plain Facts" is sold only by subscription.—Agents wanted.
For sample copies, territory and terms, address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
General Agents for the West. Oakland, Cal.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE BI-MONTHLY, 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 affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and house-keepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by every member.

Price, 50 Cents per Year.
Address, **PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.**

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, : : : : : 50 cents.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 2s.
Address, **American Sentinel, 1059 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.**

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., NOVEMBER, 1886.

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 Oct. 7, Rev. Robert White presents an article on "Jesuitry in Politics;" but if anybody wants to see the perfection of Jesuitry in politics, just let him watch closely the National Reform movement and its methods.

PROFESSOR McALLISTER, the Treasurer of the National Reform Association, in a late financial appeal in behalf of National Reform, says that National Reform lecturers "are listened to by large numbers and with deeper interest than ever before."

We have obtained some particulars of the trial of those men in Arkansas for working on Sunday. We regret that we have not space to give them in this paper; but we received them so late that we are compelled to lay the matter over till our next issue, when we promise to give our readers some specimens of Arkansas justice.

THE North Ohio Methodist Episcopal Conference lately held at Canal Dover, unanimously requested the Bishop to appoint Rev. J. P. Mills to the work of "District Secretary of the National Reform Association." The Bishop, Mallalieu, made the appointment, and shook hands with Mr. Mills, wishing him "abundant success" in his new work.

THE Catholic Church in the United States has learned to talk of the union of Church and State as an "unholy union." Whether the Catholics have learned this trick from the National Reform party, or whether the National Reform party has learned it from the Catholics, we shall not take upon ourselves to precisely decide; but this we know that the expression comes with equal grace from both classes.

A "MONTHLY reading" lately issued by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union on the subject of "Our National Sins," says: "A true Theocracy is yet to come," and "the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers, hence I pray devoutly as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women." This point of "a true Theocracy" we commend to the consideration of President Brunot, who claims that it is a false charge that the design of National Reform is to turn this Republic into a Theocracy. As for the other, we should like for the author of the "reading," or some one else, to tell us how many law-makers there can properly be in a true Theocracy? Perhaps, too, we might remark that the scheme of "the enthronement of Christ in law-makers" by ballot, is but the expression in another form of the National Reform method of bringing the gospel to the masses, as developed in Mrs. Woodbridge's Chautauqua speech.

Convicted by Their Own Testimony.

In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, President Brunot said: "No State can rightly attempt to compel the consciences of its citizens with a particular religion, and, as we believe, no particular religion can rightly attempt to use the State to compel men's consciences to its belief."

Then we should like to know what Mr. Brunot means by acting as the head of a movement that has in view no other aim than that of compelling men's consciences with a particular religion, namely, the Christian religion? Or does the gentleman mean to convey the impression that Christianity is not a particular religion? For it is the sheerest and most absurd sophistry to say that men's acts may be compelled with a particular religion without compelling the conscience; because when in conformity with a particular religion, men who do not believe it at all are compelled to act as though they believed it; this is nothing else than to compel the conscience.

By the way, for the especial benefit of Rev. M. A. Gault, we might in this connection indulge just a little in a "clashing voices" exercise. With the above quotation from President Brunot, please read the following from Vice-President E. B. Graham:—

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its *Christian* features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and . . . stay there till they die."

And the following from the *Christian Statesman*:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality."

Now if it be right for a Government to so persistently enforce upon all, the laws of Christian morality, that the refusal to submit can only result in perpetual banishment to some wild, desolate land, then we should like to know how Mr. Brunot's proposition can be true? But President Brunot's proposition is true. Therefore it is perfectly clear that the aim of Vice-President Graham, the *Christian Statesman*, and the whole National Reform movement, is but to cause the State and the Christian religion to do what cannot rightly be done.

What Do They Mean?

SAYS Rev. M. A. Gault, in his "Clashing Voices," *Statesman*, September 9, 1886:—

"It is outside the province of human Government to supervise the thoughts and opinions of any one. But it is the duty of Government to supervise the morals of the people, as far as their outward acts are concerned. . . . This movement is prompted by love to humanity, laboring to persuade the Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals."

Does Mr. Gault mean to say that God's perfect system of morals only takes supervision of the outward acts? Such is the real logic of his argument. Here is his *major premise*: It is the duty of "the Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals." Here is his *minor*: "It is the duty of Government to supervise the morals of the people, as far as their outward acts are concerned." From these premises, the only conclusion is: Therefore "God's perfect system of morals" supervises the morals of the people

only as far as their outward acts are concerned." And this conclusion is confirmed by his other statement, that, "It is outside the province of human Government to supervise the thoughts and opinions of any one."

But Mr. Gault does not mean at all what his argument proves, he knows full well, and he means it so, that "God's perfect system of morals" does most decidedly "supervise the thoughts and opinions" and the very intents of the heart of every soul of man. Now if the Government is to adopt God's perfect system of morals, how can it possibly avoid the supervision of the thoughts and opinions of its subjects? If it is the duty of human Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals, which supervises the thoughts and opinions of every one, then how can such supervision be outside the province of human Government? Having adopted as its supreme law, a system of morals that supervises the thoughts and opinions of men, upon what principle will the Government stop simply with "the outward acts"? Upon no principle whatever.

If perchance Mr. Gault should not mean either of these deductions, but really means that under God's perfect system of morals the Government shall touch only the outward acts, then it must be that he means that the Government shall uproot the tree of immorality in this nation, by plucking off the leaves; that the inside of the national cup and platter shall be made clean by a Governmental washing of the outside. Then we simply cite him to the words of Christ to the Pharisees on this very subject. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." Matt. 23: 25, 26.

But whether the gentleman means any or none of these deductions, the *fact* is that in the statements which he has made, he has involved himself in a muddle out of which he can never get, in harmony with God's perfect system of morals.

THE ecclesiastical power has no scruple in employing in its own favor those arms of which it deprecates the use, the employment of which it treats as impious usurpation, when put forth against it.—*Dean Milman*.

"THE lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day" Isa. 2: 11.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER, 1886.

NUMBER 12.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

By entering into society men never intended, nor could intend, to make their religion a matter of civil cognizance. For religion being a prevailing disposition of the soul to universal holiness, it can neither be increased nor lessened by any political laws. Besides, how can any person, with the least color of reason, pretend that I have a right to judge for myself, and yet punish me for using it?—that is, for doing what he acknowledged I had a right to do. To plead for it, would be a contradiction in terms.—*William Livingston, 1765.*

OUR glorious reformers, when they broke through the fetters of superstition, effected more than could be expected from an age so darkened. But they left much to be done by their posterity. They lopped off, indeed, some of the branches of popery, but they left the root and stock when they left us under the domination of human systems and decisions, usurping the infallibility which can be attributed to Revelation alone. They dethroned one usurper only to raise up another; they refused allegiance to the Pope, only to place the civil magistrate in the throne of Christ, vested with authority to enact laws, and inflict penalties in his kingdom. And if we now cast our eyes over the nations of the earth we shall find that, instead of possessing the pure religion of the gospel, they may be divided either into infidels who deny the truth, or politicians who make religion a stalking horse for their ambition, or professors, who walk in the trammels of orthodoxy, and are more attentive to traditions and ordinances of men than to the oracles of truth.

The civil magistrate has everywhere contaminated religion by making it an engine of policy; and freedom of thought and the right of private judgment, in matters of conscience, driven from every other corner of the earth, direct their course to this happy country as their last asylum. Let us cherish the noble guests, and shelter them under the wings of an universal toleration. Be this the seat of unbounded religious freedom. She will bring with her in her train, industry, wisdom, and commerce. She thrives most when left to shoot forth in her natural luxuriance, and asks from human policy only not to be checked in her growth by artificial encouragements.—*Samuel Adams, 1776.*

Is It Blindness, or Duplicity?

THE student of human nature must needs meet with many perplexities, for there are so many phases of the workings of the human mind that it seems almost impossible to account for them all, or even to classify them. It is a standing matter of surprise that educated men, of fair intelligence, will become so addicted to riding a hobby that they cannot see their own inconsistency, though it may be apparent to others; or discover any force in the most tangible proofs, if they do not harmonize with their own pet theories. And a more persistent set of hobby riders cannot be found than the advocates of the Religious Amendment of our National Constitution, who style themselves "National Reformers."

In a late number of the *Christian Statesman*, one of its regular correspondents, "the Rev. M. A. Gault," quotes from the AMERICAN SENTINEL the following words:—

"The National Reform Party proposes to make Christ king of the United States, and yet they maintain that the Government must still remain a Republic. Will the *Christian Statesman*, or some other advocate of this reform, tell us how this thing can be?"

And then he proceeds to comment on this query, which comment we propose to notice. He says:—

"If you would study your Bible more before you spring into the arena to champion the anti-National Reform cause, you would know that the model of Government which Christ gave to Israel was much more republican than that of the United States. All their rulers were elected by the people, while there are one hundred thousand of ours in whose election the people have no choice."

It is a custom with this class of people, when they are not able to render a reason, to insinuate or openly declare that their opponents are ignorant, and have never studied the Bible. But one thing is noticeable, that while they make many assertions concerning the "republic of Israel," the election of its officers, etc., and continue to accuse their opponents of ignorance, prejudice, and a failure to study their Bibles, they studiously ignore all our requests to give *the proofs* to sustain their assertions. We have made tangible statements concerning Moses, Saul, David, Nehemiah, and others, setting forth facts which utterly demolish the claims of the "reformers;" and while they pass by these statements without a notice, people will soon learn what estimate to put upon their sneers and accusations of ignorance. It is time that they began to give some evidence that they themselves are not lamentably ignorant. Mo-

ses, Aaron, Joshua, Samuel, Saul, David, and through the latter a whole line of kings, were all chosen of God without even the knowledge of the people. Will "the Rev. M. A. Gault" soon comply with our reiterated request to point out some of the rulers of Israel who were elected by the people? He says: "All their rulers were elected by the people." We only ask him to name a few. And we shall be indebted to him if he will point out the circumstances of some of these elections, and tell us if there were opposing candidates! We shall anxiously wait for information on these points.

His knowledge of Government in the abstract must be quite limited, judging from his use of terms. "All their rulers were elected by the people, while there are one hundred thousand of ours [rulers] in whose election the people have no choice." If the people have no choice in their election, by whom are they elected? His confusion of language is probably owing to the fact that he does not apprehend the difference between election and appointment. Our executives have the power to appoint certain officers (not rulers); but the people make the laws giving the executives that power, and then elect the executives who may exercise that power. Will Mr. Gault, or any of his co-laborers, point out a parallel to this in their hypothetical "republic of Israel"? This statement concerning the election of one hundred thousand of our rulers is more than erroneous—it is positively foolish. One charge that our model reformers make against our Government is, that the will of the people is the supreme authority. But, lo, we are now informed that the power of the people in this nation is not so extensive and complete as it was in their model "republic of Israel." How will they reconcile their statements? They may indeed drown the voice of their opponents by crying, "Great is Diana, of the Ephesians." This will be as pertinent as any answer they have yet attempted to give.

Mr. Gault says:—

"You complain that the *Christian Statesman* does not notice your opposition. It is because your arguments have not touched the real questions at issue."

But while so many readers differ with you, would it not be well to notice them enough to *prove* that they have not reached the questions at issue? If we have not touched the real issues, you could easily show our failure. Why not try it, and let the readers of the *Statesman* judge for themselves? Perhaps your readers are all of that class who will take all your statements for granted, without asking for proof; but we doubt it.

What are the real questions at issue, and where may they be found? Are they contained in your platform of principles, in the speeches made in your conventions, and in the editorials and communications in the *Statesman*? These we have noticed, and at considerable length. If we have not touched the real questions at issue, it is because your party has studiously concealed them. We have pointed out the unavoidable consequences to follow the legal enforcement of the usages of Christianity; the tendency of their demands that religious tests shall be made qualifications for office, and that the First Amendment of the Constitution shall be repealed. We have even gone so far as to notice at some length the statement of "the Rev. M. A. Gault" himself, that it may cost us another war to blot infidelity out of our Constitution! And all this, he dares to assert, does not touch the real questions at issue. We can but repeat the question at the head of this article—Is it blindness or duplicity?

Now if, in their platform, their speeches, and their publications, we have failed to find the "questions at issue," then we ask him to frankly state some of these questions, and we promise to promptly notice them.

But again he says:—

"It may be exhilarating for the editor of the *SENTINEL* to stand on his head and turn hand-springs before the public upon so serious and important a question; but as his true friend we beg of him, we implore him, to keep out from under the wheels of the National Reform movement."

Now that sounds better, and is much more consistent than what he said before. True, his figures are rather low and unseemly, but his exhortation is pathetic and touching! We advise him to hereafter confine himself to exhortation altogether. As an expositor of the Bible he has proved himself a sad failure. His references to history are a series of blunders. Only in exhortation does he seem to have any chance of success. Yet even in this line it may be well for him to direct his efforts to those who have not studied the subject of "National Reform" as we have, and who have not yet so fully discovered its fallacies.

We are far from being convinced that there is any danger in getting "under the wheels of the National Reform movement." In that stage it is not dangerous. But if they ever get the power they covet, to control this Government, and through it to enforce by law their theories of religion, to the exclusion of those of others who are as honest, as conscientious, as well versed in Scripture, and every way as worthy as they, then we may well fear, for somebody will surely be crushed under the wheels of their modern Juggernaut.

J. H. W.

THE *Christian Nation* greatly prides itself that it was enabled lately to present an article on National Reform, which was written by a boy of fourteen years. But in this it has not much to boast of, for if the National Reform arguments generally, be judged by any real merit that they possess, or the knowledge of the principles of government which they display, they might well all be thought to be excoctigated by boys of fourteen years of age.

Infidel Views of the "Logic of Christianity."

THE following letter was received at this office September 29. As the *SENTINEL* aims to do full justice to National Reform, we insert the letter entire.

SPARTA, Ill., Sept. 20, 1886.

THE *SENTINEL* EDITORS—*Gents*: I have received several numbers of your journal. I do not intend to become a subscriber. I have met with your best arguments before, in the contest with infidels. When I want to refresh my mind I will send for the *Boston Investigator*, or some paper of that class. I would rather have the strong statement of the infidel argument as infidels put it, and not the feeble statement of infidelity as made by Christians. You are in the wrong company. You are fighting your own side of the cause. Abbott, of the *Index*, said in my hearing, "The logic of Christianity is under your movement. If I were a Christian I would be with you, but as I am not, I oppose you with all my might." (I give his words from memory.) In the judgment of most Christians you are on the wrong side; so also in the judgment of honest infidels. Better shinny on your own side. But if not, I prefer to get the Simon-pure infidel arguments against national Christianity. You can add nothing to them, so please stop the paper. I have had samples enough.

Yours respectfully,

D. O. FARIS.

Mr. Faris is, of course, a National Reformer, and thinks, even as he says, that we are "in the wrong company." And to prove that we are in the wrong, he quotes Mr. Abbott's statement that "the logic of Christianity" is behind the National Reform movement. The value of Mr. Faris's proof can be better appreciated when it is understood what Mr. Abbott considers the logic of Christianity. According to Mr. Abbott's estimate, then, what *is* the logic of Christianity? Everybody who is at all acquainted with Mr. Abbott's opinion of Christianity, knows that what he holds to be the logic of Christianity is the destruction of all liberty, cruel oppression, and persistent and bloody persecution. With such a view as this of what the logic of Christianity is, we say that Mr. Abbott is literally correct when he says that the logic of Christianity is behind the National Reform movement. This, all opponents of that movement will realize as surely as the movement shall prove a success.

But the Christianity which Mr. Abbott sees is not the Christianity of Christ, nor that of those who follow Christ: the Christianity which Mr. Abbott sees, in common with Colonel Ingersol, the *Investigator*, and all other of Mr. Faris's "honest infidels," is the Christianity (?) of Romanism, of the Inquisition, of the torture-chamber, of the thumb-screw, the rack, and the stake. Everybody knows that this is the Christianity, and that this is "the logic of Christianity," which these "honest infidels" never weary of holding up before the world. That such is the view that Mr. Abbott holds in relation to what Christianity is, we prove by his own words, in the very speech to which Mr. Faris refers. The speech was made at the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, February 1, 1872. We quote from *the record*. In that speech Mr. Abbott said:—

"The reaction you will create will open the eyes of millions to the fact that *Christianity and freedom are incompatible*."

With such views of Christianity we do not wonder at all that infidels say that if they believed in Christianity they would take their stand by the side of National Reformers. If we believed that "Christianity and freedom are incompatible," and then believed in Christianity, we should instantly take our stand by the side of Mr. Faris and his fellow—"reformers;" for the utter destruction of freedom in free America is the logic of National Reform. Now, if National Reform represents Christianity, then "the logic of Christianity" does lie behind the National Reform movement. If Mr. Faris accepts Mr. Abbott's definition and views of Christianity, he is at perfect liberty to do so, and we freely yield to him and to National Reform all the comfort they can get from such Christianity, and from Mr. Abbott's hypothetical Christian indorsement of the National Reform movement. As for us we accept no such definition, nor any such views, of Christianity, nor of the logic of Christianity; and because we do not, but believe in Christianity with all our heart, we oppose National Reform with all our might. Nor do we expect to fall into the mistake into which Mr. Abbott seems to have fallen, of confounding Christianity and National Reform.

Further, Mr. Faris kindly informs us that, "in the judgment of most Christians" we "are on the wrong side." Mr. Faris may be correct in his estimate of "the judgment of most Christians." But that is nothing to us. We are not trying to shape our course according to the judgment of the multitude, even though that multitude be composed of "most Christians;" that would be contrary to the principles of both the Bible and sound journalism. "The judgment of most Christians" is not the final judgment. Our sole endeavor in all our work and in all our ways, is to so conform to the word of God that we may at the last receive the approval of the judgment of God. Besides this, we know full well that "in the judgment of most Christians," William Lloyd Garrison was "on the wrong side" when he declared that slavery was wrong and should be abolished. "In the judgment of most Christians" John Wesley was on the wrong side. "In the judgment of most Christians" Martin Luther was on the wrong side. "In the judgment of most" of the popular and powerful religionists of the day, the apostles of Christ were on the wrong side, and were commanded "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right *in the sight of God* to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." And so say we to Mr. Faris, and to all those whose "judgment" he seems to be empowered to express.

And, too, our correspondent courteously invites us to "stop the paper." This paper was started expressly to expose the iniquity that lurks in the National Reform movement, and to awake the American people to the danger that threatens their liberties should that movement succeed. The paper has now been running but a year, yet it has had a total circulation of more than 136,000 copies, and we are happy to know that its influence is being felt even in

National Reform circles, and *we do not propose to stop the paper.* Sorry are we, Mr Faris, that we cannot please you, but in our judgment and perhaps "in the judgment of most Christians" in this matter, "you are on the wrong side"—at least as yet.

A. T. J.

The American Hierarchy.

IN our remarks on the "National Reformed Constitution," in the SENTINEL for November, we closed with these words: "If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask them to wait till the next issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, when we promise, if the Lord will, to present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt." We now propose to fulfill our promise.

Let it be observed that the immediate effect of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, will be to make the ten commandments the supreme law of the land. In a word, the ten commandments will then be the Constitution of the United States. This is what the National Reformers propose, and here is the proof. In the *Christian Statesman* of February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan presented an article in which he asked the question, "How is the Amendment to be carried out practically?" And in the answer to this question he made this statement:—

"In brief, its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will become unconstitutional."

Now the ten commandments are the law of God. The ten commandments are, for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. It is the moral law. Every duty enjoined in the Bible, that is to say every duty of man, finds its spring in some one of the ten commandments. This law takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To violate that law, even in thought, is sin. For said Christ: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." And again: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Matt. 5 : 21, 22, 27, 28. And "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." 1 John 3 : 15.

This is sufficient to show that the ten commandments deal with the thoughts, with the heart, with the conscience. By this law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:20); in fact, God's own definition of sin is that "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. And as already shown, the law may be transgressed by thinking illy or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so.

Let it also be observed that the National Re-

formers not only propose to make the moral law, the supreme law—the Constitution—of the Government of the United States, but they propose to make themselves the supreme interpreters of that law. Again we quote Mr. J. C. K. Milligan's words:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do with *shaping* and *forming* opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points."—*Christian Statesman*, February 21, 1884.

Now there is absolutely nothing that a man can do, or say, or think, that does not involve a moral question. The National Reformers propose to bring about in this Government, a condition of things by which they shall have "much to do" with "all moral questions," and "with interpretations of Scripture on moral points;" which is only to say that they propose to have "much to do" with what every person does and says and thinks. Therefore it is proven to a demonstration that the direct aim of the National Reformers is to establish in this nation a hierarchy perfectly patterned after the infamous model of the Papacy.

We have not the space, nor will it be considered necessary, in confirmation of this, to take up the ten commandments one by one. One of them will be sufficient, and we shall choose the one upon which the National Reformers themselves make their greatest argument for national guilt, that is,

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Bear in mind that in the National Reformed Government, the fourth commandment will be a part of the Constitution of the United States, because the ten commandments will be the Constitution. Then everybody in the United States will have to keep the fourth commandment, for to refuse to do so will be rebellion. Now let no one misunderstand us. Our opposition is not against the ten commandments, nor against any one of them. We believe most decidedly in keeping the ten commandments, in every jot and tittle, according to the word of Christ, and we teach men so. In short, we believe in keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We strictly practice in accordance with this belief. Therefore what we shall ever say on this subject, let no one misconstrue into an opposition to the ten commandments, nor to Christ, nor to the Bible. Our opposition is solely to the National Reform movement, and to the hierarchy, the establishment of which is the object of that movement. We believe in strictly keeping the moral law, in deed, in word, and in thought; but we decidedly oppose the project of the National Reformers to put *civil* government into the realm of *morals*, to make civil rulers moral governors, and to make a set of ambitious clerics the supervisors of men's thoughts and the conservators of men's consciences.

Suppose then that the National Reform movement has proved a success. The ten commandments are the supreme law—the Constitution of the Government—and the National Reformers set about to accomplish one of the "practical results" that is sought by their Amendment, namely, "the perpetuation of the Sabbath."—*See Resolutions, Pittsburg Convention.* The Na-

tional Reformers expect a "universal gathering" and "discussion" about the changes that will be made in the Constitution, and this question of the bearing of the ten commandments will, in the nature of the case, be the chief, because the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the "Reformed" Constitution. And as the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the Constitution, and as the fourth commandment of the ten is to have the chief place in the efforts of the National Reformers, it follows that the bearing of the fourth commandment will be the one great national question in the National Reformed Government. What then says the commandment? Let us read:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

Even now there is no little discussion about the meaning of this commandment. There are the Jews who profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the seventh day—Saturday. There are the National Reformers and the evangelical Christians generally who also profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the first day—Sunday. Then between these extremes there lies a third class who are not Jews, neither are they classed as "evangelical" Christians, yet they profess to be Christians, and profess to keep the fourth commandment—we refer to the Seventh-day Baptists and the Seventh-day Adventists. These insist that to obey the commandment, the seventh day must be kept even by Christians. There are yet others who believe that Sunday should be kept with some degree of sacredness, but with no reference whatever to the fourth commandment.

It is evident that all these discordant views of the bearing of the fourth commandment, are not going to be reconciled by the adoption of the proposed Amendment to the Constitution. And as that amendment will then be a part of the National Constitution, the question of the meaning of the commandment, and of what day is to be observed in obeying the commandment, will have to be decided in the Supreme Court of the United States. And mark, if the Supreme Court be left to itself, if the court be allowed to sit simply as a court of law, when this question should come up for decision it would do so as a question of law and not of theology.

Considering it therefore as a question of law, the court would be guided by the acknowledged rules that are laid down for the interpretation of law and statute. Let us try the interpretation of the commandment by some of these rules. Chancellor Kent, in his "Commentaries," lays down this rule:—

"The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import."

The first question then is, Are the words of the fourth commandment such as are of common use? Look at them and see. The only

answer that there can be is, They are. There is not a word in the commandment that is not of common use. Then the judges have no alternative, the words are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary significance and import.

The Hon. John A. Bingham was appointed by the House of Representatives, to conduct the impeachment of President Johnson. In the course of that trial Mr. Bingham stated this rule of law:—

“When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction. They must be followed.”

The words of the fourth commandment, being of common use, must be plain. Then the court is allowed no latitude for construction, it must follow the plain words of the statute.

What is the purpose of the fourth commandment? It is to secure the keeping of the Sabbath-day. For the first sentence is, “Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.” But what day is the Sabbath-day? The commandment itself tells: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Remember that we are asking these questions simply from the standpoint of law, and not of theology. We are simply examining it as it will have to be examined should the National Reform movement succeed. These are the very questions that the judges of the Supreme Court will have to ask. And if they are to follow the rules of law, and the words of the then Constitution, these are the very answers that they will have to make. The judges must follow the words of the statute. As jurists they can do nothing else. Therefore if the court be left to itself and to the principles and rules of civil law, as everybody knows that Saturday is the seventh day, it follows inevitably that as surely as the National Reform movement succeeds, everybody in these United States will have to

KEEP SATURDAY FOR THE SABBATH.

But is that what the National Reformers desire to accomplish? Is that what they are aiming at? No, indeed, not they! For the court is not to be left to itself and to the rules of civil law. Such a decision as that, the National Reformers never will allow. And right here is where their hierarchy comes in. Here is where they appear as the “interpreters of Scripture” on “all questions of morals.” Here is the point at which they step in with their “final decisions.” For as soon as such an interpretation as that is proposed, they will assert that that is not the *correct interpretation*. They will say that the rules of *civil law* do not apply in the interpretation of a *religious* statute; that this is a theological question and it must be decided by theological definitions. They will say that the unanimous verdict of the theological world on this question is that the expression “seventh day” in the fourth commandment does not mean the definite seventh day of the week, but “one day in seven,” “one day of rest after six days of work;” that in the Jewish dispensation the day kept was Saturday, but in the Christian dispensation the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, that it is in fact the distinctive badge of Christianity; that this has been by Constitutional amendment declared to be a

Christian nation, and as this commandment is a part of the Constitution, it must be interpreted by the rules of Christian theology.

Can there be any doubt as to which way the question will be decided? Not the least. It will have to be decided in favor of the prevalent Christianity, and the “Christian Sabbath” will thus be declared to be the Sabbath in this Government. But by whom is the question decided? by whom is the final decision made? Not by the judges but by the theologians. Not by the court but by “the leaders and teachers in our churches.” And that is nothing else than the rule of a hierarchy.

Here, and by this, we are brought face to face with another important consideration—in fact, the culmination of National Reform purposes and aims. It is this: As all these questions are to be decided not as questions of law, but of theology; and as “the leaders and teachers” in the churches are to be the interpreters on moral and theological points; it follows that the success of the National Reform movement will be the destruction of all distinction between law and theology, between civil and religious affairs. All the courts of the land will be—not courts of law but—*courts of theology*; and every question of Government and of life will become a theological question, subject to the supervision and the “final decision” of these “leaders and teachers” in the churches. All of which will be but to turn this Government into a man-made theocracy, with the leaders of National Reform in the seat of God. In short, it will be but a new form of the Papacy under the title of National Reform.

Even when this question of the Sabbath is decided, we do not believe that all the Seventh-day Baptists, and all the Seventh-day Adventists, and all the Jews in the country, are going to accept and conform to the decision without coercion. But coercion will be persecution, while if there is no coercion the Reformed Constitution will be set at defiance, and all the work of the National Reformers will be in vain. But as we are not to suppose for a moment that they are working in vain, it follows that the success of National Reform will certainly bring persecution. But that is only to carry out the spirit of the Papacy.

If these people who do not want to keep Sunday should all set themselves to work together to obtain an amendment to the Constitution, by which they could and would, under pains and penalties, compel all persons in the United States to keep Saturday and submit to their “interpretation” and “final decision” upon all questions of Scripture and morals, the National Reformers would at once pronounce it an invasion of human right and religious liberty—in short, they would pronounce it an infamous proceeding. And so should we. Therefore when the National Reformers deliberately propose to do this very thing, only putting Sunday instead of Saturday in the law, and bend every element to its accomplishment, then we do likewise pronounce that an infamous proceeding. And so should every one who has any regard for human right and liberty of conscience.

If there be any such thing as logical deductions from clear statements, we believe that we

have fulfilled our promise to show that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this Nation. A. T. J.

National Reform vs. the Kingdom of Christ.

WE notice in the *Christian Instructor* of September 30, an exposition of the International Sunday-school lesson for October 10, which is at variance with the avowed views of the *Instructor* on National Reform. The *Instructor*, we are sorry to say, belongs to the ministerial corps that has in all ages labored for a form of civil government founded on persecuting principles. The exposition to which we refer is on John 18:36: “Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.”

The expositor remarks, “This is an avowal by Christ that he is a king, but it is an intimation also that he does not claim to be a king in the sense in which the Jews charged him. Yet it is of such a nature that Pilate in his ignorance of spiritual things would not understand what was meant by the statement ‘that it was not of this world;’ hence he added, ‘If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews.’”

The expositor remarks, “It is not, like other kingdoms, established and upheld by the power of officers and soldiers. . . . As it is a spiritual kingdom so it is maintained and propagated not by carnal weapons but by spiritual weapons. Its life and strength are in its principles and not in its material force.”

Very good, and yet the *Instructor* is laboring to have the Nation to declare in the Constitution that Jesus Christ is mediatorial ruler of the Nation, and to support that rule with the military power of the Government. The *Instructor* in the exposition referred to, declares that the kingdom of which Christ spoke is not to be enforced by the “power of officers and soldiers,” and yet labors for that very purpose.

The kingdom that Christ set up he declared was not one for which he would summon his “servants to fight,” yet the *Instructor* and the National Reformers would call to the support of this kingdom all the bayonets of this mighty Nation. When Peter in the madness of his national reform zeal drew his sword in the defense of the kingdom of Christ, this glorious spiritual King commanded Peter to sheathe his sword. He would not permit the shedding of a single drop of blood in the support of his kingdom, and healed by a miracle the wound inflicted by Peter. But the *Instructor* and the National Reformers generally, propose to establish in this Nation the kingdom of Christ, by the whole mighty power of this Government; and as they themselves avow, at the expense of as much if not more blood, if necessary, than was shed for the destruction of slavery.

If the Constitution of the United States is amended as these Covenanters desire, a violation of the proposed amendment would require the summoning of the whole military power of the Government. When the South sought to overthrow the Constitution, two millions of men marched to sustain it. It is this same force the

Instructor invokes for the support of a kingdom Christ himself declares is not of this world. Christ forbids his servants to fight for his kingdom, while the *Instructor* countermands his orders, and if need be would call out the whole military power of a Government of this world to sustain a kingdom which is *not* of this world.

The National Reform movement is but an attempt to revive the principles of the Covenanter Church which have languished for two hundred years, and proposes to engraft these principles upon the Constitution of the United States so that the power of the Government can be used to enforce them. In a word, they desire to see the army of the United States march as did the armies of Scotland and England to the support of "Christ's crown and covenant."

ORIENT.

The American Papacy.

DURING the past year, there has been largely circulated a book entitled "Our Country," that has excited a great deal of attention throughout the United States. The book was written for the American Home Missionary Society, its object being to present "facts and arguments showing the imperative need of home missionary work for the evangelization of the land." In a startling, as well as splendid, array of facts, it presents the growth, the size, the resources, and the perils of our country.

Among these perils the author rightly places Romanism, and by many excellent quotations proves that it is indeed a peril. We quote a passage or two:—

"The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience*. Nothing is dearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX., in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: 'The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State.' The same Pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematized 'those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,' also 'all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.'"

"The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O'Connor: 'Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.' . . . The Archbishop of St. Louis once said: 'Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.'"

"Cardinal Manning advises Romanists throughout the world to enter politics as *Romanists*, and to do this especially in England and the United States. In our large cities the priests are already in politics, and to some purpose. . . . We are told that the native Catholics of Arizona and New Mexico are not as energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these territories. True, but they are *energetic enough to be counted*. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often *much more*."

All this and much more is true of Romanism. And although there is just cause for fear that Romanism will yet wield civil power here, and that the principles of Romanism will yet be allowed by the laws of this nation, yet we are

certain that it will never accomplish this of itself nor in its own name. We are perfectly assured that if ever Romanism gains such power in this Government, it will be through the mediumship and by the instrumentalities of the National Reform party; for, as crafty, as cruel, as bitterly opposed to our free institutions as Rome is, as this book shows she is, and as men know that she is, yet the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with her, and enlist her in the promotion of their scheme of so-called reform.

We are not in this bringing against the National Reformers a railing accusation; we simply deal with facts, and the logic of facts. And in saying that the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with Romanism in America, we only state the sober truth. Please read the following statement from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman*, of December 11, 1884:—

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

What the *Statesman* designates as "political atheism," is nothing more nor less than the present form of Government, and the present Constitution, of the United States. To oppose National Reform is to them sheer atheism; and to oppose the kind of Government which they indorse is political atheism. That no religious test shall be required of a civil ruler, is declared by Rev. M. A. Gault to be "the infidel theory of Government."—*Statesman*, December 24, 1885. The "theory of Government taught in our National Constitution" is declared by Rev. A. M. Milligan to be "the infidel theory."—*Speech in the New York Convention*.

Again the *Statesman* says:—

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

It is beyond question, therefore, that what the *Statesman* means is that, whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate with the National Reformers in the scheme of the establishment of National Christianity in the United States, the National Reformers "will gladly join hands with them." But the Roman Catholics are always ready to co-operate in that thing. That is one of Rome's clearest characteristics. Rome hates our present form of Government and our present Constitution as heartily as do the National Reformers. Rome, too, would readily enough brand our present system of Government as "political atheism," if the National Reformers had not already done it for her. And everybody may rest assured that the National Reformers will have the pleasure of "gladly" joining hands with Rome, just as soon as they shall have gained a position of sufficient importance to make it to the interest of Rome to join hands with them. In fact, this is exactly what Roman Catholics are commanded to do. In his Encyclical published only last year, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church, and all Catholic writers and journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the view of the above prescriptions."

NATIONAL REFORM AND ROMANISM IDENTICAL.

From the above quotations from the *Statesman* it is seen that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity. National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be re-modeled before this National Christianity can be established; to re-model our Constitution and legislation is the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what "all Catholics" are by the Pope *ex-cathedra* commanded to do, and not to lose sight of it for an instant. Therefore, what the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome are identical, and why should they not "gladly join hands"?

But that the National Reformers will gladly join hands with Rome, is not all of the story—not near all. They actually and deliberately propose to make overtures to Rome for co-operation. They actually propose to make advances, and repeated advances, and even to suffer rebuffs, to gain the help of Rome in their Romish scheme of "National Christianity." Now to the proof of this. In the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, says:—

"This common interest [of all religious people in the Sabbath—Sunday] 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 proffers, and the time is not yet come when the Roman 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."

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the National Reformers. They are not only willing to make the advances, but are willing to be subjected to "rebuffs," and, being rebuffed, to make "repeated advances" to overcome the coquetry, and gain the treacherous favor of "the mistress of witchcrafts," "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth"! And why this willingness? Because, "It is one of the *necessities* of the situation"—and the italics are his. Shades of Wickliffe, and Luther, and Zwingle, and Milton, and Wesley, and of all the martyrs! was there ever in the world a more humiliating, a more contemptible surrender to the Papacy? How many of the American people are ready to join in it? But know of a surety that every one who joins in the National Reform movement thereby joins in a scheme for the delivery of this free land into the bloody hands of the Papacy. Just here please read again the quotations from Dr. Strong's book, at the beginning of this article, and see whether the National Reformers in

joining hands with Rome do not equally with Rome show themselves the enemies of the United States Government, and of American institutions—the enemies of human right and human liberty.

It is true, as Mr. Scovel says, the National Reformers do now receive somewhat cool treatment, and perhaps some rebuffs. The Catholic Church does not to any considerable extent directly aid in the National Reform movement. She is too crafty for that. She knows as well as they, that "it is one of the necessities of the situation," and she is determined to have the surrender come from them. We personally know a gentleman, who, riding on the railroad not long since, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, "What is your church going to do with the Religious Amendment movement? are you going to help it forward? are you going to vote for it?" "Oh," said the priest, "we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants, we let them do all that. They are all coming to us, and we only have to wait."

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and such it will to all appearances remain until the National Reformers have done the work; till they, by repeated advances and in spite of repeated "rebuffs," have come to her and made the proper surrender. Because she knows that were she now to actively engage in the enterprise, it would arouse suspicion, and the success of National Christianity would be seriously compromised. But let the Reformers do the work, as they are doing, and bring the matter to the point of being *voted* upon, then there will be found at the polls every Catholic voter in the United States, casting his ballot for the Religious Amendment, which, in the words of the Pope, will "cause the Constitution of" the United States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church," and by which, as the Archbishop of St. Louis says, "heresy and unbelief" will become "crimes," and will be "punished as crimes," as in the "Christian countries" of Italy and Spain.

It may be of interest to inquire, What was the subject which drew from Mr. Scovel this expression of willingness, if not anxiety to gain the co-operation of Rome?—He is writing of a movement of the Catholic Church in Europe, for the strict observance of Sunday, or, as Macaulay says of the Puritan reign under the Commonwealth, Mr. Scovel "will call it Sabbath." It is to compel everybody to keep Sunday that the National Reformers want the Constitutional Amendment, and legislation under it. Now, as the Catholics in Europe are earnestly engaged in this enterprise, and as the National Reformers in America are engaged in it, the question occurs to the National Reformers, "Why shall we not join hands with the Catholics in America, so that we can win? True it is, we may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for the time has not come when the Roman Church will strike hands with other churches—as such; but *the time has come for us to make repeated advances and gladly accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it.* It is one of the necessities of the situation. For without the

help of Rome, we cannot amend the Constitution; without the help of Rome, we cannot compel people to keep Sunday. But if we can enlist with us the powerful hand, and the masterly organization, of Rome, our success is assured." That is the sum and substance of this proposition of the National Reformers.

SOLD INTO THE HANDS OF ROME.

Although the Catholic Church apparently takes no very active interest in this movement itself, we may rest assured that there is not a single writer, nor a single official, of the Catholic Church, from the Pope to the lowest priest in America, who ever "for an instant" loses sight of the movement, or of the "prescriptions" which the Pope has given in view of it.

Then when the matter comes to the enforcement of the laws, what is to hinder the Catholics from doing it, and that, too, in the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our own cities and at our very doors, defends the "Holy Inquisition." And when, by Constitutional Amendment, the refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to surrender to the Catholics, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case, alone, ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

It is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by "the necessities of the situation," to unite with Rome, having, *by the help of Rome*, gained those ends, it will be impossible, *without the help of Rome*, either to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy.

Lord Macaulay made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

"It is impossible to deny that the polity of the church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. . . . The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of Statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

And it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression that the National Reformers deliberately propose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, or anything else, out of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

We know that a good many people have regarded the AMERICAN SENTINEL as exerting itself to no purpose, because they think there is no danger of the success of National Reform. But in the National Reform party *allied with Rome*, there is danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday—the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—the danger is increased and is imminent. In view of these facts there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, the ill-informed zeal of thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws, will be induced to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it, and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it.

We say that if the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. If they have not religion enough to lead them to do it without the aid of civil laws to compel themselves to do it, then let them have laws to compel *themselves* to do it. But Heaven forefend that they shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask by which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws, and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome.

The success of the National Reform movement will be the success of Rome. Therefore, to support the National Reform movement is to support Rome. How many, then, of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme? A. T. J.

WE are the first people in the world who have had it in their power to choose their own form of Government. Constitutions were forced on all other nations by the will of their conquerors, or they were formed by accident, caprice, or the overbearing influence of prevailing parties or particular persons. But, happily for us, the bands of British Government were dissolved at a time when no rank above that of freemen existed among us, and when we were in a capacity to choose for ourselves among the various forms of government, and to adopt that which best suited our country and people. Our deliberations on this occasion were not directed by the overgrown authority of a conquering general, or the ambition of an aspiring nobility, but by the pole star of public good, inducing us to prefer those forms that would most effectually secure the greatest portion of political happiness to the greatest number of people. We had the example of all ages for our instruction, and many among us were well acquainted with the causes of prosperity and misery in other Governments.—*David Ramsay.*

"THE weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

We Believe, Therefore We Speak.

A SUBSCRIBER addresses us as follows:—

"I like your paper very much, and think the demand for just such a paper is very urgent. But I see that in all of your papers you write as though Jesus Christ was a real character, and the Bible all truth. . . . Go to the bottom, and then tell us if you do not think that all the gods, devils, etc., were made by man."

In answer to this, we can only say that in all our papers we have written just what we believe,—that Jesus Christ is a real character and that the Bible is all true. We do not say that we have gone to the bottom, but we do say that we have gone far enough to be perfectly assured that *all* gods, devils, etc., were not made by man. We are certain that God made man and all things that are, except the devil and his works. Lucifer made himself a devil: God made him a cherub. It is because we so firmly believe the reality of Christ and of God, and the truth of the Scriptures, that we write as we do in opposition to the National Reform movement. God and Christ command us to keep the commandments of God. That, we propose ever to do, but the National Reform party proposes to compel us, and all other people in the United States, to keep that which is not a command of God at all. Christ directs us to "Render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and unto God that which is God's." But the National Reform party proposes to compel all people in the United States to render to Cæsar not only that which is Cæsar's, but also to render to Cæsar that which is God's. Christ said: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The practice of the National Reform party is, whatsoever ye would *not* that men should do to you, do ye *that* to them. Therefore respect to God, to Christ, and the Bible; and the defense of the rights of those who wish to respect these and the natural rights of man—these are the principles upon which the AMERICAN SENTINEL is founded, and in accordance with which it is conducted. We are only happy that in all our papers our readers can discern that God and Christ are written of as real persons, and the Bible as true.

COTTON MATHER said: "New England being a country whose interests are remarkably in-wrapped in ecclesiastical circumstances, ministers ought to concern themselves in politics;" and among the fruits of it there was the Salem witchcraft executions. And says Bancroft: "The power of the ministers over the magistrates, having now no effect but to narrow and restrain, reposed no longer on the energy of religion, but on superstitious veneration. It is the beauty of truth that nothing can rest upon it but justice. The ministers, desirous of unjust influence, could build their hope of it only on error; and the struggle for greater freedom of mind—the struggle against superstition, and against the slavish interpretation of the Bible—was one with the struggle against their dominion in the State. . . . And to the ministers, in their self-righteousness, it never occurred that vanity and love of power had blinded their judgment."—*History of the United States, chap. 30, par. 14, 15.*

Publishers' Department.

Renewal of Subscriptions.

WITH this issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL many thousand subscriptions will expire. Please examine the little yellow tab on your paper. The date printed opposite your name tells to what time your subscription is paid. If it reads, *Dec., '86, or Jan., '87, please send us your renewal immediately.*

Terms: single copy, per year, post-paid, 50 cents; or with "Marvel of Nations," to either old or new subscribers, one year, \$1.25.

In order to increase the circulation of the SENTINEL, the Publishers make the following *liberal offer* for 1887, when taken in clubs:—

5 to 9 copies, 1 year, each 40c.; 6 months, 20c.; 3 months, 15c.
10 or more, " " 30c.; " " 15c.; " " 10c.
100 or more, " " 25c.; " " 15c.; " " 10c.

All papers in a club should go to one name and address.

We are pleased to note with what favor this important paper is meeting at the hands of the reading public. It has reached a regular mail circulation of *ten thousand copies* monthly, while many copies are being used in the tract distributors and city mission work, etc. The total number of AMERICAN SENTINELS printed this year is 136,000 copies. We hope to print 500,000 copies during the coming year.

OUR GENERAL AGENTS.

Australia—International Tract Society, *Bible Echo* Office, Rae and Scotchmer Sts., North Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia.
British Guiana.—Joseph R. Brathwaite, 37 Brickdam, Georgetown, and Thos. E. Amsterdam, 10 Church St., New Amsterdam, B. G., S. A.
California Tract Society—1067 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.
Canada Tract Society—M. L. Cushing, Sec'y, South Stukely, P. Q.
Colorado Tract Society—Cor. 31st and Champa Sts., Denver, Colo.
Dakota Tract Society—A. H. Beaumont, Sec., Vilas, Miner Co., Dak.
District of Columbia—International Tract Society, W. H. Saxby, Agent, 1831 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
England—*The Present Truth*, 72 Heneage St., Grimsby, Eng.
Florida Tract Society—502 West Monroe St., Jacksonville, Fla.
Hawaiian Islands—International Tract Society, Honolulu, H. I.
Illinois Tract Society—3652 Vincennes Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Indiana Tract Society—No. 32 Cherry St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Iowa Tract Society—1315 E. Sycamore St., Des Moines, Iowa.
Kansas Tract Society—Box 160, Ottawa, Franklin Co., Kan.
Kentucky Tract Society—Harry Rupert, Sec., West Clifty, Grayson Co., Ky.
Louisiana—International Tract Society, Pitt Street, between Valmont and Leontine Streets, New Orleans, La.
Maine—Mrs. A. J. Goodrich, South Lancaster, Mass.
Michigan Tract Society—Hattie House, Sec'y, Battle Creek, Mich.
Minnesota Tract Society—338 Lake Street E., Minneapolis, Minn.
Missouri Tract Society—2339 Chestnut St., St. Louis, Mo.
Montana—Walter Harper, Box 95, Helena, Mont.
Nebraska Tract Society—Fremont, Dodge Co., Neb.
New England—N. E. Tract Society, South Lancaster, Mass.
New York Tract Society—J. V. Willson, Sec., Box 113, Rome, N. Y.
New Zealand—Edward Hare and Eld. A. G. Daniells, Upper Queen Street (Turner Street), Auckland, N. Z.
North Pacific—N. P. Tract Society, Box 18, East Portland, Oregon.
Norway—*Sundhedsbladet*, Christiania, Norway.
Ohio Tract Society—L. T. Dysert, Sec., 259 Adams St., Toledo, Ohio.
Pennsylvania Tract Society—No. 5 Madison St., Wellsville, N. Y.
Society Islands—John I. Tay, Papeete, Tahiti, Society Islands.
Switzerland—Elder W. C. White, 48 Weiherweg, Basel, Switzerland.
Tennessee Tract Society—Springville, Henry Co., Tenn.
Texas Tract Society—Mrs. Lee Gregory, Secretary, Denton, Tex.
Upper Columbia—U. C. Tract Society, Walla Walla, W. T.
Vancouver Island—Bernard Robb, Victoria, B. C.
Vermont—Lizzie A. Stone, South Lancaster, Mass.
Virginia—Lillie D. Woods, Quicksburgh, Va.
Wisconsin Tract Society—1029 Jenifer St., Madison, Wis.

OUR COUNTRY,

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

By U. SMITH.

Author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and Other Popular Works.

This is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a

HISTORICAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a

CHAIN OF PROPHECY,

Of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the Prophet of God, hundreds of years ago. THE SUNDAY QUESTION, MODERN SPIRITUALISM AND NATIONAL REFORM are prominent among the topics ably discussed in this work.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type and elegantly bound. Price \$1.00.

The publishers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of "The Marvel of Nations" whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with their paper, one year, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1069 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

OXFORD TEACHERS' BIBLES.

PRICES AND STYLES OF BINDING.

Pearl 16mo. (Size 4x5 1/4 x 1 1/4 inches.)

(Page for Page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.25
500.	French Morocco, circuit.....	1.40
501.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	1.35
502.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	2.15
509.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	2.50
513.	As No. 513, with round corners.....	2.60
514.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.20
510.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.35
511 1/2.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	2.70
512.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined.....	4.00
515.	As No. 515, with round corners.....	4.15
515 1/2.	Postage, 10 cents extra.	

Pearl 16mo. India paper edition. (Size 4x5 1/2 x 1 inches.)

(*The smallest Teachers' Bible in the World.*)

NOS.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$3.25
514x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	5.50
515 1/2 x.	Postage, 8 cents extra.	

Ruby 16mo. (Size 4 1/4 x 6 1/2 x 1 1/2 inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.90
550.	French Morocco, circuit.....	2.30
551.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.20
552.	Persian Seal, solid covers, round corners.....	3.00
559.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	3.15
563.	As No. 563, with round corners.....	3.30
564.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.70
560.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.85
561 1/2.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	3.75
562.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	4.65
565.	As No. 565, with round corners.....	4.80
563 1/2.	As No. 565 1/2, Brown Levant.....	4.80
566.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	7.00
571.	Postage, 12 cents extra.	

Ruby 16mo. India paper edition. (Size 4 1/4 x 6 1/4 x 1 inches.)

NOS.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$4.50
564x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	4.50
565 1/2 x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	6.50
566x.	As No. 565 1/2 x, Brown Levant.....	6.50
571x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.50
	Postage, 9 cents extra.	

Nonpareil 8vo. (Size 4 1/2 x 7 1/8 x 1 1/2 inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, round corners.....	\$4.00
664.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.00
660.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.15
661 1/2.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	5.00
662.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.35
665.	As No. 665, with round corners.....	5.50
666.	As No. 665 1/2, Brown Levant.....	5.50
671.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	8.00
	Postage, 16 cents extra.	

Nonpareil 8vo. Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7x1 1/4 inches.)

NOS.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$5.75
664x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	5.50
665 1/2 x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
666x.	As No. 665 1/2 x, Brown Levant.....	7.75
671x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.50
	Postage, 11 cents extra.	

Minion 8vo. (Size 5x7 1/2 x 1 1/2 inches.)

NOS.	Persian Seal, limp, round corners.....	\$ 4.30
707.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	5.00
709.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit.....	4.70
713.	As No. 713, with round corners.....	4.85
714.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.50
710.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.65
711 1/2.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.70
715.	As No. 715, with round corners.....	5.85
716.	As No. 715 1/2, Brown Levant.....	5.85
721.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	9.00
722.	Seal Skin, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold sides, round corners.....	11.00
	Postage, 18 cents extra.	

Minion 8vo. Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7 1/2 x 1 inches.)

The S. S. Superintendents' Edition.

NOS.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$ 7.00
714x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	6.75
711 1/2 x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.00
715 1/2 x.	As No. 715 1/2 x, Brown Levant.....	9.00
716x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	12.00
721x.	Postage, 18 cents extra.	

Minion small 4to. (Size 7x9 1/2 x 1 1/4 inches.)

With Wide Margin for MSS. Notes.

NOS.	Persian Morocco, limp.....	\$ 7.50
905.	Turkey Morocco, limp.....	8.75
911.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	12.50
915 1/2.	Postage, 32 cents extra.	

Brevier 8vo. (Size 5 3/4 x 8 5/8 x 1 1/2 inches.)

NOS.	Turkey Morocco, boards, family register.....	\$ 7.00
810.	Turkey Morocco, limp, family register.....	7.00
811.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
814.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	10.25
815 1/2.	Postage, 28 cents extra.	

Any books from the foregoing list can be had with Denton's Patent Index. Price, \$1.25 extra.
When ordering Bibles be sure to give the numbers of those you wish sent.

Address all orders to PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., DECEMBER, 1886.

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.

HAVING won the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the National Reformers are now courting the Salvation Army.

WE would again call attention to the fact that the SENTINEL is stereotyped, thus enabling us to furnish back numbers in any desired quantity. Already several editions have been printed of some of the numbers.

By the evidence which we present in this number of the SENTINEL, it is apparent that the National Reform movement is nothing else than a new Papacy; therefore, there is now an urgent demand for the vigorous revival of true Protestantism. The SENTINEL earnestly hopes to continue its protestations.

MASSACHUSETTS has fallen into line with Arkansas and Tennessee in the work of persecution, and certain men in Worcester are to be tried for working on Sunday, after having conscientiously observed the seventh day—Saturday—as the Sabbath. Massachusetts has not a very enviable character in the matter of persecution. It was from Massachusetts that Roger Williams and others—women too—were banished; it was in Massachusetts that the Baptists were whipped; it was in Massachusetts that Quakers, and women at that, were hanged—on Boston Common; it was in Massachusetts that women were hanged as witches; it was in Massachusetts, and only last year, that a man was fined and imprisoned for publicly reading the Scriptures. With such a record it would be a wonder indeed if Massachusetts were less willing than any other State to persecute people for worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Falling into Line.

WE stated some time ago that the church of the United Brethren had put a National Reform preacher into the field, and would support him. Bishop Dixon, of that church, is a Vice-President of the National Reform Association. The Bishop was lately holding some conferences out in Ohio, and District Secretary Rev. R. C. Wylie visited the Conferences in the interests of the National Reform revolution. He says the Bishop presented him to the Conference, and during a lull in business called upon him to occupy the time. Then the Committee on Resolutions presented the following:—

"Resolved, That we are in sympathy and hearty accord with the National Reform Association, and that we bid the Rev. Mr. Wylie, their agent in this region, Godspeed, and shall pray God's blessing upon him and his work."

All this was at Stryker. From there Mr. Wylie went to Delphos to attend another Con-

ference of the same church. There again the Bishop introduced him to the Conference, and gave him time to speak for National Reform. Here, too, a resolution of thanks was passed, by "a hearty vote."

From Delphos Mr. Wylie went to the General Conference of the Free Methodist Church, held at Coopersville, Michigan. The senior Superintendent, B. T. Roberts (the superintendents in the Free Methodist Church correspond to the bishops in the other churches), introduced the subject of National Reform to the Conference, and an hour was set apart for Mr. Wylie to speak. His address "was greeted with many hearty 'Amens.'" At the conclusion of his remarks, Mr. Wylie says: "Superintendent Roberts replied, assuring me of his own sympathy with our aims, and also of the hearty co-operation of the Free Methodist Church in our endeavors. . . . And all the people said, 'Amen.'" The "Committee on Reforms" in its report, said: "We recognize the objects and aims of the National Reform Association, and will labor and pray for its success."

By all this, it is quite manifest that the United Brethren Church, and the Free Methodist Church, may well be counted as pledged to National Reform—that is, to revolution and Romanism. And "Secretary" Leiper says that the "nods and amens a National Reformer gets in a Methodist [Episcopal] meeting help him wonderfully." Yet we believe that when the people of those churches understand that National Reform is only a scheme to deliver them into the hands of Rome, the National Reformers will not find it so easy to make the delivery, as it now appears.

The "Sentinel."

WITH this number, the AMERICAN SENTINEL completes its first year of publication. We are gratified with the reception that has been given it by the people of the nation, more than 136,000 copies having been circulated. The cause to which it is devoted is a most important one. It is a cause which vitally affects every person in the whole nation. The principles upon which the SENTINEL stands, and which it defends, are the principles for the defense of which our Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. The cause grows more important as the days go by. The National Reform movement is constantly and rapidly gaining favor in all parts of the country, and the facts presented in this paper show that the danger is great and imminent; yet the AMERICAN SENTINEL is the only paper in the country that is devoted to the analysis of that movement, and to exposing the danger that lies in it. We know there are thousands of people who need but to be shown the true meaning of National Reform, to cast it off utterly. And as it vitally concerns the civil and religious liberty of every person, it is important that every person shall know of it, therefore it is important that every person should have the opportunity to read the SENTINEL.

Therefore to every person who is, or becomes, acquainted with the SENTINEL, we extend an earnest invitation to help us in extend-

ing its circulation. With this issue a large number of subscriptions expire. Please renew for yourself, send it to your friends, and ask your neighbors to subscribe. For terms to agents, and in clubs, see previous page. You need the paper. It is for you, not for us, that the matter is written and printed. We have just now begun to get into the real merit of the discussion, and it shall still be our endeavor to make every number tell for truth, right, justice, and liberty. We do not want to remove your name from our list, and to prevent possibility of the loss of any numbers, and of mistake in dropping and taking up your name, please look at the yellow tab on your paper, and if your subscription expires with this number and volume, please renew at once. The number for January, 1887, will go to press about December 27. Be sure to have your letter of renewal here, with all the new subscribers you can obtain, by that time. We hope to see more than 250,000 copies circulated in 1887; and we shall see it, if you will help us.

Bloody Revolutionists.

THE Ministers' Association of Des Moines, Iowa, lately passed some resolutions against National Reform, one of which reads thus:—

"Resolved, That the National Reform Association is an attempt to accomplish by revolution the Christianizing of the nation, and therefore meets our disapproval."

Commenting on this, Rev. M. A. Gault says:—

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

What kind of a Christianity can that be which proposes to accomplish its purposes by a "bloody revolution"? Yet such is the style of "Christianity" that is represented in the National Reform Association. Mr. Gault says that Dr. Emory Miller, of the Centenary M. E. Church, of Des Moines, "expressed his emphatic condemnation of the whole movement, saying that he had given it careful study, and his convictions were based upon mature investigation." Dr. Miller certainly does well, and so would everybody else, to condemn the whole movement. In fact, as that movement boldly contemplates the alternative of a "bloody revolution," it is difficult to see how it can be understandingly indorsed or supported by anybody but a bloody revolutionist.

THE Pacific Press Publishing House carries the largest stock of Bibles of any house west of Chicago. Send for catalogue, free.

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 subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

Index to Volume I.

A Christian Nation 1, 26
 An Unprofitable Alliance 1
 A Parallel 7
 A Christian Nation 7
 A "Non Sequitur." 8
 A Good Confession 8
 A Christian Empire 16
 An Important Truth 17
 A Significant Fact Acknowledged 23
 A Lesson from Ezra 35
 A Cool Calculation 37
 A Constant Menace 39
 A Characteristic Expression 49
 A National Reform Axiom 56
 An Effective Prescription 62
 A Disinfectant Needed 64
 An Evidence of Impending Ruin 72
 A Political Gospel 74
 A Precursor of National Reform 77
 An Epistle "in Love." 80
 A Pernicious Fallacy 82
 American Romanism 84
Both True and Good 24
 Bold and Base Avowal 33
 Bloody Revolutionists 96
Catholic and Protestant 12
 Church and State 19, 28, 38
 "Clashing Voices." 48
 Civil Government and Religion 70
 Convicted by Their Own Testimony 88
Difficult to Learn 40
 Design of the Proposed Amendment 52
Effect of National Religion 9
 Enemies of Religious Liberty 80
Falling into Line 96
God in the Constitution 15
 Government not Paternal 61
Have Infidels Any Rights? 29
 His Last Cigar 39
 How Will They Do It? 41
Is It Blindness? 8
 Injustice of Religious Intolerance 30
 "Influence of the Union." 36
 Is It Blindness, or Duplicity? 89
 Infidel Views of the "Logic of Christianity." 90
Judge Black on Utah 28
 Juvenile Smokers 39
Legalizing Christianity 25
 Liberty-Loving Presbyterians 47
Macaulay on Gladstone 6, 23, 30
 Morality and Religion 13, 18, 35
 Model for Religious Amendmentists 64
No Christianity by Law 5
 No Power but of God 5
 National Reform and the Rights of Conscience 11
 Not a Christian Nation 14
 Notices of the SENTINEL 24
 National Religion 38
 National Reform Opposed to True Protestantism 47
 National Reform and the Chinese 50
 National Reform Opposed to the Bible 51
 National Reformed Presbyterianism 60
 National Reform and the Jews 67
 "National Reformers" the Enemies of American Institutions 68
 National Christianity in America 86
 National Reform vs. the Kingdom of Christ 92
Proposed Union of Church and State 4
 Pity for Rum's Victims 14
 Policy of the New Government Outlined 17
 Persecution or Nothing 37
 Personality of the State 44

Rights of Infidels 16
 Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law 21
 Religion in Politics 24
 Religion and the Church 45
 Results of Churchly Ambition 56
 Result of the Constitutional Amendment 73
 Religious Teaching by the State 79
 "Reformed" Political Methods 80
 Recognition of Christianity Demanded 80
 Religious Legislation 81
Secularized Christianity 9
 Story on the First Amendment 33
 State Theology 54
 "Secretary Leiper" on the AMERICAN SENTINEL 65
 Significant Facts 67
 Some More Clashing Voices 72
 State Recognition of Christianity 76
 Study the Constitution 80
 Some Features of the Reformed Constitution 85
The Mormon Question 2, 10
 The Never-Failing Result 8
 Too Plain to Be Denied 8
 The State and the Church 9
 There Is Danger in It 15
 "Testing the Right to Observe the Seventh Day." 16
 The *Christian Statesman* and the AMERICAN SENTINEL 16
 The Truth in the Case 17
 The Chinese Question 20
 The Other Side 25
 The Stranger—the Dissenter 27
 The Tobacco Plague 31
 There Is Danger 32
 The Price of Liberty 40
 The Republic of Israel! 41
 The Natural Right of Mankind 43
 The Higher Law 46
 The National Reform Movement an Absurdity 53
 The Inevitable Result 56
 The Kingdom of Christ 57
 The Golden Opportunity of National Reform 58
 The Danger Real 59
 The Strength of the Movement 62
 The Principles of National Reform 69
 The Salem Witchcraft 73
 The American Constitution 75
 The Principles of National Reform and of the Turk 83
 The American Hierarchy 91
 The American Papacy 93
 The SENTINEL 1, 96
What Is the Harm? 13
 "What Does It Amount to?" 22
 What Do They Want? 27
 "What Think Ye of Christ?" 42
 Who Shall Decide? 48
 Will "National Reformers" Persecute? 59
 What Do They Mean? 88
 We Believe, Therefore We Speak 95

THE STORY OF THE BIBLE,
 FROM GENESIS TO REVELATION.

Told in simple language; adapted to all ages, but more especially to the young, and will be read with pleasure as well as profit by every member of the family. Of its illustrations of Bible subjects, hundreds in number, many are of the greatest merit, and all are of interest. As a contribution toward the more general understanding of the Bible,
 ITS VALUE CAN SCARCELY BE OVERESTIMATED.
 It is not merely stories about the Bible, but it is the Bible story itself, told in a simple, easy style, which makes it both interesting and comprehensive, even to young children. Comprising more than 700 pages, printed on fine, calendered paper, and bound in cloth, it is a very attractive and useful book.
 IT SHOULD BE IN EVERY LIBRARY.
 Price per copy, bound in cloth, \$1.00
 Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY
 BETWEEN
CHRIST AND SATAN FROM THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE END OF TIME.

By Mrs. E. G. WHITE,
 Author of "The Life of Christ," "Sketches from the Life of Paul," "Bible Sanctification," and other popular works.

PRINTED AND BOUND IN THE VERY BEST STYLE. OVER TEN THOUSAND SOLD IN SIX MONTHS.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other. Beginning with our Lord's great prophecy given while viewing Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, in which he outlines the history of the whole dispensation, it sketches the fulfillment. It pictures the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Temple. It calls our attention to the bitter persecutions of the Christians in the first centuries, and notes the rise and growth of the Papacy. It gives a clear conception of the character and influence of the Waldenses, who, through centuries of persecution, maintained the purity of their faith, and by their missionary efforts prepared the nations of Europe for the Reformation.

Brief and lifelike sketches are given of the works, the successes, and the persecutions of Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale, Huss, Jerome, Knox, and other reformers and martyrs.

Considerable space is given to the life, work, and influence of later reformers and great religious leaders, such as George Whitefield, the Wesleys, and William Miller, and this is followed by chapters treating upon The Origin of Evil, The Agency of Evil Spirits, The Snares of Satan, and the Judgment.

The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

Over 500 pages; 22 full-page cuts. Price, \$1.50
 To foreign countries, post-paid, \$s
 Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.,
 Or the nearest Agent or Book Depository.

PLAIN FACTS FOR OLD AND YOUNG

—EMBRACING—
NATURAL HISTORY AND HYGIENE OF ORGANIC LIFE,

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,
 Member of the British and American Associations for the Advancement of Science, Editor of "Good Health," and Author of Various Works on Health.

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED,
 CONTAINING OVER 600 OCTAVO PAGES.

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

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

100 CHOICE HEALTH THOUGHTS.
 "Plain Facts" is sold only by subscription.—Agents wanted.
 For sample copies, territory and terms, address,
 PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
 General Agents for the West. Oakland, Cal.

HOME HAND BOOK
 OF
DOMESTIC HYGIENE AND RATIONAL MEDICINE.

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.
 Member of the American and British Associations for the Advancement of Science, the Societe' D' Hygiene of France, The American Public Health Association, The American Social Science Association, The American Society of Microscopists, etc.

Contains over 1600 Pages. Is Illustrated with 500 Engravings, Including 26 Full Page Colored Plates, and a Paper Manikin.

The "Home Hand Book" tells in plain, every-day language, how to preserve health, and if lost, how to regain it. It is, by far, the most important medical work for domestic use that has yet appeared, and is rapidly making its way into the homes of the Pacific Coast. It is written in the light of the most recent scientific investigation by a physician of large experience and acknowledged ability, and contains the most approved methods for the treatment of more than 600 diseases.

The most Complete and Comprehensive Work of the Kind ever Issued from the Press.

THIS BOOK IS SOLD ONLY BY SUBSCRIPTION.
 For sample copies, territory, and terms, address,
 PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

Christ the Way of Life.

We have a select stock of this beautiful and instructive steel-plate engraving, with keys in the Danish, Swedish, German, French, and English languages.

The design of this engraving is to present at one view the leading events in the history of man as related to the divine plan of redemption, from the time of the first sin and the fall to the final restoration of the race to the Paradise of God.

Its central figure is that of Christ hanging upon the cruel cross. By taking our position at the foot of the cross, we look backward in the history of man, and trace the steps which have led to the scenes of Calvary. The scenes which suggest the provisions of the gospel are enacted in the shadow of the cross, which is cast far back over the history of the race, reaching even to the gates of Eden.

The "Way of Life," as a work of art, commends itself to all lovers of the beautiful. Unlike many religious allegorical pictures, this not only presents a sacred theme, but by its skillful grouping, and its harmonious combination of light and shade, it delights the cultivated taste, and suggests abundant food for thought.

THE KEY.

An elegant 12-mo. pamphlet of 48 pages, containing a description of every part of the picture, and an impressive article by Mrs. E. G. White, accompanies each engraving.

Price, printed in first-class style on heavy plate paper, size 22x28 inches. \$1.50
Price, India Proofs, size 24x32 inches. 2.50

100 AGENTS WANTED.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., General Agents for Pacific Coast States and Territories.

THE COMING CONFLICT;

-OR-

THE GREAT ISSUE NOW PENDING IN THIS COUNTRY.

By W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

This book contains a complete history of the rise and progress of the National Reform Party, together with an exegesis of the last portion of the thirteenth chapter of the book of Revelation, assigning to the United States its proper place in prophecy.

EMPHATICALLY A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

484 pages, in muslin covers, and will be mailed to any address post-paid, for \$1.00.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

BIBLE READINGS.

IN TWO NUMBERS.

EMBRACING A PORTION OF THE

BIBLE COURSE AT HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.

(Including also the readings given at the State Meeting in Oakland.)

By ELD. E. J. WAGGONER.

These Readings differ in two respects from other series of readings that have been published. They were prepared especially for the use of colporters and those who intend to conduct Bible-readings in missionary fields, and they present a connected chain of argument upon the fundamental doctrines of Present Truth.

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

Table with 2 columns: No. Ques. and text. Includes Daniel 2, Daniel 7, Daniel 8, Daniel 9, The Sanctuary, The Law of God, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, The Law of God No. 4, Ephesians 2:15, Romans 6:14, Romans 10:4, Galatians 3:13, Romans 3:20, Tithing, etc.

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

Table with 2 columns: No. Ques. and text. Includes The Sabbath, No. 1, Luke 23:39-43, 1 Peter 3:18-20, Luke 16:19-31, Living Souls, Nature of Man, Punishment of the Wicked, Work of the Spirit, Church Membership, Missionary Labor, etc.

PRICE FOR THE TWO, 50 CENTS.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

OUR COUNTRY,

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

By U. SMITH.

Author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and Other Popular Works.

This is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a

HISTORICAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a

CHAIN OF PROPHECY,

Of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the Prophet of God, hundreds of years ago. The SUNDAY QUESTION, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND NATIONAL REFORM are prominent among the topics ably discussed in this work.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 232 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type and elegantly bound. Price \$1.00.

The publishers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of "The Marvel of Nations" whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with their paper, one year, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

TEMPERANCE PACKAGES.

We have put up in neat packages, with printed wrappers, three different assortments of our health and temperance works which we will furnish, post-paid, at the prices named.

Ten Cent Package.

This package contains 100 pages in twenty-five tracts, as follows:- The Code of Health--How to Live a Century--Pure Air--How to Ventilate a House--A Back Yard Examined--Inventory of a Cellar--What's in the Well--Cayenne and Its Congeners--A Live Hog Examined--A Peep into a Packing House--The Contents of a Tea-Pot--Tea Tasters--Tea Drinking and Nervousness--Tea Topers--Tea and Tippling--Tobacco Poisoning--A Relic of Barbarism--Tobacco Blindness--Science vs. Tobacco-Using--The Smoke Nuisance--The Rum Family--A Drunkard's Stomach--Gin Livers--A Rum Blossom--Alcoholism.

Of the twenty-five tracts, ten are devoted to general hygiene, five to the subject of temperance, five to alcoholic drinks, and five to tea and coffee. Twelve packages, post-paid, for \$1.00.

Forty Cent Package.

The second package, costing forty cents, post-paid, contains the following tracts and pamphlets:-

True Temperance--Alcohol, What is it?--Our Nation's Curse--Cause and Cure of Intemperance--Effects of Intemperance--The Drunkard's Arguments Answered--Alcoholic Medication--Alcoholic Poison--Tobacco Poisoning--Tobacco-Using a Cause of Disease--Tobacco-Using a Relic of Barbarism--Evil Effects of Tea and Coffee--Ten Arguments on Tea and Coffee--Pork, the Dangers of its Use--Diphtheria, its Causes, Prevention, and Proper Treatment. By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. This book should be in every household.

One Dollar Package.

The Third Package, costing \$1.00, post-paid, contains in addition to the forty cent package the following pamphlets:-

Proper Diet for Man, price 15c--The Uses of Water, price 25c--Dyspepsia, Its Cause and Cure, price 25c. The Object in Arranging these packages is to get them in a convenient form for sale and for selection. Address, PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL, Oakland, Cal.

THE ATONEMENT:

AN EXAMINATION OF A

REMEDIAL SYSTEM, IN THE LIGHT OF NATURE AND OF REVELATION.

By ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

This work is a critical and exhaustive treatise on the plan of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures, showing its harmony with the principles of justice and mercy, its consistency with reason, and its final results as affecting the destiny of the human race. 368 pp.; cloth, \$1.00.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal. Or, REVIEW AND HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.

NEW SABBATH-SCHOOL SONG BOOK, JOYFUL GREETING,

Contains 216 pages, or over 40 pages more than the ordinary S. S. song book. It is

THE LARGEST BOOK EVER SOLD FOR THE MONEY. The book is neatly gotten up, printed on good paper, and substantially bound.

Notwithstanding the fact that this book is so much larger than other popular S. S. song books, it will be furnished at the usual prices--35 cts. per copy post-paid; \$3.00 per dozen, by freight or express. If to be sent by mail at dozen rates add five cents per copy for postage.

All orders west of the Rocky Mountains should be addressed to PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal. General Agents for Pacific States and Territories.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR.

AN ILLUSTRATED WEEKLY PAPER FOR YOUTH AND CHILDREN, DEVOTED TO MORAL, MENTAL, AND RELIGIOUS CULTURE.

THIS paper is not devoted to insipid stories and religious fiction, but is filled with a great variety of that kind of reading which tends to the healthful development of the youthful mind. Its pages are made bright by the choicest illustrative pictures, and its columns are always full of useful information.

As a Sabbath-school and Lesson paper, it is suited to the wants of scholars and teachers, and is calculated to increase the interest of all who read it, in thorough Bible study.

TERMS, ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.--Single copy, 75 cents a year; Five copies to one address, 60 cents each; Ten or more copies to one address, 50 cents each.

NEW PREMIUM OFFER--"GOLDEN GRAINS" SERIES.

For every new subscription, accompanied with 85 cents, we will give "Golden Grains" series, consisting of a package of ten beautiful pamphlets of 32 pages each. These comprise a choice collection of sketches, stories, poems, etc., adapted to the wants of children, and contain more reading matter than can be found in many dollar books. Remember, the whole series, 320 pages, and the INSTRUCTOR for a year, for 85 cents.

Address, YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR, Battle Creek, Mich. Or, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

PRACTICAL MANUAL OF HEALTH AND TEMPERANCE.

EMBRACING THE

Treatment of Common Diseases, Accidents and Emergencies, the Alcohol and Tobacco Habit, the Cooking School, Useful Hints and Recipes.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

A book that everybody needs! Brim full of information on a hundred useful topics! It tells how to treat the most common diseases successfully with simple remedies; how to disinfect and ventilate; how to tell poisonous colors in wall-paper, flannels, stockings, and hat linings; what to do in case of accidents; how to resuscitate the drowned, and gives much other important information.

THE COOKING SCHOOL, BY MRS. E. E. KELLOGG,

Is a special department containing sixty pages of excellent instruction in the art of cookery, choice recipes, etc. Just such valuable information as every house-keeper wants! What shall we eat? and how shall it be cooked? are questions of the greatest importance for the proper enjoyment of life and the preservation of health.

The "Practical Manual," including all departments, contains over three hundred 12mo. pages, neatly bound in cloth, and will be sent, post-paid, for 75 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

OUR COUNTRY'S FUTURE FORETOLD.

THE UNITED STATES IN PROPHECY.

By ELD. U. SMITH.

This is a full exposition of a portion of prophecy which applies to our own Government, showing the position the United States holds in prophecy, and the part it has to act in the closing scenes of time.

THE SUNDAY MOVEMENT,

Which is now attracting such general attention, is thoroughly canvassed, and abundant testimony is given to prove that it is fast coming to be the ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION in this country. Dealing with our own land and applying to our own time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. New edition; revised and enlarged. Cloth, 225 pp., 75c. Paper covers, new edition, condensed, 186 pp., 25c. Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

THE AGE TO COME: A REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE.

By ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.

Embracing a critical examination of the Temporal Millennium--The Return of the Jews--Time and Manner of the Establishment of the Kingdom of God--The Day of the Lord, and the Promises to Israel. Second edition revised. 168 pages; price, post-paid, 20 cents. Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.; Or, REVIEW AND HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.

MATTER AND SPIRIT; OR, THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN THOUGHT.

By ELD. D. M. CANRIGHT.

A PHILOSOPHICAL argument on an important theme, indicated by its title. 66 pp. Price, 10 cents. Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.



Adventist Pioneer Library

For more information, visit:

www.APLib.org

or write to:

apl@netbox.com