

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 textured, brownish-gold color.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

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

YEAR
1887
VOL. 2, 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 1887 by *The Pacific Press Publishing Company*.

Published in the USA

November, 2018

ISBN: 978-1-61455-068-6

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 2, Number 1 (January, 1887).....	1
Volume 2, Number 2 (February, 1887).....	9
Volume 2, Number 3 (March, 1887).....	17
Volume 2, Number 4 (April, 1887).....	25
Volume 2, Number 5 (May, 1887).....	33
Volume 2, Number 6 (June, 1887).....	41
Volume 2, Number 7 (July, 1887).....	49
Volume 2, Number 8 (August, 1887).....	57
Volume 2, Number 9 (September, 1887).....	65
Volume 2, Number 10 (October, 1887).....	73
Volume 2, Number 11 (November, 1887).....	81
Volume 2, Number 12 (December, 1887).....	89

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1887.

NUMBER 1.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE Protestant doctrine touching the right of private judgment, is not that opposite doctrines may both be true, but it is that there is on the face of the earth no visible body to whose decrees men are bound to submit their private judgment on points of faith.—*Macaulay*.

National Reform in the South.

THE *Christian Statesman* says that recently National Reform "Secretary" Weir "has met with a cordial welcome for the sake of his cause," in Maryland and Virginia, and thereby "has been convinced that the work ought to be carried at once into the Southern States." The *Statesman* and Mr. Weir are both way behind the times. If they had carefully read the *SENTINEL* they would have learned that National Reform has already begun—more than a year ago—in the Southern States. Both in Arkansas and in Tennessee, quite a goodly number of people have been fined and imprisoned, within the past year, for worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences. But if Secretary Weir or some other leading National Reformer should go down there, we have no doubt that the good work could, by organization, be greatly promoted, and their ebullient zeal made much more effective in rooting out heresy. For the information of whoever of the "Secretaries" shall go to the South, we would state that he will certainly find at Springville, Arkansas; Paris, Tennessee; and Atalla, Alabama, a cordial welcome for the sake of his cause. He would do well to make these places his headquarters. At Paris there are now honest Christian men lying in prison for conscience' sake; in Springville the same thing has been; and in Atalla there is an earnest desire on the part of certain persons that it shall be. Also in Worcester, Massachusetts, there are men who are soon to be compelled to stand trial for conscience' sake; we would direct the National Reformers to that city as a promising field. We would advise all the "District Secretaries" to become subscribers, and regular readers of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*. They can thus keep well informed in regard to all the particularly good openings for the display of their activities for National Reform.

The "American Sentinel," Volume 2.

THE first volume of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL* met with as great favor as could be expected, or even desired. True, its circulation was not nearly as large as it should have been, but was as large as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances. It has had a great many intelligent and appreciative readers; and many have confessed themselves enlightened upon the subject of which it treats, and have become aroused to the importance of the subject, and to the danger which impends over our beloved country from the strenuous efforts which are being made to unite Church and State in this land.

Volume Two is commenced under more favorable auspices. Friends have been raised up who are pledged to aid in extending its circulation. We have reason to confidently look for a largely increased subscription list for 1887.

The progress of the National Reform party, and the course of the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of that party, we have carefully watched for about a score of years. We have marked every phase of the agitation of the question of a Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and closely studied the arguments by which that party seeks to accomplish its ends. That many of those people think they are laboring for the glory of God, and for the upbuilding of the kingdom of Christ, does not turn their sophistries into truths, nor lessen the danger which their movement threatens. The ultimate action of the Inquisition—the burning of heretics—was named an "act of faith." The Saviour forewarned his followers that the time would come when "whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." John 16:2. Zeal for the church and for the cause of God, led Saul to persecute the Christians; but that did not remove the guilt of the persecutors, nor lighten the stones by which Stephen was put to death.

Considering the magnitude and the rapid growth of the Religious Amendment movement, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to it by the secular press. The public press ought always to be the advocate of the people's rights—the vigilant guardian of our liberties. Some of the newspapers have highly commended the *SENTINEL*, while others have expressed their surprise that anybody considered the movement worthy of so much notice. We fear that the majority of the papers will utterly ignore this subject until our dearest liberties are subverted, and the way is opened for the scenes which marked

"the dark ages" of European history to be re-enacted in America.

While we have followed the Amendmentists in the announcements of their purposes, in their platform, their published speeches, their sermons, editorials, etc., they have studiously avoided meeting our arguments, concealing them from their readers. They only meet us with repeated sneers at, what they are pleased to term, our ignorance of the Bible, of history, of the principles of civil government, and even of their own intentions. It may be gratifying to their self-complacency to hide themselves behind slurs and insinuations; but the popularity of their cause will not always prove a shield for their course.

They have declared, with great assurance, that they have not given us much notice because our arguments "do not meet the question." But we appeal to the readers, both theirs and ours: What is the point which we have to meet? Where shall it be found? We propose to briefly re-examine some of the positions which they have taken before the public, and if we do not both touch the question, and fully meet it, we invite them, one and all, to point out our failure.

The National Reform Convention held in Pittsburg, Pa., Feb. 4, 5, 1874, was the largest of the kind that was ever held, and the *Statesman* says the report of its proceedings is "more full of life than either of the others." Hon. Felix R. Brunot, president of the National Association, was chosen president of this convention. On taking the chair, President Brunot delivered an address, in which he quoted verbatim from the published principles of the Association, as follows:—

"We propose '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.'"

This paragraph expresses the very "sum and substance" of the aims and designs of the Religious Amendment party. A more clear and explicit expression of the object of that party could not be made. As we will further show, in another article, this is *the point* of their movement.

Now we inquire: Have we mistaken "the point" aimed at by the Religious Amendmentists? Surely we have not. President Brunot, speaking for the Association and the convention, says, "We propose"—and then follows

this declaration of their aims. Have we failed to "meet" this point, as they have said? The leading article of the first number of the SENTINEL was mostly devoted to an examination of this very paragraph. And in every number we have taken up the speeches and writings of the leading advocates of that Amendment, and pointed out the sophistries of their reasonings and the dangerous tendency of their doctrines. Failed to meet the question, indeed!

The correct way to judge measures is by their consequences. The plan of these "Reformers" may seem plausible; but we must look beyond present appearances, and inquire what effect this Amendment would have on the administration of our Government. This is a question of interest to every citizen, and in answering it we shall deal only with evident facts,—so evident that none can possibly deny them.

1. To place the laws, institutions, and usages of Christianity on a legal basis is to make them matters of legal enforcement. And as no law can exist or be enforced without a penalty, so Christianity, or what they may be pleased to recognize as Christianity, would then be enforced by civil penalties. Anything less than this would not place the laws of Christianity on a legal basis in the law of the land.

2. A person can be convicted of a misdemeanor only before a court of justice, and the court is necessarily constituted the judge or exponent of the law. And, therefore, under the proposed Religious Amendment, the court would have to decide what is or what is not Christian law, institution, or usage.

3. But the Amendmentists do not intend that such questions shall be decided by civil courts. May it not be, then, that they will do something to relieve this matter of its odious appearance? Let us see. A writer in the *Christian Statesman* says:—

"We will not allow the civil Government to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."

But we see no hope of relief in this suggestion. No matter what is the nature of the court or tribunal which shall determine questions of Christian institution or usage, the fact would remain that matters of Christian faith and practice would be removed from the domain of individual conscience, and placed in the hands of a legal body, whose duty or privilege it should be to 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! For, remember, whatever they decide is Christian institution or usage, is to be placed on a legal basis in the law of the land.

4. There are many different forms of religion in the land; and inasmuch as all creeds and faiths cannot possibly be embraced in the same legal enactment, it will become the duty of the law-makers to decide which shall be enforced as the true religion! It then needs no extended argument to show that *somebody's religious rights* will be trampled under foot. And it would not make any difference how small the minority whose consciences were ignored, and who were made to conform to

somebody else's religion which themselves did not believe, it would still be *religious oppression*, and a subversion of the dearest principles of our Government.

5. It is quite useless for the advocates of the proposed Religious Amendment to deny that their movement tends to a union of Church and State, for they expressly declare that "the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interest of the Church." (See *Christian Statesman* of March, 1884.) In the same article it was declared to be "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." And they complacently talk of what the churches will and will not suffer the civil Government to do in carrying out the Religious Amendment. Now if placing Christian usages on a legal basis, and subordinating the civil State to the will and interests of the Church, is not a union of Church and State, then we shall be pleased to be informed what would be such a union. Such a state of things once existed under the Roman emperors and popes, and it is universally regarded as a union of Church and State. And so it would be here.

6. Not only religionists, but non-religionists, have rights. Not only will minorities in religion be compelled to observe religious usages which they do not believe, but non-religionists will also be compelled to observe "Christian laws, institutions, and usages," without any religious conviction whatever. These model "Reformers" do not pretend that they can make men Christians by legal enactment; they only intend to compel them by law to act as if they were Christians!

7. Under the proposed Amendment, and in such a Government as they contemplate, only professed Christians can be eligible to office. They have already announced that in their system of government every consistent infidel will be disfranchised, and Christians alone, or they who conform to Christian usages, can be permitted to hold office. It needs no great insight into politics and human nature to foresee that every persistent office-seeker will then become a member of the church—the most popular one, of course—as the surest stepping-stone to office. And in this manner these model Reformers propose to turn our republic into the kingdom of Christ!

8. But one more point we will notice. The National Reformers profess the intention to retain the republican features of our Government; the officers will be elected by the majority, and the administration of the Government will be shaped according to the will of the majority. But the will of the majority is constantly changing, as parties rise and fall. As there are now party politics, so then there will be party religions. To suppose otherwise, is to suppose that human nature is suddenly to be entirely transformed. The majority, wherever that majority may be found, will always have it in their power to determine what religion shall be enforced at any given time. And the religion of the nation will be put in the market at every general election. Religious questions will then be canvassed, not

only in the churches and in the civil courts, but on the stump, on the streets, and in the saloons. Candidates will be put up on this and that religious issue. And what would be the consequence? Religion itself would become contemptible in the eyes of the masses, and a reaction would take place, fatal to the cause of Christianity in our country, or else a *religious tribunal of last resort* would be demanded—a second papal system, modeled after that of Rome.

This is but a digest of these subjects as they have been presented in the first volume of the SENTINEL, and we repeat our appeal to the reader: Have we not herein met the very point, the vital question at issue? We invite, we earnestly urge, our opposers to point out any particular wherein we err in our conclusions. Please to show that what we have indicated as conclusions, are not relevant. We affirm that what we have indicated as the results of that Amendment being adopted, are not only possible, but inevitable.

American citizens, sons of the patriots of 1776 and 1787, our appeal is unto you. Do not be deluded by the siren song of "assured peace in the land." Strife and contention, religious intolerance and persecution, are as sure to follow the adoption of a Religious Amendment to our National Constitution as effect follows cause. It is in your power now to avert it. But if you let the warning pass unheeded; if you suffer the flood-gates of bigotry and intolerance, of misguided religious zeal, to be opened in this land, be assured that no hand can stay the flood until desolation and ruin are left in its track. J. H. W.

Civil Government and the Mediator.

THE grand error, perhaps, of National Reform is in its persistently hugging the fabulous and shadowy being it calls a "moral person." But let us admit (for the argument) that the State is a moral person, as National Reformers say. It will be admitted that no unfallen being or person approaches God through a Mediator. Adam and Eve did not before the fall. Holy angels do not now. The question then arises, Is civil government, if a "moral person," a fallen person? Civil government was instituted after man's fall and was intended for the benefit of believers and unbelievers, and differed in this respect from the church, which was intended by its founder to be made up only of believers. There has been no change made in the constitution of civil government since it was instituted. If then it is a fallen person, it must have been created so by a holy and righteous God; which is a conclusion too dishonoring to God to be entertained for a moment. Civil government then not having fallen from "its first estate," needs no Mediator, and has no atonement, as one writer in the name of National Reform admits. It worships God in obeying his commands, and that without a Mediator.

We notice a few scriptures. National Reform says, "Christ as Mediator represents the Godhead in the government of the world." That is for National Reformers to prove. It seems monstrous to hold that God can surrender, or delegate his essential kingdom to

another. We are, according to this astounding idea, to understand that when Christ declares a sparrow shall not fall to the ground without the permission of our heavenly Father, the reference is to the mediatorial kingdom instead of God's kingdom of providence, or his essential kingdom; that when our Saviour taught his disciples to pray to their heavenly Father for daily bread, the Mediator was meant. Will some ardent National Reformer cite us to a single passage of Scripture that asserts that Christ as Mediator ever furnished a mouthful of food for his people *except by a miracle*? His whole work upon the hearts of men is supernatural. Christ as Mediator does not interfere with the essential government of the Godhead in his natural and providential dealing with mankind, except as the interests of his church require. Saint and sinner eat of the grain from the same field, warmed by God's sun, fertilized by his rains, and the only difference is, the saints through mediatorial intercession receive a supernatural blessing with it.

National Reformers cite Matt. 28:18, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." They set up a man of straw; no one denies the power of the Mediator. But the question is as to the exercise of that power. We hold to the declaration that the exercise of the mediatorial power is subservient to the interests of the church. The mediatorial power is infinite, but its exercise is just equal to the need of the children of God. The grace of the Mediator is infinite, but its exercise is limited to the perfect welfare of the elect. So it is we apprehend in regard to the power of the Mediator; it is limited in its exercise to the needs of the elect. If we are charged with impiety in holding to the latter, National Reformers are liable to the same charge in reference to the former.

Matt. 28:18 is cited, but this does not refer to the government of the world in the exercise of "all power" but to the needs of his church baptizing and teaching. It refers undoubtedly to Christ's spiritual kingdom. We believe the National Reformers make a gross misapplication of the text. The work that Christ put upon his disciples was a mighty one. From the human standpoint the means to the end were insignificant and foolish. Hence Christ, to help their wavering faith, prefaced his command by telling them, all power in earth and heaven was given unto him. "Go ye therefore," said he, without fear and doubting, "and disciple all nations," "and, lo, I am with you alway." The reference is undoubtedly to the exercise of Christ's power in establishing his spiritual kingdom. This will be clear when we compare Rev. 2:26 with the text cited. This passage gives the same power precisely into the hands of believers. If the passage cited by the National Reformers gives Christ, as Mediator, rule over civil governments, or "the nations," then in that case he is to have rivals to his supremacy, for Rev. 2:26 puts the same power into the hands of believers. "To him ["that overcometh"] will I give power over the nations." We have had these passages examined by a critical and learned expositor, and he tells us the original word is the same in both places.

One passage more, Col. 2:9, 10. These verses have no reference whatever by any kind of twisting to civil government. National Reformers, to make this citation available, must show that civil governments are included in the words, "principalities and powers." This no man can do; because the apostle settles it beyond all controversy the other way. In the fifteenth verse it is said, having "spoiled principalities and powers;" and if civil government is included, then the apostle was mistaken, for civil government yet lives unspoiled, for National Reformers to quarrel over with the rest of the world. The allusion is doubtless the same the apostle makes in Eph. 6:12, to spiritual powers: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness," etc. The exposition that National Reformers give would make the Mediator "spoil" an institution of which National Reform declares him the head. He is absurdly made by them to overwhelm his own kingdom. They seem determined to "take him by force and make him King." We are profoundly persuaded that the crown National Reform holds in its hand is a crown of thorns.

ORIENT.

Both Sides.

From the Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville, Ohio, we have the following communication under the heading, "Hear the Other Side," which in harmony with his request we gladly give place in the SENTINEL:—

"Through your kindness I have received the AMERICAN SENTINEL for January, February, March, October, and November, 1886. I have given them careful perusal, and have also noted some things to which, with your permission, I would like to reply in your columns.

"As your aim and mine is only to know and to do what is right, and as it is not victory for its own sake, but for truth's sake that we are (or ought to be) striving for, I feel sure you will cheerfully accord me the privilege of correcting what I regard as misstatements made (no doubt honestly) by you of the sentiments, purposes, and position of the National Reform Association. This, and not the 'Religious Amendment party,' or the 'God-in-the-Constitution' party, is our correct designation. These and all similar titles we disown and disclaim. Whatever may be the design of those who employ them, they convey a wrong, because a one-sided and imperfect, notion of the object of the National Reform Association.

"Before, however, proceeding to the correction of what I consider misinterpretations and misapprehensions of the declarations and views of the advocates of National Reform, I desire to enter my protest against the very serious charges you lay at their door. Although you pay a not undeserved tribute to the respectability, learning, piety, and patriotism of its published list of officers, over and over again you affirm that our professed object is one thing while our real object is another and a totally different thing (p. 76). You assert that we are laboring to subvert the Constitution of our country (p. 78), and to overthrow all that was done by the Revolutionary fathers (p. 81); that we propose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake (pp. 78, 84); that we are seeking our own aggrandizement (p. 86); that we are actuated by ambition (p. 76); and that our repeated re-affir-

mations or denials that we do not contemplate in any sense a union of Church and State is a mere blind (p. 19), a display of effrontery (p. 81), an exhibition of duplicity (p. 74), and a piece of Jesuitical casuistry to hide our real intention (p. 19). You also say that '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' (p. 20).

"Do you really think, Messrs. Editors, that this is an honorable mode of warfare? Is it necessary to the success of your cause? If it is, then verily it must be a bad one. When such questionable measures have to be employed to defend it, it is 'condemned already.' If you think the advocates of National Reform are mistaken or misguided, have a zeal that is not according to knowledge, and do not perceive the natural and necessary consequences of their movement, you have an undaunted right to say so, and also to try to prove what you say. But to hold them up to public reprobation as deliberate and intentional deceivers is, to say the least, very unfair. Insinuation, defamation, and aspersion of motives are not arguments. Let us reason together, but because we differ, let us not descend to vituperation.

"A great deal of what you have written against the National Reform Association arises from a misreading (how to account for it I do not know) of the constitution of the Association. In almost every paper you sent me (and I suppose the same is true of those I have not received), you say that the object of the National Reform Association, in the Amendment to our National Constitution they wish incorporated in that instrument, is 'to legalize the laws and institutions of Christianity, or of that which they may claim is Christianity;' or 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis' (pp. 1, 3, 4). How foreign this is to our purpose will be seen almost at a glance by comparing your way of putting it with the language of the constitution of the National Reform Association. As many of your readers may never have seen it, and as it is of itself a sufficient reply to much that has appeared in the SENTINEL, I ask as a matter of justice, and that your readers may have an opportunity of judging for themselves, that you publish it in full. The readers of the SENTINEL will do themselves a favor by referring to it as often as may be necessary.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

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

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

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

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

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

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves under the following ARTICLES, and pledge ourselves to God, and to one another, to labor, through wise and lawful means, for the ends herein set forth:—

ARTICLE I.

"This Society shall be called the "NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION."

ARTICLE II.

“The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”

“After reading this constitution law, can any one truthfully affirm that the aim of the National Reform Association is ‘to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis’? It distinctly specifies ‘the Christian laws, usages, and institutions of our Government’—those and no more. Between the statement of the SENTINEL, ‘to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental laws of the land,’ and the one in the constitution of the National Reform Association, ‘to place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government’ on such a basis, there is a world-wide difference. The former embraces all the doctrines, rules, and principles of Christianity; the latter only such ‘moral laws of the Christian religion’ as are necessarily involved in the practical administration of our Government. The chief of these are mentioned in the constitution of the Association, and the undeniable fact ‘that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government,’ is asserted. The SENTINEL's version of our aims and purposes is as wide of the mark as it possibly can be. To any such scheme as that attributed by the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the friends of National Reform, the latter are as much opposed (and as honestly) as are or can be the former. The AMERICAN SENTINEL, therefore, is wasting its ammunition, firing at a specter of its own creating, fighting a ghost of its own imagining.

“As this communication is already perhaps too long, I reserve, with your permission, further criticisms to a future article.

“ROBERT WHITE.

“Stuebenville, Ohio.”

We have no desire to present a one-sided view, and shall always be glad to publish views of the other side when they are presented in as temperate and candid a manner as are the above. Indeed this has been our course from the first.

Mr. White refers to several expressions which he has found in different numbers of the SENTINEL, and asks if we “really think that this is an honorable mode of warfare?” We can answer that if the expressions had been used with no direct or dependent connection, if they had been printed as a series of expletives with no explanation, we should not consider such to be an honorable mode of warfare. But when in every instance the expressions are simply and only the logical deduction from the propositions of the National Reformers themselves, then we are prepared to say without hesitancy that such is an honorable mode of warfare.

It is an honorable mode of warfare to trace every proposition to its logical conclusion; and if sound logic demonstrates that while the professed object of National Reform is one thing, the real object is a totally different thing; if the logic of the thing shows that

it is subversive of the constitution; if not only logical conclusions, but their own words, show that the practice of persecution for conscience will be the outcome of the success of National Reformers; if sound logic develops casuistry and even Jesuitical casuistry; then we say that in all this there is nothing but an honorable mode of warfare.

Mr. White speaks of our “insinuations,” &c. Now Webster's Unabridged says that to insinuate is “to hint; to suggest by remote allusion.” So far as we know we have insinuated nothing. What we have had to say we have said openly and plainly. And if what we have said appears to him as “insinuations,” then we should be glad for him to tell us how we can speak plainly and directly.

We wish Mr. White had spent his time in showing that our reasoning is not logical, and that our expressions are not the plain statements of logical conclusions from the propositions of National Reformers, instead of complaining of the expressions themselves. If our reasoning is not sound, if our conclusions are not logical, it ought to be easy enough for the principals in the movement to show it. There are certainly enough professors, and Doctors of Divinity, and Doctors of Laws, pledged to National Reform, to furnish some one to point out wherein we have reasoned wrongly, or where we have missed the point in our arguments on the propositions of the National Reformers. Besides this, if in our arguments we have so constantly missed the point of National Reform, how does it happen that our efforts hurt the National Reformers so much? If they are not hit, how does it happen that they are hurt? And if the real point of National Reform is missed, how does it happen that the National Reformers are hit?

If the reader will look over the numbers of the SENTINEL, he will find copious extracts from the writings of National Reformers. We have endeavored to represent them fairly, and in order to do this, have uniformly quoted their own language. If we have misconstrued the sentiments, the purpose, and the position of the National Reform Association, it can only have been because its advocates have not meant what they said. In noticing the strictures of Mr. White, we shall simply requote a few statements made by National Reformers. And here we would say that we have never yet used the expression “God-in-the-Constitution” party. We have referred to the National Reform Association as the “Religious Amendment party,” and we think justly, although they may disclaim that distinctive title. To show that this is so, we quote from a speech made by Professor Blanchard in the National Reform Convention held in Pittsburg in 1874. He said:—

“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 religion or admit anything called religion.”

In the same convention President Brunot said:—

“The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country.”

In March, 1884, Rev. J. M. Foster, writing

in the *Christian Statesman*, concerning the model State, said:—

“According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere existed for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church.” And again: “The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury.”

Rev. R. M. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886, declared that it is right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed.

The National Reform Association has for its avowed object the securing of such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian Nation. And when that Amendment shall have been secured, Congress must, according to Professor Blanchard, establish a standard religion. If, then, the Amendment which they desire is not a Religious Amendment, language does not mean anything. Moreover, Christianity cannot be separated from religion, for it *is* religion. A Christian man is a religious man, and a Christian nation must be a religious nation; therefore we say again, that if the Constitution is so amended that this Nation shall seem to be a Christian Nation, the Amendment which secures that object will be a Religious Amendment. Although National Reformers repudiate the title of “Religious Amendment party,” their own writers proclaim the fact that they do want a religious test for citizenship. We do not see, therefore, how the emphatic declarations, made again and again by National Reformers, that they do not want a *Religious* Amendment to the Constitution, nor anything like a union of Church and State, can be considered as anything else than a “blind,” or a manifestation of Jesuitical casuistry.

In view of the above quotations, we think we are justified in calling the National Reformers the “Religious Amendment party.” In fact, we always wince whenever we write “National Reformers” and “National Reform Association,” for we cannot regard their movement as a reform in any particular. It is true that many advocates of this movement are highly respectable and learned and pious, and we cannot believe that they realize what will be the result of their proposed Amendment. But we cannot allow that they are patriotic, even though they are honest in their purpose, for patriotism seeks only the welfare of the country, and the success of their movement would be the greatest calamity which this Nation ever suffered. We are obliged, however, to discredit the piety of many who stand high in the National Reform councils, and the reason for this will shortly appear.

Now a few words concerning the constitution of the National Reform Association. According to that its idea is to place “all Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.” If they purpose to follow the letter of their constitution, they might as well stop at once, for in our Government there are no Christian laws or institutions. “Christian laws” are precepts

regulating the practice of the Christian religion. Christian institutions are those ordinances which Christ has placed in the church, such as baptism and the Lord's supper. To the claim that it is desired to regulate marriage laws, judicial oaths, and the observance of the Sabbath, we submit that these are not Christian institutions. The moral law of ten commandments antedates Christianity and is obligatory on all mankind. For the observance or non-observance of its precepts, Jew and Gentile, Pagan and Christian, will alike have to give an account to God. That part of the law which relates especially to man's duty to his fellows and tends to secure harmony and good order in society, human Governments are empowered to enforce, and that without regard to the form of religion that may be professed. The Czar of Russia, the Shah of Persia, the emperors of China and Japan, the queen of England, and the President of the United States are alike ministers of God to execute wrath upon those who trample upon the rights of their neighbors. And it is a fact that in many heathen countries the rights of citizens have been as well maintained as in some so-called Christian nations. It is also a fact that there is no such thing as Christianity in marriage. Marriage was instituted in Eden for the whole race, and the marriage of the Jew is just as sacred as that of the Protestant. The regulation of marriage is within the province of every nation, whether it is Christian or Pagan.

Mr. White uses the expression "moral laws of the Christian religion." This is simply an absurdity. The Christian religion has no moral laws. The moral law is of primary and universal obligation. It covers every conceivable act or thought. If the moral law had never been broken there would be no necessity for the Christian religion, but since it has been violated, Christianity is the means devised to bring man back to obedience to it. We cannot refrain from saying, what we believe to be the truth, that if those who call themselves National Reformers had a just conception of the true object of the Christian religion, and of the Spirit which actuated its Founder, they would cease their efforts to tamper with the Constitution of the United States. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and steadfastly resisted all human efforts to make him king. When two of his disciples wished to call down fire upon some who did not acknowledge his divinity, he rebuked them, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And when Peter drew his sword in defense of the Master, he was sternly rebuked.

Mr. White is grieved because the SENTINEL attributes to National Reformers the purpose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake. Let National Reformers answer for themselves on this point. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, one of the vice-presidents of the Association, says: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon." And the same man classes deists, Jews, Seventh-day Baptists, and, in fact, all who deny the claims of the National Reform Association, as atheists.

And now remembering that opposition to the so-called National Reform movement is counted as infidelity and atheism, we quote the following from another vice-president, Rev. E. B. Graham. He says:—

"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."

This is the fate to which at least one National Reformer would consign, not only those who deny the existence of God, but also those who, believing in God and Christ and the Bible, are content to rely upon the aid of the Spirit of God alone in their efforts to spread the gospel, and who refuse to invoke civil aid in that work, or to yield their consciences to the will of any human power. Again we quote from the pen of Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the leading lights of the National Reform Association. He says:—

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

That is to say that National Reformers are ready to shed blood if need be in order to enforce their ideas of Christian morality upon the people. If this does not mean persecution for conscience' sake, then such a thing never existed. It may be that we have been mistaken in charging duplicity and Jesuitical casuistry upon National Reformers who claim that they desire no union of Church and State, and that the success of their movement cannot result in persecution; but if so, then we are forced to attribute to them a degree of ignorance which is inconceivable.

Once more: The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, stated its desire to join hands with Roman Catholics in carrying forward the work of National Reform. And in the *Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, speaking of this desire to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has 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."

Now when we remember what the Catholic Church has been and has done in the past, and that it is the church's boast that Rome never changes, and that in the encyclical letter published by Pope Leo XIII. only a little over a year ago, every act of every Pope was endorsed, certainly every one who is not willingly blind must see that when National Reformers co-operate with the Catholic Church on its own terms, and when by such co-operation they have secured the power which they desire, persecution will follow as a matter of course. The idea that in matters of religion the minority must submit to the majority is of long standing with Roman Catholics, and is openly avowed by National

Reformers. But minorities do not always submit willingly, and if that idea is carried out, force must be used.

But space forbids our making further quotations. We submit to Mr. White that it is strictly an honorable mode of warfare to condemn an opponent out of his own mouth. We have made no statements concerning National Reformers which the facts will not warrant. While we cannot believe that all self-styled National Reformers are actuated by sincere motives, we do believe that many of them are honest at heart and desire only the truth, but are deceived as to the real object and the necessary result of the National Reform Association. In this latter class we gladly place our correspondent. And as our desire is to reclaim those who have fallen into error, as well as to bring the real truth before all, we hold our columns open to any one who is competent and authorized to speak for the National Reform Association, who shall wish to make a statement as to its nature and object.

E. J. W.

The Arkansas "Extravagance."

In the October SENTINEL, we commented upon an editorial, and an article, both from the *Christian Cynosure*. The article, copied entire from the columns of the *Cynosure*, was written to that paper by Elder R. M. Kilgore, from Arkansas, giving an account of the persecution of some Seventh-day Adventists in that State for working on Sunday after having conscientiously kept what they believed to be the Sabbath. The *Cynosure* correspondent gave a number of names and facts such as clearly showed the meanest kind of persecution.

It seems that the *Cynosure* got hold of a copy of the SENTINEL containing the matter mentioned above, and from the way in which it refers to us it would appear that the *Cynosure* does not recognize its own article, but attributes the thing all to the SENTINEL. In the *Cynosure* of November 25, 1886, in a short editorial we find the following:—

"The AMERICAN SENTINEL, of Oakland, California, comes to us with a long reply to an editorial of this paper, in which the writer gives a long list of fines and imprisonments of Seventh-day Adventists for work on Sunday. One man is said to have been sent to jail from Springdale, Ark., for 'digging potatoes for his table on Sunday.' This and other parts of the article wear an aspect of extravagance, so that we must wait for confirmation of the facts before commenting on them."

More than half of our "long reply" and all of that part of it that "gives a long list of fines and imprisonments" was the aforementioned article from the columns of the *Cynosure* itself. As it appears to the *Cynosure* to be so extravagant, we would mildly inquire whether it is the habit of that paper to print accounts that are so extravagant that they cannot be believed without confirmation? We might ask too what the *Cynosure* would count a "confirmation"? The account which we copied from the *Cynosure* is already a matter of public record in Arkansas even to the Supreme Court. In Tennessee also there are similar facts that are likewise a matter of public record. Does the *Cynosure* demand another

batch of these persecuting prosecutions to confirm the statements printed in its own columns? It seems to us that the *Cynosure* is exceedingly hard to convince.

As for commenting on the matter the *Cynosure* did that vigorously, and very properly condemned the persecuting proceedings, and asked that the names and the jails should be published at once, *while as yet it was a mere matter of report*; but since the facts have been given, and the names and the jails have been published in its own columns, not a word has the *Cynosure* had to say on the subject. And when we published the *Cynosure's* report in full, and commented on it in our columns, that paper turns upon us, and accuses its own article of wearing "an aspect of extravagance," and demands "confirmation" of its own published report before "commenting on" it.

As the editor of the *Cynosure* seems not to be acquainted with the matter he printed in his own paper, we will give him some references. Please look at the *Cynosure* of July 29, 1886, editorial page, and the editor's comment, and call for names and jails will there be found; then look at its correspondents' columns in the *Cynosure* of August 12, 1886, and there will be found the names of the persons, places, and jails, and with these the "long list of fines and imprisonments" and the facts, which seem to the editor of the *Cynosure* to wear so much of "an aspect of extravagance." We hope the editor of the *Cynosure* will examine the articles referred to, for we very much desire to see what comments he will make upon the facts.

If the *Cynosure* must still wait for more confirmation, we know not how it can be satisfied except by repetition of the persecution; but to report such repetition would be only adding more extravagance to that which already has appeared. We agree with the *Cynosure* that the facts of this persecution do wear an aspect of extravagance. In fact we know not how the matter could be more extravagant without bordering very closely upon the manners and methods of the Romish Inquisition. Yet as the outcome of the National Reform movement will be to make such extravagance National, and as the *Cynosure* is heartily in favor of National Reform, there appears no ground of hope that we shall ever see in the columns of the *Christian Cynosure* any just comments upon such persecuting extravagance.

A. T. J.

The Situation of the Present as Related to the Past.

In reading the lives of John and Charles Wesley, one is astonished at the unreasonable prejudice manifested against the labors of these men. They were frequently set upon by mobs, and miserably abused when they had committed no offense except preaching plain Bible truths without conforming to all the burdensome ritual of the Established Church. But any attempt at a description of the opposition they had to meet would be out of place in this short article. The point which I wish to notice is the opinion that was entertained by the reformers of those times regarding ministers

meddling themselves much in matters of civil government.

Dr. Whitehead was a personal friend of John Wesley, and one of three to whom Mr. Wesley willed all his manuscript. From this manuscript the Doctor wrote the authorized lives of the Wesleys. In this book he expresses the sentiment of his fellow-laborers. In this work he publishes an account of a Methodist minister named Westall, preaching at Cambourn, England, in the year 1751. The services were held in the house of one Mr. Harris. In the midst of the discourse he was assaulted by a mob and forcibly taken from the house. This was on Sunday. He was held by them until the following Tuesday, at which time the Rev. Dr. Borlase issued his *mittimus*, by virtue of which Westall was to be committed to the house of correction at Bodmin as a vagrant. He was kept in charge at that place until the next quarter, when the justices met and decided the action illegal. This circumstance caused Mr. Whitehead to remark as follows:—

"How seldom have we seen clergymen in the commission of the peace, but they have neglected the duties of their profession, and grossly abused the power committed to them! Our Lord declared his kingdom was not of this world, and when his ministers, of any denomination, obtain dominion and authority over the temporal things of others, or acquire any share in the civil government, it seems as if a curse attended everything they do. They mar whatever they meddle with, and occasion infinite confusion and mischief."

It will be seen from the above expression of sentiment that the early Methodists were far from favoring the meddling of ministers with the civil government. As they sought God in earnest prayer for divine aid, they could realize something of the inconsistency of a church professing to follow the meek and lowly Saviour, and yet at the same time endeavoring to force every one to worship God just as they did. In their condition they could measure the enormity of the crime attached to the persecution of the righteous, because they chanced to be on the side of the few. These representative pioneers could then pass sweeping condemnation upon the very things now so earnestly sought after by their professed followers.

It is to be supposed that there are honest, God-fearing people not on the popular side of some of the theological problems of our times. What shall these expect from the reverend magistrates when all Christian laws, institutions, and usages (as they shall interpret them) shall be placed on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation? Will any one have an occasion to complain of these clerical officials then as Dr. Whitehead and Wesley remonstrated against them in their day? Are men so much better now than they were then that they make to us a great blessing out of what proved to be such a curse then? If mankind has improved so much since Wesley's time that there is no danger of civil power being prostituted for partisan purposes, we would then suppose that the people are so far enlightened that they could become religious without the aid of a theocracy to coerce them into the service of the Lord.

WM. COVERT.

Our One Hundred Thousand Rulers.

[It will be noticed that the following article is on the same subject as one already printed in the December number of the SENTINEL. The writer of that article was absent from the office when he wrote it, and this article was written several days before that one reached the office. Consequently this article was laid over, and that one was printed. This is not printed now because we think that justice was not done in the other, but because it was already written and because it treats the subject so differently that really there is no repetition.]

In the SENTINEL for June we inserted the following: "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?" Rev. M. A. Gault found this item in the SENTINEL, and in it he found something with which he could make his voice to clash, and so, in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, he has undertaken to tell us just how this thing can be, and this is how he does it:—

"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 voice."

Mark it, reader, in the "model of government which Christ gave to Israel," "all their rulers were elected by the people." We know not exactly what time it is to which Mr. Gault refers as the one when Christ gave to Israel their "model of Government." We do not know whether he refers to the time when Moses was chosen; or when the seventy elders were chosen; or when the judges were chosen; or when Saul was chosen; and so not knowing to which time it is that he refers we shall have to notice all four of these, and of course the first one to which we come where the rulers were elected by the people, that must be the time, and that the "model of Government" received from Christ, to which Mr. Gault refers.

If the gentleman refers to the "model of government" that was instituted when Moses was chosen, then we should like very much for him to tell us about how many, if any, of "the people" were at the burning bush when Moses was elected. Exodus 3.

If Mr. Gault refers to the "model of government" instituted at the time the seventy elders were chosen, then we would refer him to the following scripture: "And the Lord [not the people] 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 them there; and I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them. . . . And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people,

and set them round about the tabernacle. And the Lord came down in the 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, 24, 25. And in view of this we wish he would tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of the seventy elders.

If our critic refers to the "model of Government" in which the judges ruled, then we would call his attention to Judges 2 : 16-18: "The Lord raised up judges. . . . And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge." And in view of this scripture will he tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of a judge whom the Lord raised up?

Or if perchance the reverend gentleman refers to none of these, but means that "model of Government" which was established when a king was chosen, then we ask him to read the following: "Now the Lord had told Samuel in his ear a day before Saul came, saying, To-morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel. . . . And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people." "Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" 1 Sam. 9 : 15-17; 10 : 1. But Saul was finally rejected, not by the people, but by the Lord, and again Mr. Gault may read: "The Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite; for I have provided me a king from among his sons." And when after all the other sons of Jesse had passed by, and David was sent for, when he came, "the Lord said, Arise, anoint him; for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon Daniel from that day forward." 1 Sam. 16 : 1, 12, 13. And to David God said: "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7 : 12-16.

Now as Mr. Gault conveys the idea that he has studied the Bible a great deal, it certainly is not asking too much of him to request that he tell us about how many of "the people" cast their ballots when Saul or David was elected king of Israel.

Here, then, in these four forms of Government—that under Moses and Joshua, the seventy elders, the judges, and the kings—are all wherein there is any possibility of finding a "model of Government which Christ gave

to Israel," and the plain Scripture, the plain matter of fact, is, that in not a single one of them is there a shadow or a hint of such a thing as that "all," or any, of "their rulers were elected by the people." So much for Mr. Gault's study of the Bible and of the "model of Government which Christ gave to Israel."

Now just a word upon his study(?) of our own Government. He says that in our Government, in this Government of the United States, "there are one hundred thousand rulers in whose election the people have no choice." If this were to come from anybody but a leading National Reformer, we should call it a most astounding statement. But as these are the men who are to be made the interpreters of the Scriptures on all points civil, ecclesiastical, and moral, and whose decision is to be final, when one of them speaks *ex cathedra*, it becomes us, to whom there belongs no right of interpretation nor decision on any subject moral or civil, to be very meek about how we shall handle it. Therefore we shall be very careful in our examination of this oracular utterance.

No doubt it will be a piece of very interesting news to the American people to learn that they have in this Government "one hundred thousand rulers" at all; much more when it is declared that this is only the number of those "in whose election the people have no voice;" and that consequently there are in the United States "one hundred thousand rulers" beside those who are elected by the people! Now we have looked this thing over somewhat, and we know that from the President of the United States down through the governors of States, to the constable of a precinct, they are all "rulers," as we presume Mr. Gault would call them, in whose election the people *do* have a voice. To go outside of the list of these, then, the only other place under the Government where we find "rulers" is among officers of the army and navy, for there we know there are some who rule with an iron hand. But they have nothing to do with us, they are not rulers "of ours;" besides there are not one hundred thousand persons in the army and navy together, officers, soldiers, and marines. So assuredly these cannot be the "rulers" whom our critic has in mind.

We cannot imagine, therefore, to what class of our rulers it can be to which Mr. Gault refers by such a vast number "in whose election the people have no voice," unless it be to the *appointees of the civil service!* that is, the postmasters, registers, and receivers of land offices, internal revenue collectors, etc., etc., and all their clerks! These we believe now amount to just about a hundred thousand; and these "rulers" are all appointed. In regard to these Mr. Gault is correct in saying that in their "election the people have no voice." And as these are the only "rulers" "of ours" in whose "election the people have no voice," we are absolutely driven to the conclusion that these *are* the "rulers" to whom our eminent critic undoubtedly refers.

But the idea of applying the title of "rulers" to postmasters, registers of land offices, revenue collectors, and such like! The idea of

calling a lot of servants, "rulers"! Well, well, no number of exclamation points could express our astonishment, and we are utterly at a loss for language to fitly characterize such a conception of Government, and of rulers; especially when it is coupled with the ambition to make itself the sole interpreter in all affairs of Government.

And it is such men as Mr. M. A. Gault whom the National Reform party proposes to make the National interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points;" men whose interpretations the most casual reader can see are utterly at variance with every portion of Scripture on the subject; and whose ideas of Government are so crude as to suppose that a lot of Government clerks are rulers of the people. It is such men as this, and men of such ideas of Scripture and of Government as are these, into whose hands the American people are coolly asked to put, by Constitutional Amendment, the direction of all the affairs of religion and Government. It is such men as these whom we are asked to make the supreme arbiters of the Nation, and whose decision will be "final." And the worst of it all is, that from what we see actually occurring in the Nation at this very time, we are not prepared to say but that the American people are going to do just this thing. But let them know of a surety that in the day when the affairs of this Nation are put into the ambitious hands of the National Reformers, in that day the American people will bind the fair form of Liberty in fetters more absolute than any she has ever borne outside of the bitter rule of the Papal Inquisition.

A. T. J.

OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

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

By U. SMITH.

AUTHOR OF "SMITH'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES," ETC., ETC.

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

The Sunday Question,

Modern Spiritualism, and

National Reform

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE MARVEL OF NATIONS is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

COMBINATION OFFER.—Arrangements have been made whereby those who desire can receive a copy of this Popular Book, and the *American Sentinel*, one year, post-paid, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.

A POPULAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION,

ESTABLISHED IN 1882.

FOUR YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY.

FOUNDED AND MANAGED UPON SOUND PRINCIPLES.

THOROUGH INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTS OF LEARNING

IN ALL THE GRADES AND THROUGH THE

CLASSICAL COURSE.

FACULTY CONSISTS OF FIFTEEN INSTRUCTORS OF EXPERIENCE.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

1. Instruction in the various trades, with two hours per day spent in active work.
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.

Spring Term begins Monday, January 3, 1887.

S. BROWNSBERGER, A. M., President.

Healdsburg, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1887.

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

SECTION VII of the constitution of Kansas reads as follows:—

"The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or to support any form of worship; nor shall control of, or interference with, the right of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship."

And yet Mr. M. A. Gault, speaking with direct reference to this section, calls the Kansas constitution a "rickety constitution." See *Christian Statesman*, October 22, 1885.

"SECRETARY" GAULT SAYS:—

"An ungodly world has ever frowned contempt upon ministers of the gospel who take an active part in the politics of the day. The devil only asked of the Saviour that he would withdraw from politics and let him manage the governments of the world."

Webster defines blasphemous as "wickedly calumnious," and under this definition we think we are just in saying that the above paragraph is blasphemous; for it is false and libelous, and could have been written by no one except a "National Reformer," or an avowed infidel. If Mr. Gault has ever read the Bible he must know that our Saviour never had anything to do with politics. He must know also that the devil tried to draw our Saviour into politics, and as an inducement offered him "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," but the offer was rejected with scorn. Yet Mr. Gault is the man who advises SENTINEL writers to study the Bible, and is one of the men to whom, when "National Reform" shall have succeeded, the courts must look for the interpretation of the Bible. All true Christians should pray to be spared the sight.

We would inform Mr. Gault that the Saviour could have entered into politics only at the expense of falling down and worshiping Satan. This proposition is still open to the ministers of Christ, and they cannot mingle in politics without to a greater or less extent accepting it.

THE *Christian Nation* puts the whole thing in a nut-shell, when it says:—

"There seems to us to be a feeling throughout the rank and file of our workers for National Reform something like this: Secure the respect of men for our cause first, and then work as much as possible without losing that respect."

It would be impossible to make a clearer or better analysis of the methods of National Reform. The *Nation* calls upon them to get down from their "loftiness," but we are quite sure that they will not do it. Their movement is essentially of this world, and is dependent solely upon worldly influences, worldly meth-

ods, and the political preferences of men ambitious of worldly power; therefore, the first and last consideration *must* be to secure the respect of men. For the National Reform workers to get down from such "loftiness" would be the certain destruction of their cause.

Wendell Phillips said: "No reform, moral or intellectual, ever came down from the upper classes of society. Each and all came up from the protest of martyr and victim." This very characteristic, and the essential one, of National Reform, of working exclusively amongst "the upper classes of society," of courting the respect of the "respectable classes," shows that it lacks the element of a true reform. It begins in the wrong place; it uses the wrong methods of true reform. By Mr. Phillips' statement—and it is the truth—"National Reform" is the reverse of true-reform, and therefore is not reform at all.

Our Questions Answered.

IN several different issues of the SENTINEL we have inserted for the special benefit of Mr. M. A. Gault a "clashing voices" exercise. So far we have no evidence that the reverend gentleman has applied his genius to the explication of any one of them. Now we have an exercise to which we would call the *particularly* special attention of Rev. M. A. Gault, District Secretary of the National Reform Association.

This which we now insert is not exactly a clashing voices exercise. We rather think that it would be more to the credit of Mr. Gault if it were. The voices are entirely too much alike to appear well. We happen to have in this office a copy of the *St. Louis Republican* of Sunday, August 1, 1886, in which there is an article written by Mr. George Yule, of St. Louis, under the heading, "Christians against Christ." The last words of Mr. Yule's article are as follows:—

"In conclusion I would remark that it is absolutely suicidal for the pastor of the First Christian Church to continue fooling, like a giddy little boy, in front of the ponderous wheels of the Juggernaut of Truth. *It may be an exhilarating thing for him to stand upon his head and turn hand-springs before the public upon the serious Sunday question; but as his true friend, we beg of him, we plead with him, we implore him, to keep out from under those wheels.*"

Now with the last sentence of this, please "read, compare, and inwardly digest" the following written by the Rev. M. A. Gault in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, 1886, page-4, first column.

"*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.*"

We say again that these voices are entirely too much alike to appear well for Mr. Gault. A comparison of these two quotations casts a good deal of a shadow upon Mr. M. A. Gault's literary honesty. And, lest some one should think that we are indulging in "insinuations," we would say that as a matter of fact Mr.

Gault's words appear to be a downright plagiarism. For about his words in the *Statesman* there is not a sign of quotation marks nor of credit. The words appear in the *Statesman* as wholly his own. If the words are his own, then a comparison with those of Mr. Yule reveals a psychological phenomenon that is truly wonderful.

In our December issue we printed an article under the heading, "Is It Ignorance or Duplicity?" in reply to Mr. Gault's "counterblast to" the SENTINEL. And in view of that article and the evidence here presented, we think there can be no doubt as to how our question should be answered. Our columns are open. Will Mr. Gault rise and explain?

A. T. J.

National Reform and Romanism.

NATIONAL REFORM SAYS:—

"The churches and pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions 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 will be developed there."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 21, 1884.

It was in this way that Rome placed herself in the position of sole interpreter of the Scriptures on all points. Whenever a conflict of opinion occurred, it was brought immediately to the notice of the church, and she must decide as to what was the Scripture in the case, and which one of the disputants was in the right, and her decision was final; consequently no opinion could be held, and no duty practiced, which she chose to declare unscriptural. Therefore, if the Scriptures were to be interpreted alone by her, and conduct was to be regulated alone by her decisions, it is manifest that the more the people read the Scriptures, the more was she annoyed by new controversies, and by the necessity of rendering new decisions; and then *why should she not prohibit* the laity from reading the Scriptures? Besides, where was the use of the laity reading the Scriptures anyhow, when none but the clergy could interpret?

When the National Reformers shall have succeeded, will they prohibit our reading and interpreting the Scriptures? If not, why not? Would it not be vastly better to do so at once than to be kept in a constant whirl of "interpretations" and decisions? Then they could regulate the faith and practice of their so-called Christian government by bulls issued, as occasion required, "*in Domino salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*" This would save them a vast deal of labor, and doubtless would work just as well.

A. T. J.

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 St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1887.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE *Independent* says: "If the religious views of infidels or some form of paganism were to be taught by the State, and believers in the religion of the Bible were to be taxed to pay the expenses thereof, these believers would complain bitterly and justly. The principle, however, is the same, no matter what religious views are incorporated into a system of popular education at the public expense. It is no better and no worse when applied to the religion of the Bible than it would be if applied to any other form of religious belief. The fact that the majority of the people, so far as they have any religion, believe in Christianity, and would have that taught by the State, if any religion is to be thus taught, does not alter the case at all. The rights of the minority not thus believing are just as sacred to them as those of the majority."

MR. GAULT, in the *Christian Statesman* of December 30, 1886, seems to think he has settled a vexed question. He refers to Deut. 1: 13, where Moses said to the people, "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." We referred to the same transaction (Num. 11: 16, 17) in speaking of this subject. But the question with us is: Who gave Moses authority to make rulers for the tribes? And would these wise men have had any authority to act if Moses had not put them into office? The President of the United States has the power to appoint a great many officers, and it is quite customary for the people to present names to him that he may appoint the men of their selection. He may or he may not appoint the ones they select; but in any case, their selection does not make these men officers. They must be appointed by authority. But when the people elect their officers, the President has no more to say on the subject than Mr. Gault has. There was no election, in any proper sense of the term, in the transaction referred to in Num. 11, or Deut. 1.

But let us go back of that. The people elect our President, and thereby give him the appointing power. But *who elected Moses?* Who gave him such power over the tribes and over their judges? Will Mr. Gault please to meet the question, and not longer evade it?

"National Reform" Principles Exemplified.

THERE is no place on earth where the principles of the "National Reform Association" are more clearly exemplified than they are in the Territory of Utah. It is as useless for the Reformers to deny the likeness as it is to deny that their movement contemplates a complete union of Church and State. Over against their constant disclaimers of a desire to inaugurate such a union, every feature of a practical union of Church and State is found embodied in their demands for changes in our Government. And it is a noticeable fact that all classes, except the self-styled Reformers themselves, no matter what their belief may be in respect to matters of the Government and of Christianity, are fully agreed that a union of Church and State will be the unavoidable result of their movement.

What is the actual condition in Utah? And, What are the actual demands of the National Reformers? Answers to these questions will cover the entire subject under consideration, and we will proceed to answer them by quotations from the pages of the organs of the Association.

The *Christian Nation* of Jan. 13, 1886, quoted the words of a man who had spent some time in Utah studying the situation. He said:—

"The Territorial Government of Utah is now and has been from the beginning, dominated by the Mormon Church. Twenty-five years before our forefathers were called upon to proclaim liberty, they eradicated the evil of a union between Church and State. Thomas Jefferson, as you know, was the great apostle of this reform, and it as much as anything else prepared us for a republican form of government; but, for the last forty years, there has existed in Utah an ecclesiastical rule more flagrant than anything Jefferson was ever called upon to consider. The Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God on earth—i. e., it is a sort of theocratic government."

In this description of things in Utah, three points are made prominent: 1. The Mormon Church dominates the civil Government, and this is fitly represented as a union of Church and State. 2. Thomas Jefferson was opposed to this state of things, it being contrary to republican government. 3. The Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God on earth. The first and third points present the peculiar characteristics of Mormonism, and we shall now show that what these embrace is demanded by the Reformers, in our Government.

We shall not preserve the order laid down, but notice,

First, The National Reformers claim that

this Government or nation will be the kingdom of Christ when the Religious Amendment is adopted. In the Pittsburg Convention, in 1874, Dr. Browne, speaking of the present and future position of office-seekers in respect to their movement, said:—

"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."

This language is unmistakable, and is in entire harmony with the general tenor of their teachings. Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, in the *Statesman* of March 21, 1884, said:—

"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."

It is well known that the National Reformers have captured bodily the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The highest officers of the Union are vice-presidents of the Reform Association, and labor zealously in its interest. Mrs. Woodbridge, in an address to the Knights of Labor, in Cleveland, urged upon the Knights the claim of the National Reform cause, closing with the following 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."

In the *Statesman* of May 27, 1886, that superlatively zealous National Reformer, "Rev. M. A. Gault," addressing an objecting minister, said:—

"Strange to tell, you are harder to reconcile to the enthronement of Christ in the nation, than even the Unitarians."

The pamphlet report of the Pittsburg Convention is prefaced with an article by Dr. McAllister, the general secretary of the Association, the closing words of which are as follows:—

"This edition of the report is sent forth with the prayer that He whose honor this movement seeks to promote, . . . will carry forward the glorious work until our beloved nation shall become one of the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

The first quotation given from the *Nation* says that "the Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God upon the earth." And the analogy between this and the claim of the Reformers is complete. They constantly affirm that it is not their intention to *legalize a church*, but to bring Christ into his kingdom, to put the Government upon his shoulders, to enthrone

him, to crown him, in this nation. In this respect the theory of the Mormons and of the National Reformers is identical. The theory is absurd, for the Scriptures give no intimation that Christ will be brought into his kingdom, enthroned, or crowned, in any such manner. The theory is peculiar to the Reformed Presbyterians and the Mormons; and the latter apparently borrowed it from the former.

Secondly, The Mormon Church dominates the civil Government, and this is, practically, a union of Church and State. But this is exactly what the Reformers demand in the whole nation. Rev. J. M. Foster, in the *Statesman* of March, 1884, said:—

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

If this does not mean that the State, the civil power, is to be subordinated to the church, then no language could be framed to express such an idea. And this is not a *lapsus lingue*, an unconsidered expression, for “Secretary Leiper,” a valiant defender of National Reform, undertook to vindicate Mr. Foster in the following language:—

“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?”

Yes, we emphatically deny the statement, even as we deny that marriage is a Christian institution. There are some things in the government and providence of God which are as truly for the non-believer as for the believer. If the National Reformers had their way the sun would shine and the rain would fall only upon the Reformed Presbyterian Church! But that is not God’s method. But the point is, that Mr. Leiper indorses Mr. Foster’s statement, and emphatically repudiates our “views of the relation of Church and State.” In the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886, we find the following strong language:—

“A civil recognition of the church is often represented as inconsistent with her independence and freedom, whereas it is absolutely necessary to that freedom. No true friend of Christ would accept State favor at the expense of independence. The church exists as the Lord has ordained, and the [civil] ruler in an official recognition accepts it as it is, and its great charter, the word, is pleadable before any Legislature or in any court. Otherwise, if the church is only known as a voluntary association, it is bound down to the specific regulations that determine the order of procedure. In the United States, whose Federal Constitution knows no Bible, no Christ, no God, the church has no reason to boast of freedom of action in her own department, and is exposed to prosecution and penalties, when insubordinate members choose to appeal to the civil courts against that discipline which they had vowed to accept.”

Here again we demur to the doctrine. The church is properly a voluntary association; and it has no right to transcend the duties which lie between man and man, or to so deprive its members of their rights as to become subject to “prosecution and penalties.” It is only in such a Government as the National Reformers seek to establish that the

civil power can interfere in questions of doctrines and ordinances; but in questions of individual rights it ought to interfere, for the Bible gives no church or officer authority to lord it over God’s heritage. But our gentle Reformers are by no means satisfied with the measure of power conferred upon them in the gospel. They must, forsooth, usurp authority over the Government which protects them.

The *Statesman* of December 9, 1886, publishes extracts from what it calls “a noteworthy thanksgiving sermon,” in which are the following words:—

“It used to be the law in New England that no man could vote who was not a professing Christian, a member of the church of Christ. An absurd and pernicious law, doubtless, with men what they are. Yet the law is an almost pathetic memorial of the grand design of the Pilgrim Puritans to establish a theocracy in the New World, to which they had fled from the corruptions and persecutions of the Old—a State which should be governed by those and those only who were governed by God. It is also a striking prophecy of that prime necessity of good citizenship, a heart-felt submission and allegiance to the authority of God, which will inevitably result in an effort to realize in society divine ideals of love and justice.”

But the Reformers themselves do not admit even the half-hearted disclaimer here used. Thus Hon. Mr. Patterson, of Pennsylvania, in his speech in the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, said:—

“And this religion, as understood by Protestants, tending, by its effects, to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen, and magistrate, was by the people (of Massachusetts) established as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution; and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution.”

That is to say, that as professed Christians only could vote or exercise the rights of citizenship in Massachusetts, so it should be in all the United States. Remember, it was under this very Christian arrangement in Massachusetts that dissenters were banished, whipped, and put to death! Lest the reader should think that we draw too strong conclusions from these several statements, we quote again from the *Christian Nation* of September 15, 1886:—

“Of course, a Government organized on a basis embracing Christianity, could not, with propriety, intrust those with office who are hostile to its characteristic faith. And none of this class have any right to claim that they shall be equally eligible to office with those who are *bona fide* citizens.”

Here it is in full. None are *bona fide* citizens unless they are in harmony with the “characteristic faith,” or religion of the Government! Under their benign rule, which, they often boast, will “secure the rights of all classes,” the dissenter will not be a *bona fide* citizen, and will have no right to claim equal rights with the patriotic Reformed Presbyterian! no right to claim eligibility to office. And there is no Church and State in this; oh, no! “Will you walk into my parlor?”

Once more: President Brunot, in his Pittsburg address, said it was their purpose to acknowledge the Bible as the supreme rule of the conduct of the nation. In the *Christian*

Nation of February 24, 1886, are the following words:—

“Respect for the Bible means respect for the church, for the preaching of the gospel, and for all the means of grace.”

We might multiply quotations to show that they expect to have “the church” occupy a controlling position in their new manner of government, but space forbids. And, as far as the purpose of this article is concerned, it is not needed, for we have fully shown all that we claimed of the complete likeness of the system of the Mormons and of the National Reformers. Both claim that their system, when carried out, is the kingdom of Christ on earth. Both claim that it is the duty of the civil Government to care for, to uphold, and to enforce the teachings of the church. Both claim that the civil offices should be filled by members of the church, and that dissenters have no right to hold office. And this state of things, in the description of Utah as quoted from the *Nation*, is represented as a union of Church and State. But how will the Reformers avoid the conclusion that the same state of things in the whole country will be a national union of Church and State?

It was this very thing that Thomas Jefferson opposed as inimical to a republican Government. It was against this that the framers of our Constitution wisely guarded in the Sixth Article and the First Amendment. It is well known that Thomas Jefferson, more than any other man, is blamed for the secular character, or, what the Reformers claim, the godless character of our Government. Thomas Jefferson was not a religionist; but he was a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and we hope that the people of the United States may be aroused to the fact that our liberties, both civil and religious, are in danger from the efforts now being made to subordinate this civil Government to the will of the church. It is just as dangerous to republicanism now as it was in the days of Jefferson; just as dangerous to individual rights as it was two centuries ago in Massachusetts; just as dangerous in Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Tennessee, as it is in Utah. And let us not be deceived with the idea that the days of religious persecution have passed away, never to return. Religious bigotry and intolerance are manifest in every part of our land. Were it not so, the cause of “National Reform” or of the Religious Amendment of the Constitution, would not flourish as it does, and become popular as it is very fast becoming. Dr. Howard Crosby well said: “The moment you put religion into the hands of the Government, you do what Constantine did, and will bring about the dark ruin of the tenth century.”

J. H. W.

THE same cause which restrained the vigor, polluted the character of the church; for, being unable immediately to repress by its own spiritual weapons the violent animosities of its ministers, and impatient of the gradual influence of time and reason, in a dark and disastrous moment it had recourse to that temporal sword which was not intended for its service, and which it has never yet employed without disgrace or with impunity.—*Waddington.*

The National Reform Doctrine of Majorities.

LAST October, at the Wichita, Kansas, Reform Convention, Rev. J. M. Armour, of Sterling, Kansas, delivered an address, in which he inveighed against the idea of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and maintained that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," in the following manner:—

"If government be of man,—if it be the mere will of the people,—why should I stand in awe of it? I do not. I cannot look with awe and reverence upon the decisions and mandates of neighbor Jones, for I know that he is not the source of law to me; he is but my equal. Now if he and Smith agree to say what I shall do, must I recognize in Jones and Smith my rightful rulers? the government that I ought to respect and obey? Nay; if Jones and Smith and Brown agree to lay down the law for me, I am still unsubdued. I still assert my right. . . . Nay, let millions of men, each of them my equal, command what is wrong or what is right, and their commands can never inspire in me profound reverence. Their will cannot be law to me. . . . It is but the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best. Multiply it by the millions, it is the Jones, Smith, and Brown power still. *Its will is not law.* It has no authority but what belongs to brute force. Neither God nor my conscience bind me to obey the will of a million any more than one of my neighbors."—*Christian Statesman, Dec. 13, 1883.*

The same doctrine was held in the Cleveland National Convention. Rev. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Nor is the consent of the majority sufficient. One man cannot consent for another. Three-fourths of the people cannot consent for the remaining fourth. Forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine people cannot consent for the fifty-millionth man."

Again Mr. Armour said:—

"Any command by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is not only not binding upon those to whom it is addressed, but they to whom such command comes are solemnly bound to disobey and resist it. . . . So all men owe it to themselves to obey no command but such as, traced to its source, has a divine sanction."

From these plain and forcible declarations, it would naturally be supposed that the National Reform party expect that the Religious Amendment will be adopted so entirely unanimously that there will not be one single dissenting voice. Because by the foregoing they plainly allow that if there shall be the fifty-millionth man who holds their work or their laws to be not of God, that "fifty-millionth man" is not bound to obey, but "solemnly bound to disobey and resist" the authority of their Government under the Religious Amendment. And the unanimous voice of the other "forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine" "cannot consent for" him.

But if the National Reform party means this, where then is the efficacy of their movement? "Aye! there's the rub;" they don't mean it; for proof of which, now see

THE OTHER SIDE.

"So long as Christians are in the majority, they have a right to maintain a Christian

character in their Government." Please observe, "their (?) Government." See *Christian Statesman*, November 1, 1883, editorial.

Again:—

"This Amendment of the Constitution means that a majority of the people of this land shall first believe the principles we seek to have embodied there; and so believe them that their views shall crystallize into the form of law, and that in its most potent form." Please observe, "most potent." See *Statesman*, December 20, 1883, page 1.

Again:—

"How is the Amendment to be carried out practically? . . . A majority must decide."—*Id.*, Feb. 21, 1884.

So, then, if the Government be purely civil and secular, it is only the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best, though it be multiplied by "millions." But if it call itself Christian and religious, it is instantly clothed with "divine right." Neither God nor conscience binds us to "obey the will of a million any more than one," unless that "million" call itself Christian. "The consent of the majority is not sufficient," provided that majority shall not call itself Christian. "Any command, by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is to be solemnly disobeyed and resisted," unless said command should be issued by a power calling itself Christian. But if the power choose to call itself Christian, though every act be the opposite of Christian principle; though it transcend by a "higher law" the sum of all Christian duty, yet if it only call itself Christian, then if it be a majority it "must decide," and exact obedience to its "views" by the "most potent form of law."

How ingenuous! How magnanimous! How eminently Christian! How pre-eminently charitable the National Reform party is, to be sure!!

A. T. J.

The Legacy from Our Fathers.

ONE of the stock arguments of the National Reformers in favor of their movement is that loyalty to the memory of our forefathers demands it. One of the reasons given in the preamble of their constitution is, "that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established." And "the legacy which we have received from our fathers" is a common method of commending those "Christian institutions" which they wish to enforce by civil law. We wish to notice a few things in the early history of our country to see how strong this argument really is.

One of the institutions which we received as a legacy from our fathers was slavery. All are acquainted with the fact that in the colonies, both North and South, slavery was practiced. In McMaster's "History of the People of the United States" we read the following:—

"If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North. While the States were yet colonies, to buy negroes and sell them into slavery had become a source of profit to the inhabitants of many New England towns. Scarce a year passed by but numbers of slavers went out from

Boston, from Medford, from Salem, from Providence, from Newport, from Bristol, in Rhode Island. The trade was of a threefold kind: Molasses brought from Jamaica was turned to rum; the rum dispatched to Africa bought negroes; the negroes, carried to Jamaica or the Southern ports, were exchanged for molasses, which, in turn, taken back to New England, was quickly made into rum."—*Chap. 7, par. 15.*

It cost the nation millions of dollars and thousands of lives to get rid of this legacy, yet Mr. Gault, speaking of the National Reform Association, is willing to have another revolution equally bloody, if necessary to secure their ends.

But slavery will hardly be called a Christian institution, hence it cannot be what they refer to in their constitution. We must remember, however, that it was engaged in by the Christian men who settled this country; and even they could not give it a Christian character. Let us look, then, at some of the acts which they did in the name of and for Christianity. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Quakers," we read the following:—

"The earliest appearance of Quakers in America is a remarkable one. In July, 1656, two women Quakers, Mary Fisher and Ann Austin, arrived at Boston. Under the general law against heresy their books were burnt by the hangman, they were searched for signs of witchcraft, they were imprisoned for five weeks and then sent away. During the same year eight others were sent back to England.

"In 1657 and 1658 laws were passed to prevent the introduction of Quakers into Massachusetts, and it was enacted that on the first conviction one ear should be cut off, on the second the remaining ear, and that on the third conviction the tongue should be bored with a hot iron. Fines were laid upon all who entertained Quakers or were present at their meetings. Thereupon the Quakers, who were perhaps not without the obstinacy of which Marcus Antoninus complained in the early Christians, rushed to Massachusetts as if invited, and the result was that the general court of the colony banished them on pain of death, and four Quakers, three men and one woman, were hung for refusing to depart from the jurisdiction, or obstinately returning within it. That the Quakers were irritating cannot be denied; some of them appear to have publicly mocked the institutions and the rulers of the colony, and to have interrupted public worship; and some of their men and women too acted with fanaticism and disorder. But even such conduct furnishes but a poor apology for inflicting stripes and death on men and women. The particulars of the proceedings of Governor Endicott and the magistrates of New England as given in Besse are startling to read. On the restoration of Charles II. a memorial was presented to him by the Quakers in England, stating the persecutions which their fellow members had undergone in New England. Even the careless Charles was moved to issue an order to the colony which effectually stopped the hanging of Quakers for their religion, though it by no means put an end to the persecution of the body in New England."

In McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, art. "Baptists," we find the following as a further illustration of how the Puritan Fathers put the stamp of Christianity on this country:—

"Massachusetts issued laws against them in 1644, imprisoned several Baptists in 1651, and banished others in 1669. In 1680 the doors of a Baptist meeting-house were nailed

up. In New York laws were issued against them in 1662, in Virginia in 1664. With the beginning of the eighteenth century the persecution greatly abated. They were released from tithes in 1727 in Massachusetts, in 1729 in New Hampshire and Connecticut, but not before 1785 in Virginia. The spread of their principles was greatly hindered by these persecutions."

In Bancroft's "History of the United States," we find an account of the struggle which Roger Williams and the Baptists had for religious liberty. Since the National Reformers are desirous of having this country sustain the same relation to religion which it did then, we quote quite largely from those chapters. In the following paragraphs the reader will find a very correct picture of the result of National Reform principles:—

"A fugitive from English persecution, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and had arrived at its only effectual remedy, the sanctity of conscience. In soul matters, he would have no weapons but soul weapons. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate inward freedom. The principle contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence; it would blot from the statute-book the felony of non-conformity; would quench the fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal protection to every form of religious faith; and never suffer the force of the Government to be employed against the dissenter's meeting-house, the Jewish synagogue, or the Roman cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of his views, he never changed his position; the sanctity of conscience was the great tenet, which, with all its consequences, he defended, as he first trod the shores of New England; and, in his extreme old age, it was the last pulsation of his heart. The doctrine was a logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers; and it was sure to be one day accepted by the whole Protestant world. But it placed the young emigrant in direct opposition to the system of the founders of Massachusetts, who were bent on making the State a united body of believers."

"The Government avoided an explicit rupture with the Church of England; Williams would hold no communion with it on account of its intolerance; 'for,' said he, 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Christ Jesus.' The magistrates insisted on the presence of every man at public worship; Williams reprobated the law; the worst statute in the English code was that which did but enforce attendance upon the parish church. To compel men to unite with those of a different creed, he regarded as an open violation of their natural rights; to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling seemed only like requiring hypocrisy. 'An unbelieving soul is dead in sin,' such was his argument; and to force the indifferent from one worship to another 'was like shifting a dead man into several changes of apparel.' 'No one should be bound to worship, or,' he added, 'to maintain a worship, against his own consent.' 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, amazed at his tenets; 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'from them that hire him.'

"The magistrates were selected exclusively from the members of the church; with equal propriety, reasoned Williams, might 'a doctor

of physic or a pilot' be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church."—*Chap. 9, par. 54, 70, 71.*

"Anabaptism was to the establishment a dangerous rival. When Clarke, the pure and tolerant Baptist of Rhode Island, one of the happy few who have connected their name with the liberty and happiness of a commonwealth, began to preach to a small audience in Lynn, he was seized by the civil officers. Being compelled to attend public worship with the congregation of the town, he expressed his aversion by a harmless indecorum, which would have been without excuse, had his presence been voluntary. He and his companions were tried, and condemned to pay a fine of twenty or thirty pounds; and Holmes, who refused to pay his fine, was whipped unmercifully.

"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 what a jury should 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 punishable by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine.

"By degrees the spirit of the establishment began to subvert the fundamental principles of independency. The liberty of prophesying was refused, except the approbation of four elders, or of a county court, had been obtained. Remonstrance was useless. The union of Church and State was fast corrupting both: it mingled base ambition with the former; it gave a false direction to the legislation of the latter. And in 1658 the general court claimed for itself, for the counsel, and for any two organic churches, the right of silencing any person who was not as yet ordained. The creation of a national, uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which had disgraced their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged."—*Chap. 10, par. 78-80.*

Many more quotations might be made, but these are sufficient. Let it be remembered that the men who practiced these cruelties were Christian men urged on by Christian ministers. These men were no worse than are the men who to-day occupy similar positions. Their action was simply the natural result of the idea that the State was "a model of Christ's kingdom on earth." And this, let it be remembered, is the position taken by National Reformers. Whoever wishes to know the result of the success of the National Reform Association, has only to read the history of the Salem Witchcraft and of the persecutions of the dissenting Baptists and Quakers. Those are the only "Christian features" which our forefathers gave to the Government. We do not wish to disparage the men who settled this country; they lived up to the light which they had. They had themselves suffered oppression for their religious convictions, and had never known such a thing as religious toleration, consequently it took them some time to accord to others that freedom which they demanded for themselves.

But we are happy to say that these "Christian features" were not permanently stamped upon our Government. By the time that the

ship of State was fairly launched, men had learned more of the principles of religious toleration. The Declaration of Independence recognized the fact that all men had equal rights, and the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall make no law 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."

This Constitution comprises all that we have received from our forefathers. We believe it to be the best Constitution ever formed by man, because it carefully guards the rights of all, and leaves the conscience of everyone free. It is this Constitution which makes the United States the best country in the world for the spread of the gospel. And because it allows perfect freedom for the preaching of the gospel from the Bible alone, we are desirous of having it kept as it is, and we cannot countenance those men who, having far more light than the Puritan Fathers had, would revive in this country the practice of the Dark Ages.

E. J. W.

"Are Our Politics to Be Purified."

THIS is a question asked by the National Reform party. We, too, may ask the same question. The Reform party place great reliance upon the success of their movement for the accomplishment of this (much-to-be-desired, indeed!) result. Dr. Merrick in his address at the Cleveland National Reform Convention, said:—

"Where, then, is the antidote [for corrupt politics] to be found? Unhesitatingly I answer, In the religion of Jesus Christ. . . . How can it fail to purify our politics if Christianity be allowed its legitimate place in our Government?"—*Christian Statesman, Dec. 20, 1883.*

Dr. McAllister, also, in the same convention, said:—

"Finally, the proposed Amendment will draw to the administration of the Government such men as the law of God requires,—not the reckless, the unprincipled, the profane, but able men, who fear God and hate covetousness."—*Ibid., Dec. 27, 1883.*

This thing has been tried several times, and always with the same result, namely, to make corruption more corrupt. Given, human nature what it is, and make profession of religion a qualification for governmental favor, or political preference, and the inevitable result will always be that thousands will profess the required religion expressly to obtain political preferment, and for no other reason; and so to dishonest ambition is added deliberate hypocrisy.

The first to employ this method was he to whom can be traced almost every ill that Christianity has suffered (this last one being by no means the least),—Constantine. He made the bishop of Rome a prince of the empire, and clothed the inferior bishops with such power that they not only ruled as princes, but imitated the princes in pride, luxury, worldly pomp, and hateful haughtiness,—imitated the princes in these, and imitated the emperor in persecuting with relentless vigor all who differed with them in faith. And the

bishop of Rome, above all in rank, held the supremacy also in pride, arrogance, and profusion of luxury, to such a degree that one of the most eminent of the heathen writers exclaimed, either in envy or indignation, "Make me bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian."

Nor were the governmental favors of Constantine confined to the bishops; they extended to all orders; and by the promise of a white garment, and twenty pieces of gold to every convert, there was secured in a single year the baptism of no fewer than twelve thousand men, besides a proportionate number of women and children. See Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of Rome," chap. 20, par. 17. And the inevitable consequence was that "formalism succeeded faith, and religion fled from a station among the rulers of Christendom to find shelter in her native scenes among the suffering and the poor." Was politics purified there? No! religion was corrupted and faith debased; and amidst and by it all, were taken the widest and most rapid strides of the Church of Rome toward that fearful height of power and depth of degradation which was the astonishment and the shame of the world.

Another notable instance was Louis XIV. of France. The early part of his reign was a time of much license; "but in his old age he became religious; and he determined that his subjects should be religious too. He shrugged his shoulders and knitted his brows if he observed at his levee, or near his dinner table, any gentleman who neglected the duties enjoined by the church. He rewarded piety with blue ribands, pensions, invitations to Marlé, governments, and regiments. Forthwith Versailles became in everything but dress, a convent. The pulpits and confessionals were surrounded by swords and embroidery. The marshals were much in prayer; and there was hardly one among the dukes and peers who did not carry good little books in his pocket, fast during lent, and communicate at Easter. Madame de Maintenon, who had a great share in the blessed work, boasted that devotion had become quite the fashion."

And was politics purified? With a vengeance! We read on: "A fashion indeed it was; and like a fashion it passed away. No sooner had the old king been carried to St. Denis than the whole court unmasked. Every man hastened to indemnify himself, by the excess of licentiousness and impudence, for years of mortification. The same persons who, a few months before, with meek voices and demure looks, had consulted divines about the state of their souls, now surrounded the midnight table, where, amidst the bounding of champagne corks, a drunken prince, enthroned between Dubois and Madame de Parabere, hiccoughed out atheistical arguments and obscene jests. The early part of the reign of Louis XIV. had been a time of license; but the most dissolute men of that generation would have blushed at the orgies of the Regency."—*Macaulay's Essay on Leigh Hunt.*

But undoubtedly the most notable instance of all is that of the Puritan rule, of the Commonwealth of England. "It was solemnly resolved by Parliament 'that no person shall

be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness.' The pious assembly had a Bible lying on the table for reference.

. . . To know whether a man was really godly was impossible. But it was easy to know whether he had a plain dress, lank hair, no starch in his linen, no gay furniture in his house; whether he talked through his nose, and showed the whites of his eyes; whether he named his children Assurance, Tribulation, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz; whether he avoided Spring Garden when in town, and abstained from hunting and hawking when in the country; whether he expounded hard scriptures to his troops of dragoons, and talked in a committee of ways and means about seeking the Lord. These were tests which could easily be applied. The misfortune was that they proved nothing. Such as they were, they were employed by the dominant party. And the consequence was that a crowd of impostors, in every walk of life, began to mimic and to caricature what were then regarded as the outward signs of sanctity."—*Ibid.*

Thus has it ever been, and thus will it ever be, where Governments, as such, attempt to propagate a religion. The only means which it is possible for Governments to employ are "reward and punishment; powerful means indeed for influencing the exterior act, but altogether impotent for the purpose of touching the heart. A public functionary who is told that he will be promoted if he is a devout Catholic, and turned out of his place if he is not, will probably go to mass every morning, exclude meat from his table on Fridays, shrive himself regularly, and perhaps let his superiors know that he wears a hair shirt next his skin. Under a Puritan [or a National Reform also we may say] Government, a person who is apprised that piety is essential to thriving in the world [see *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 21, Dec. 21 and 27, 1883, and Feb. 21, 1884, particularly, but in fact almost any number], will be strict in the observance of the Sunday, or, as he will call it, Sabbath; and will avoid a theater as if it were plague-stricken. Such a show of religion as this the hope of gain and the fear of loss will produce, at a week's notice, in any abundance which a Government may require. But under this show, sensuality, ambition, avarice, and hatred retain unimpaired power, and the seeming convert has only added to the vices of a man of the world all the still darker vices which are engendered by the constant practice of dissimulation. The truth cannot be long concealed. The public discovers that the grave persons who are proposed to it as patterns, are more utterly destitute of moral principle and of moral sensibility than avowed libertines. It sees that these Pharisees are further removed from real goodness than publicans and harlots. And, as usual, it rushes to the extreme opposite to that which it quits. It considers a high religious profession as a sure mark of meanness and depravity. On the very first day on which the restraint of fear is taken away, and on which men can venture to say what they think, a frightful peal of blasphemy and ribaldry proclaims that the short-sighted policy which aimed at making a nation of saints has made a nation of scoffers."—*Ibid.*

Yet in the very face of these plainest dictates of pure reason, and these most forcible lessons of history, and in utter defiance of all the teaching of universal history itself, the National Reform party, with that persistence which is born of the blindness of bigoted zeal, is working, and will continue to work, with might and main, to bring upon this dear land all this fearful train of disorders. Their movement reminds us of nothing so much as of these quack medicines that are so abundant, warranted to cure every ill that is known to the human body; while at the same time they will create a thousand ills that the human system has never known before. As with these, so with the National Reform; it is warranted to cure all the ills of the body politic, while, as anyone with half an eye can see, it bears in its hands a perfect Pandora's box, wide open, to inflict its innumerable evils upon our country; and, as they will learn when it is too late, they will have no power to retain even hope. She herself will have flown away, and nothing remain but utter, irretrievable, awful ruin. A. T. J.

Governmental Jurisdiction.

JURISDICTION is a law term used to denote the idea of governmental authority over persons and things within the scope of its action. No such authority is absolutely universal as to the persons subject to it, or as to the matters which it embraces. Many things are so entirely private in their nature or so little concern the general public that they are by universal consent left exclusively to individual choice, without any attempt to regulate them by law. Governments exist for particular purposes, which by no means include the entire bulk of human affairs.

How, then, is it with religion considered as a faith or a worship, as a spiritual exercise or a social expression thereof? Does it come within the rightful jurisdiction of human Government? Does it properly belong to any such Government to regulate, administer, propagate, or in any way take charge of the religion of the people? The answer given by history is that most of the Governments of the world have assumed that religion lies within the scope of their regulating and administrative agency. The legislation consequent upon the assumption, whether more or less liberal, or more or less oppressive, will be according to the general civilization of the people. Pains and penalties, discriminations on religious grounds, special immunities granted or denied on these grounds, compulsory taxation for the support and propagation of religion, the appointment and control of religious teachers, religious tests as qualifications for civil office or to testify in a court of justice—these are among the things which the assumption carries along with it, and by which it makes itself operative. The principle is the same in all cases, varying only in the extent to which it is applied.

It seems not a little strange that a principle fraught with so much evil and so essentially false, as well as absurd, should have lasted so long and spread so extensively among the nations of the earth, and that even now the

discovery of its falseness should be limited to so small a portion of the human family. Its victims usually perceive the wrong when they feel its burden; yet it has often happened, as was the case with our Puritan Fathers, that they no sooner cease to be victims than they are ready to become oppressors—forgetting, “as victors, the lessons which as victims they had learned.” One would think that so simple a proposition as that which affirms the existence and inalienable character of the rights of a religious conscience as above and beyond all human authority ought to have been among the earliest and most widely-extended discoveries of the race. The fact, however, is sadly the reverse. Of all the forms of wrong which men have suffered from each other, none have been less reasonable or more merciless and unrelenting than those of religious zeal armed with the civil power. There is no darker chapter in the history of Governments than that which chronicles their misdeeds in the attempt to administer and propagate religion. The attempt is essentially a horrible human tyranny begun, and every step of the process is that tyranny continued.

The doctrine of a *personal* God, related to men as their Creator and Preserver, being received into the mind as the *objective* basis of religion, naturally connects itself with the idea of this God as a supreme *lawgiver*, to whose authority we are directly subject and from whose administrative control no power can release us. His will, no matter how ascertained, is the final law. Peter and John were simply true to universal thought when they said: “We ought to obey God rather than men.” Daniel was true to the same thought when he disregarded the edict of a king rather than violate that of his God. The martyrs who took joyfully the spoiling of their goods and cheerfully died at the stake for what they regarded as obedience to God were true to the doctrine that God, and not man, is the supreme ruler, and that the authority of the latter—whether that of the parent, the magistrate, the legislative assembly, or the king—when in conflict with that of the former, is not for a moment to be regarded. No human law can outlaw the law of God. There is but one supreme authority in the universe, and this is exclusively vested in God himself. No one disputes this proposition who believes in the existence of a personal God. It is one of the first truths of all religion.

Now, as to the question whether there is such a God, thus related to each individual man, and, if so, as to what are his laws and what duties he requires us to perform; and as to the further question whether this God has made a supernatural revelation of his will to men, and, if so, as to what that revelation contains—as to these questions no human being, unless directly inspired by God himself, can authoritatively judge for another. What others think may be a source of light, and, in this sense, of value; but it is no rule to the individual, unless he thinks the same thing. He must adopt their thoughts before they can become his rule; and in doing so it is not possible for him to disown his own reason or

his own conscience. These faculties form his best light, and necessarily imply a negation of the authority of any other human being to govern his thoughts, or the right of any human power forcibly to interfere with their peaceable exercise. God has established no ecclesiastical bureau in any earthly Government to take the religious charge of the individual reason and conscience, to supersede their personal functions, and dispense truth and piety to men according to order. All such bureaus, whether managed by kings or popes, invade a province exclusively occupied by the divine Government, and, hence, insult the Majesty of Heaven while they outrage the rights of earth. Each individual soul must and does think for itself upon its own direct responsibility to the King of kings; and that, too, no matter how ignorant or how much superstition may have warped the understanding. What it thinks is necessarily a law whose jurisdiction no merely human opinion or authority can either displace or destroy. It is sovereign for the individual.

Moreover, religion consists essentially in *voluntary* homage and obedience rendered to God by a rational and accountable being. Its spiritual phenomena belong to a realm to which no human authority can extend. Such authority may punish their outward expression or the want of such expression; but the seat of religion lies beyond its agency. No parent can lash his child into piety and no king can make his subjects devout toward God by commanding them to be so. Religion was never forced into any soul, or forced out of it. Whoever worships and obeys God, worships and obeys the God of whom he thinks, and in whose existence he believes. He does so under the inner guidance of his own reason and conscience, and not under the authority of the reason and conscience of another. This is the immutable law of his own being, as well as of the character of the service rendered.

It follows, then, from the very nature of religion, as a matter between the soul and its God, from the absolute and supreme authority of God and from the necessary supremacy of the individual reason and conscience in determining the religious question between God and the soul, that civil Governments cannot extend their agency to the administration or regulation of religion without committing a trespass upon the rights of God and man at the same time. They cannot make its laws, since here God himself is the sole lawgiver. They cannot add to its sanctions or modify or cancel its claims. They cannot coerce men into piety, since the service itself admits of no coercion. They cannot destroy the authority of the individual reason and conscience, since this authority is indestructible by any human power. Each soul, as to its faith, its thoughts and affections, and the obligations which bind it to God, is as free from the rightful control of human authority as it could be if no such authority existed. And this is what is meant by religious freedom—freedom not from God's authority, but from man's authority, so that each one is left to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

This statement needs to be qualified by the

remark that no one, as a member of civil society, has a right so to exercise his religious liberty as to make himself a trespasser upon the rights of others, or act in a manner inconsistent with the good order and safety of that society. While free to think what he pleases, and equally free peaceably to express and propagate his opinions, he is not free to commit acts which society cannot, in consistency with its own welfare, permit to be done with impunity, for any reasons. It is the province of just and enlightened legislation to fix the limits within which individual liberty must move, and beyond which it must yield to the general good. It is possible to err here; yet without such limits fixed somewhere the community would be at the mercy of every man's superstition, and each would be licensed to do what he pleased under the color of religion. Society cannot, as an organism regulated by law, exist upon any such principle. A penal code to protect the rights of men by preventing crime is, hence, not repealed by the doctrine of religious liberty.

Restraining, then, the outward exercise of this liberty within the limits established by sound reason and impartial justice, human Governments have but a single additional duty to perform; and this is to *protect* it. Protection here does not mean patronage, or support, or regulation of religion in any way; but it does mean that no one, no matter who he is, or what may be his religion, or whether he belongs to the majority or the minority or stands absolutely alone, shall be interfered with when peaceably worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience or when peaceably imparting his religious convictions to others, and that no one shall be compelled by law to perform any religious duty or be subject to any disability on the ground of non-performance, or be required by compulsory taxation to contribute to the maintenance or propagation of any religious system. It does mean that, within the limits demanded by the rights of others, each individual shall be left absolutely free as to his religion and as to its social expression, being protected in his person against oppression and in his property against religious exactions. It does mean such a complete, universal, and impartial equality before the laws as excludes all discriminations among citizens on religious grounds, and permits every one to judge for himself as to what religion he shall adopt, or whether he shall adopt any, and then as to what he shall do or omit to do within the bounds of decency and social order. Protection is the one word that defines the whole duty of civil Government in respect to the religion of its citizens. This is all they need, all to which they are entitled, and the utmost that a just Government can consistently render.—*S. T. Spear, D. D.*

WESTERN civilization utterly repudiates this idea [of paternal Government], denies the existence of any analogy between the family and the State, and seeks to make *men* and not *children* of the people.—*Pres. George Washburn.*

“Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.” John 18 : 36.

History Repeating Itself.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL aims to be true to its name, and to call attention to the dangers threatening our country. And though the chief danger, and that in which all other dangers culminate, lies in National Reform, yet it is both interesting and profitable to take other views of the political horizon than that which lies directly in the line of vision toward National Reform. The following we think is worthy the serious consideration of every thoughtful person.

In 1857 Lord Macaulay writing of the American Republic used these words:—

"The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, not one of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith; on the other is a demagogue, canting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in carriages, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by the workingman who hears his children crying for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such seasons of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning. Either some Cæsar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions."

With that please read the following editorial note from the *Argonaut* (S. F.), of November 6, 1886.—

"Mr. Henry George has not carried New York, and has not become its mayor, but this is what has been done: An impecunious adventurer, who has no property, pays no taxes, has no residence or citizenship anywhere—so far as we know—takes his grip-sack in his hand and moves to the great American metropolis, and, gathering around him all there is of poverty, ignorance, discontent, and crime, proclaims himself a candidate for mayor; without party, or press, or money, he organizes discontent, and, becoming its leader, he marshals a band of men who have little to lose and much to gain, and marches them to the ballot-box to obtain control of the government of a city containing more than a million of people and more than a thousand millions of aggregated wealth. That he does not succeed may be a matter of congratulation; that he came within a few thousand votes of his successful opponent, seems to us an incident of great significance, that carries with it the suggestion of danger. In saying this it is not necessary to deny to Mr. Henry George great ability and thorough integrity of purpose. We may not call him crank or impracticable theorist; but the danger lies in the fact that the class of discontents is so numerous, and that it can be brought together for a political purpose, and become subordinate to party discipline, and wielded for political use. When one reflects in this direction, he can but question whether the unlimited exercise of the elective franchise ought not to be taken from an alien immigrating class, in order that the ranks of this dangerous and restless element may be prevented from further enlargement."

Then in connection with these two extracts

the following from an editorial in the November *Century* is interesting and strongly suggestive. Under the heading of "The Congressional Balance-sheet" is given a striking illustration of the incapability, if not the failure, of Congress as a legislative body. The editor says:—

"The reader may perhaps desire an explanation of this failure of our national Legislature. Let him then go to Washington while the two Houses are in session. Let him sit in the gallery of the Senate, provided an 'executive session' does not turn him out; let him scan the faces of the Senators, reflect upon their previous records, and consider how many of them came to occupy their present positions.

"Let him then go and sit for a time in the gallery of the House of Representatives, and watch that national bear-garden. Let him enjoy the usual scene—one purple-faced Representative sawing the air in the progress of what is technically called an 'oration;' a dozen or more highly-amused colleagues surrounding him; the rest of the members talking at the top of their voices, clapping their hands for pages, writing, reading, telling funny stories and laughing uproariously at them, making social calls from desk to desk, doing anything and everything except the business for which they are paid.

"Let him try to estimate the rapidity with which a plain business man, finding his clerks engaged in such a scene during business hours, would make a 'clean sweep' of them. He will no longer ask an explanation of the congressional balance-sheet. What better result could be expected from two Houses, each in its own way controlled by influences antagonistic to intelligent legislation? Congress is no longer a legislative body. Its degeneration is now admitted. It consists now of a plutocracy at one end, and a mobocracy at the other. The two chronic perils of a democracy have a firm grip on the Congress of the United States.

"Here is no question of comparative guilt or responsibility. Each House is as bad in its way as the other. Nor is there any partisan question involved. The course of Congress has for years been downhill. Able and sincere men are still to be found in both Houses, yet each successive Congress is, on the whole, worse than its predecessors; not because Democrats or Republicans control it, but because it is two years further on the road. . . .

"The Congress of the United States has become the most incapable legislative body of the constitutional world. So far as the Senate is concerned, its case is hopeless; the only remedy is outside of it, in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. The case of the House is somewhat different; its failure may be redeemed by reform within itself."

But the prospect of a cure by this prescription is as hopeless as is the case for which it is given. "The only remedy for the Senate" is said to be in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. But the constituencies are as corrupt as is the Senate. Else how is it that the Senate is so bad? The House it is said "may be redeemed by reform within itself." It *might* be it is true. But will it be? Is there hope of reform from such a source? To think so is like expecting a man to lift himself by the straps of his boots. In the last resort therefore we see only that the whole case, as the editor says of that of the Senate, is hopeless.

In view of these things stated by the *Argonaut* and the *Century*, Lord Macaulay's words are remarkable. And when we view the de-

structive violence of the participants in the almost perpetual strikes, their secret and sometimes open sympathy with Anarchists, and their always open advocacy of Socialism, which can only end in anarchy, it appears as though the American "Huns and Vandals" mentioned by Macaulay are almost ready to burst upon the nation. And though Macaulay places the time of plunder in "the twentieth century;" and though there remain but thirteen years before the twentieth century comes; yet we very much doubt whether the nineteenth century instead of the twentieth will not see this time of ruin so clearly pictured by this justly eminent writer and thinker. For when the Hun and the Vandal came upon Rome there was no Cæsar, and the time of the American Huns and Vandals seems too near to hope for a Cæsar here.

Yet there is one more step that may be taken before ruin is reached. That is, let the whole body—representatives and constituencies—become permeated with the vileness of an apostate church; let religious hypocrisy be added to political chicanery and legislative incompetency, then will be reached the condition in which Rome stood at the time to which Macaulay refers, and having reached it, a dreadful fall awaits this nation, as surely as red-handed ruin fell upon Rome. And that there may not be a single color lacking in the lurid picture, National Reform presents itself, and in it the embodiment of the last element of corruption needed to fill up the cup of iniquity, as Rome's was filled when ruin overtook her. History *does* repeat itself. And if any just lesson may be drawn from history, it seems that this one must be that ruin stands at the doors of our nation to-day; and the National Reform party has its hand upon the latch ready to open the door and let her in.

A. T. J.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS
AND GENERAL HISTORY.

BY ROBERT H. LABBERTON.

AS A CLASS TEXT-BOOK it is superior to any other in Unity, Brevity, Clearness, Logical Arrangement, and Suggestiveness.

AS A REFERENCE BOOK it should be in the Library of every school-room in the country; every Student of History should possess a copy.

In your Reading Circle or at home when you wish to consult an Atlas you need a map for a particular date. Your modern Atlas will not give it. This is the only Atlas which has a map for every period.

A MAP for any particular date can instantly be found by anyone, each map having over it in figures, the year or period it covers.

It is the only Atlas in which each nationality has, and always retains, its own distinctive color; hence every period has a map, and they are progressive, forming in themselves a panorama of events effective in the highest degree.

NEW MAPS OF ANCIENT EMPIRES.

It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Koscean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires.

The text is brief, suggestive, fascinating, but gives in an attractive form the leading events in the history of the world (not a bundle of particular histories), free from unnecessary details. It has an index.

Labberton's New Historical Atlas and General History is indispensable to Libraries, Reading Circles, School Officers, Teachers, Students, etc. It contains 198 Maps, printed in colors, 30 Genealogical Charts, and is complete in one volume, 4to. Cloth, 312 pages. Sent by Mail or Express, prepaid, for \$2.50.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

A TRACT of 24 pages, which fully answers this question, and shows how Sunday displaced the Bible Sabbath. Extracts given from Catholic writers. Price, 3 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1887.

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

THOSE who are clamoring for a kingdom of Christ on earth, which shall at the same time be a republic, might see a picture of themselves and learn something, if they would, from the following words by A. F. Schaffner, D. D., in the *Sunday School Times* of January 8:—

"Some people in our days demur to the justice and sovereignty of God, and want him rather to dance attendance on the whims of sinful men. It would please them to have the universe governed by the votes of men, rather than by the fiat of the Almighty. But the kingdom of God is an absolute monarchy, and not a republic. Had it been a republic, it would have gone to pieces long ago."

MANY have made inquiries concerning bound volumes of the SENTINEL. We are happy to say that we can now fill orders for any quantity of the first volume, bound in manilla or cloth, with index. The bound volume is neat and handy, and will be of great value as a book of reference, or a text-book for those who wish to understand the folly and iniquity of the so-called National Reform movement. Price, in manilla covers, 60 cents; in cloth, \$1.00. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

A PATERNAL Government, under exceptional circumstances, may for a time secure a certain amount of material prosperity and even of moral and intellectual development, but in general this system must develop a type of character where the virtues of childhood are not only exaggerated at the expense of those which are the glory of manhood, but are liable also to be extinguished by the vices of a manhood uncontrolled by reason or conscience.—*Pres. George Washburn.*

THE most fatal consequence which has in any age resulted from the connection between Church and State, is the application of the penalties of the one to the disorders of the other,—the correction of spiritual offenses by temporal chastisements. . . . And since its wickedness and its folly have been exposed and acknowledged, there can now be no circumstances under which a wise Government would employ such interference, or an enlightened priesthood desire it.—*Waddington.*

REFORM LOGIC.—In the *Christian Nation*, a certain minister, in an article headed, "Ours a Christian Nation," amongst other proofs (?) offers the following:—

"There is not an anti-Christian law on our statute books; that is, not a law opposed to Christianity."

And there is not a law on our statute books opposed to Mohammedanism; does that make ours a Mohammedan nation? There is not a

law against Buddhism; not a law against infidelity. Therefore—what kind of a nation are we?—A law against any of these would be an infringement of human rights, and therefore an outrage. Ours is a civil Government—just as it ought to be. To make it a religious Government—to unite it with ecclesiasticism—is simply Church and State, and any denial of it is a subterfuge.

The Truth Confessed.

THE National Reformers persistently talk about the "Christian Sabbath," and the "Christian law of marriage," and one of their most prominent "Secretaries" said, in the *Statesman*, that "the race is indebted to the religion of Christ for the pure blessing of the family." The gospel is of infinite worth to the fallen race, but we do not believe it is honored or advanced by destroying its relations. To deny original obligations and original institutions is to neutralize the gospel, for the gospel is purely remedial, and to merge every obligation and institution into the gospel is to make it elementary and not remedial.

But the truth will out sometimes. In the *Christian Nation* of December 22, 1886, in the Sunday-school Notes by Rev. W. J. Coleman, himself a zealous "Reformer," are the following words:—

"Marriage and the Sabbath, these are the two gifts of God to Paradise, which have survived the fall. How sadly sin has marred them both, yet they bear the aroma of the Eden whence they came, and hold inclosed within them the greater part of the happiness yet engaged [enjoyed?] in this world."

True, every word. But that which was given in Paradise and has "survived the fall," cannot be of Christian origin, or be any part of Christianity. Both these institutions are contained in the moral law, the violation of which made the gospel necessary. We have several times called attention to the fact that the Reformers generally ignore the proper distinction between *morality* and *religion*. The above declaration of Mr. Coleman looks toward a recognition of that distinction. We are constrained to believe that these people have no *system* of Bible ethics, but indulge in random talk to suit their fancy and the occasion.

We repeat what we have said before, "The gospel enforces all morality, but it originates none." Pardon recognizes the obligation or binding power of the law, but it does not annul law, or give authority to law. The ministry of the gospel is a "ministry of reconciliation." That, and that only. Whenever our model reformers prove that the Sabbath and marriage are of Christian origin, and did not exist in Paradise before the fall of man, then we will unite with them in talking about a "Christian Sabbath," if any such can be found, and we will accept marriage as a Christian institution, and acknowledge that the blessing of the family is peculiar to the gospel—but not till then. J. H. W.

"I CHARGE thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word."—*Paul to Timothy.*

Renewals of Subscriptions.

A NUMBER of subscriptions to this paper expire in February, 1887, also in March, 1887. The address label will tell the exact date to which your time is paid. Our terms are cash in advance and we hope that none of our readers will allow their name to be dropped from our mailing list. Please renew early so as to avoid the possibility of missing any issue of the SENTINEL. The price is only 50 cents per year, less than one cent a week. Who cannot raise that small sum to aid a noble cause? If you will send us two new subscribers at 50 cents each, we will send you the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year free.

The True Educator.

"THE students in the industrial department of the South Lancaster Academy print the *True Educator* as a part of their school work, and it is one of the neatest papers which comes to our desk. Fortunate that parent whose child has such facilities in connection with his studies."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The *True Educator* is certainly a credit to its editor and to the Academy. Shall try to send something for its columns."—*John C. Rolfe, Ph. D., Cincinnati, O.*, late instructor in Greek, Cornell University.

"The three great educational monthly periodicals of this time are the *True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass., the *American Teacher*, Boston, Mass., and the *Western School Journal*, Topeka, Kansas."—*Tonganoxie (Kansas) News.*

We have made arrangements with the publishers of the above-mentioned sixteen-page journal, whereby we can now offer the *True Educator* (regular price 75 cents) and the AMERICAN SENTINEL (price 50 cents) for \$1.00. Address PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

Combination Offer.

MANY people, in all parts of the country, are deeply interested in the investigation of the Sabbath question. To aid such we make the following combination offer to both old and new subscribers to this paper. For \$1.50 we will send the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year, and the "History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week," post-paid, to any address. This book contains a mine of information. Every text of Scripture concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length. Should be read by everybody. 528 pages. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

BY ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

THIS WORK CONTAINS A MINE OF INFORMATION.

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

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

Should be read by everybody. 528 pp. Price, \$1.25.

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, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1887.

NUMBER 3.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

The National Reform Gospel.

NATIONAL Reform Secretary J. H. Leiper says:—

“We preach exactly the same gospel to the body politic—that moral individual we call the nation—[that we do to the demoralized individual person].”—*Christian Statesman*, June 18, 1885.

The gospel which Christ sends by his ministers to the “demoralized individual” person is this: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” And this: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

Now if the National Reformers propose to preach to the body politic the gospel of Christ, and if that body politic is going to obey that gospel—if it is going to observe what Christ has commanded—then that body politic must be baptized; and the National Reformers will have to baptize it. We should like for Mr. Secretary Leiper to tell “exactly” how that thing can be accomplished.

If the National Reformers will say that the body politic needs not to be baptized, then it follows that the gospel which they preach to the body politic is not the gospel of Christ. And in that case, this being “exactly the same gospel” that they preach to the demoralized individual, it follows that the gospel which they preach either to the individual or to the body politic is not the gospel of Christ. We are persuaded that the conclusion is the literal truth of the matter, and of this persuasion we must remain until the National Reformers tell us how the body politic shall or can be baptized.

THE morality as derived from religion which the State needs will be best supplied by the confinement of its agency to things temporal and the entire omission on its part of any attempt to administer things spiritual. The State can do religion no favor so great as to have nothing to do with it, and itself no favor so great as to let religion alone. The moment the two are put in alliance with each other both are injured.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

“Foundation in Usage.”

THE *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 11, 1886, contains the first part of an article, by “the Rev. John M’Naugher,” entitled, “The State and the Sabbath.” Its opening remarks we wish to notice. It opens thus:—

“In advocating that the body politic should officially acknowledge the Lord’s day and secure it against secular uses, one cannot be charged with being a flighty theorist. That doctrine is time-honored and has been in actual operation for fifteen centuries. Ever since the issuing of Constantine’s memorable edict, A. D. 321, the Sabbath as a weekly rest-day has been a fixture in the common law of the civilized world.”

This reference to the action of Constantine, in this relation, is certainly significant, and very fitting. It is conceded by all that Constantine was the first to attempt to unite the Christian religion with the “body politic;” it is a fact of history that by him was laid the foundation for all the ecclesiastical usurpations of the Roman Papal system, and that his patronage of the church has been a curse to the cause of Christianity, the influence of which is felt even to the present time.

Let us first examine Constantine’s “memorable decree,” and we will then consider its import, and the relation that this notable emperor sustained to the Christian religion at the time of his issuing this decree. The following is the decree, of date March 7, 321:—

“Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven.”

Not only by this writer in the *Statesman*, but by a multitude of religious teachers of the present day, this decree of Constantine is recognized as the foundation of all “Sabbath” or “Lord’s day” legislation; as the first recognition by the “body politic” of the usages or institutions of Christianity. But nothing can be more easily shown than that this decree was not made in the interest of Christianity; that it did not respect the Sabbath or Lord’s day; and that it was not issued by a Christian ruler.

The reader will notice that the decree was partial; that it related only to certain classes, leaving other classes to still pursue their usual avocations; and that it was respecting “the venerable day of the sun.” Now we appeal with confidence to every student and reader of the Bible, that in all the Scriptures there is no such day or institution known as “the

venerable day of the sun.” And we affirm that, in this decree, Constantine not only did not mention any Christian institution, but he had no reference to any Christian institution.

On this point let such a reputable writer as Dr. Schaff testify:—

“He enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini* [Lord’s day], but as *dies solis* [day of the sun], in conformity to his worship of Apollo, and in company with an ordinance for the regular consulting of the *haruspex* (321).”—*History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2.

The edict of the sun’s day was issued March 7; that for consulting the *haruspex* was issued the day following, March 8. This edict of March 8 concerned the inspection of the entrails of beasts as a means of foretelling future events. It was a heathen practice, and the decree was a heathen edict, made by a heathen ruler. This of itself is sufficient to show in what light we must regard his edict for honoring “the venerable day of the sun.”

Dr. Schaff says that Constantine issued his sun’s day decree “in conformity to his worship of Apollo.” Who was Apollo, and what relation did his worship bear to reverencing “the day of the sun”? Webster says: “A deity among the Greeks and Romans, and worshiped under the name of *Phœbus*, the sun.”

On this point Gibbon furnishes decisive evidence:—

“The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity. . . . The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.”—*Decline and Fall*, vol. 2, chap. 20.

And again, a note on the same page says:—

“The panegyric of Eumenius, which was pronounced a few months before the Italian war, abounds with the most unexceptionable evidence of the Pagan superstition of Constantine, and of his particular veneration for Apollo, or the sun.”

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says:—

“The notion of conversion in the sense of a real acceptance of the new religion, and a thorough rejection of the old, is inconsistent with the hesitating attitude in which he stood towards both. Much of this may indeed be due to motives of political expediency, but there is a good deal that cannot be so explained. Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, down almost to the close of his life, retained so many heathen

superstitions. He was at best only half-heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins."—*Art. Constantine.*

Of the religion of Constantine, and of the sun god, Dr. Schaff thus speaks:—

"At first, Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of the Neo-Platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321 he enjoined regular consultation of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the God of the martyrs and the heathen goddess of fortune; and down to the end of his life he retained the title and dignity of a *Pontifex Maximus*, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. His coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ, on the other the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, *Sol invictus.*"—*Church History, vol. 2.*

Once more we hear Dr. Schaff in regard to the life and character of Constantine:—

"When at last on his death bed he submitted to baptism, with the remark, 'Now let us cast away all duplicity,' he honestly admitted the conflict of two antagonistic principles which swayed his private character and public life."—*Church History, vol. 2.*

Much, very much, historical evidence may be added to show the character of Constantine, of whom the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "Tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet [great] has in ancient or modern times been applied."

But this is the man who gave to the world the legacy of Church and State; who caused the State to "serve the interests of the Church;" and who lent the strength of his empire to "maintain and enforce the true religion;" to whose action the *Statesman* so approvingly refers as a warrant for and example of "Sabbath legislation." But never was a more groundless claim set up than that of ascribing to Constantine the issuing of an edict in favor of the Sabbath. His edict was heathenish—that, and that only, as all reliable history attests.

What was the effect of his patronizing or serving the interests of the church? He elevated the bishops to the dignity of civil magistrates, especially the bishop of Rome, whom he invested with the primacy. An early historian said:—

"Constantine likewise enacted a law favoring the clergy, permitting judgment to be passed by the bishops when litigants preferred appealing to them rather than to the secular courts; he enacted that their decree should be valid, and as far superior to that of other judges as if pronounced by the emperor himself; that the governor and military officers should see to the execution of these decrees; and that sentence, when passed by them, should be irreversible."—*Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History.*

To such a state of things our National Reformers aspire, when the "final decision" shall be with "the churches and the clergy."

But what was the effect of the State thus "serving the interests of the church," and "upholding and maintaining the true religion"? With all reliable writers there is but

one decision on this point. We can only give sample statements:—

"Passing rapidly from a state of distress and persecution to the summit of prosperity, the church degenerated as rapidly from her ancient purity, and forfeited the respect of future ages in the same proportion as she received the blind veneration of her own. Covetousness, especially, became almost a characteristic vice."—*Hallam, Middle Ages.*

"This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms; . . . the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions. . . . The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud."—*Eugene Lawrence, Historical Studies, art. Bishops of Rome.*

Want of space forbids our further pursuing this line of evidence. We will give a brief summary of the acts of the life of Constantine which seem to have a bearing on his inconsistent position as a pagan and a professed Christian.

A. D. 312, professed to have a vision of the cross. There is, however, no evidence that he ever spoke of such a thing before the year 322.

313, issued the edict of Milan, stopping persecution on account of religion.

321, March 7, issued a decree that certain classes abstain from labor on "the venerable day of the sun." This was afterwards, by his obsequious bishops, adopted as "the chief festival of the church." See Catechisms of the Catholic Church.

321, March 8, issued a decree for consulting haruspices—a practice purely pagan.

323, according to the opinion of Mosheim, made a profession of Christianity. Other writers give a later date.

324, murdered Licinius, in violation of his solemn oath.

325, convened the council of Nice, and presided over its deliberations.

325, after the council, revoked the edict of Milan, and copied the penal regulations under which Diocletian had persecuted the Christians, and employed them in persecuting those who did not accept the Catholic faith.

326, murdered his son Crispus, and his nephew Licinius, and a great number of their friends.

330, May 11, dedicated Constantinople to the virgin Mary.

337, near the close of his life was baptized into the Christian faith.

Some have endeavored to shield his character as a Christian by placing his conversion subsequent to his atrocious murders in 326; but in so doing they remove it still farther from the date of his Sunday edict, and have him presiding over the council of Nice before

he professed Christianity. It is a "mixed case" do the best they can.

They who can confidently decide that Constantine was a genuine Christian at *any time* in his life—anything but a crafty politician and a selfish ruler—must be able to adjust the balances very accurately to show where Christianity predominates over paganism! We believe that paganism may exist and flourish with any amount of *profession* of Christianity; but we do not believe that Christianity can exist with both the *profession* and *practice* of paganism. For this reason we cannot admit that Constantine ever was a Christian.

Our writer in the *Statesman* says:—

"Our affirmation, therefore, that the State sustains a protective relation to the Sabbath, cannot be made light of as a novelty. It has a foundation in usage even though this has been and is lamentably defective."

He well says that that for which they are laboring "has a foundation in usage," and in nothing higher. And the origin of this usage is traced to Constantine, whose legacy to the church has been a standing curse to the cause of Christianity for fifteen hundred years.

J. H. W.

A Substitute for the Church.

THE *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 16, 1886, after considering the manner in which the Labor Party in Philadelphia was captured by Socialists said:—

"These proceedings, taken in connection with the utterances of Henry George and his supporters in the campaign, the intercession of the Knights of Labor in convention at Richmond for the condemned Anarchists at Chicago, the efforts which have been made to secure for them a new trial, and the stay of proceedings granted by the Supreme Court which re-prieves them for five months, are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. They render more timely and significant too the religious declarations in the platforms of the Prohibition party, and the efforts which are to be made to secure such acknowledgments by all existing parties. The party which will make and adhere to a simple and hearty acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the actual ruler of nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws, will, by virtue of that very fact, become the leading party in the struggle which is even now upon us. There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted toward any party which declares for a fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

We agree with the *Statesman* that these are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. We do not think that the danger to which this country is subject from the Socialistic element can be overestimated. But we cannot see how this danger is to be averted by the formation of a political party whose platform shall contain religious declarations. There is no condition of affairs which the *Statesman*, or any lover of order, may desire to see, which cannot be brought about by the simple influence of the gospel, if it can be brought about at all; that is to say, if the spread of Socialistic ideas is prevented at all, it must be through the gospel, which is directly opposed to Socialism. Just to the extent that the gospel is accepted, the spread of Socialism will be hindered. The *Statesman*

admits this when it says, "There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted to any party that declares for the fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

The acceptance of the gospel is necessarily an acceptance of the entire Bible, the moral law included, for the apostle Peter, speaking of the word of God, says: "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter 1:25. The sole business of the church is to teach the gospel; therefore it is the church's duty to declare for the "fearless and uniform application of the law of God," not only to civil affairs but to every affair in life. Thus the Lord, speaking to the church through the prophet Isaiah said: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." Isaiah 58:1. The church was established for the express purpose of "holding forth the word of life" and teaching obedience to the law of God, at the same time that it announces pardon for sins already committed. If it does its duty it teaches men how to regulate their conduct toward one another, by announcing Christ's summary of the second table of the decalogue: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The church is not only the body that is appointed to teach the application of the law of God to human affairs, but it is the only power to which this duty has been committed. Moreover, it is the best adapted for the carrying on of this work, because it addresses itself to the individual, and not to mankind as a whole. If it were possible to entirely convert men from Socialistic ideas, then the church, dealing as it does with individuals, would present the most feasible plan of work. For if each Socialist were converted, Socialism would be at an end. We do not wish to be understood as claiming that the church should be expected to convert all men, for the Bible expressly declares that but few will find the narrow way leading to life. But we do say that as far as any progress is made in bringing men to the acceptance of the law of God, it must be made by the church. A political party with a religious platform would simply be trying to do the work which the church is set to do. The *Statesman* says that such a party would draw multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform. If that be true, why are they not drawn to the church? The answer is simply because they do not care for the law of God, but for their own selfish aims. If therefore they were drawn to such a political party it would be because they could gain political preferment.

We should think that for professed Christians to announce that the work which should be done by the church can be done only by political parties would be a humiliating confession. When the church itself applies to the civil power for aid, it acknowledges that it has lost its own power; the spirit of the gospel has departed from it, and the salt has lost its savor. They may seem to get what they desire, namely, the peace of the millennium,

but it will be only the shell with a blasted kernel inside. If the church has lost its power to convert men, of what use will a "religious" party be? "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" E. J. W.

An Image of the Papacy.

In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention of 1885, President Brunot said:—

"The First Amendment of the Constitution which provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' was never intended to de-Christianize the nation, as some now hold, but, on the contrary, was meant to keep it Christian and free. First, by guarding against the establishment of a church or sect; and second, against restrictive legislation in case the power to enact laws should fall into the hands of the enemies of all religion."—*Christian Statesman*, April 30, 1885.

Very good. It is plain therefore that any interference or change in that amendment would tend to de-Christianize the nation, and to prevent its being free. As that amendment guards against the establishment of a church, to change the amendment would open the way for the establishment of a church. As that amendment guards against restrictive legislation by the enemies of all religion, should they have the power to legislate so, to change the amendment would open the way for the enemies of all religion to restrict or abolish the practice of the Christian religion in this nation.

But to change that amendment and so to open the way for these evils, is precisely what that association, of which Mr. Brunot is president, proposes to do. Thus says "Secretary" W. J. Coleman:—

"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 [National Reform] 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."—*Statesman*, November 1, 1883.

By their own words, then, it is clearly the purpose of the National Reform Association to reverse the First Amendment of the United States Constitution so as to allow Congress to make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore it stands proven that the work of the National Reform Association is to open the way for "the establishment of a church or sect," and for the destruction of the freedom of this nation.

For (1), The State recognition of Christianity in law—both Constitutional and statutory—and the making of laws respecting and enforcing the principles of that religion, is that which the National Reform Association proposes to accomplish. But that is precisely what Constantine did in the fourth century, and out of it grew the Papacy. And just as surely as the National Reformers succeed in doing with Christianity in this nation, what Constantine did with it in the Roman State,

so surely will it follow that out of their action will grow the living image of the Papacy. Nothing can prevent it, because—

(2) In the day when, by their proposed change in the First Amendment of the Constitution, the National Reformers put it into the power and make it the province of Congress to make laws respecting religion, or prohibiting its free exercise; that very day they open wide the gates and give free course to the enemies of all religion, and to the enemies of Christianity in particular, just as soon as they can secure the power to make laws restricting or even prohibiting the free exercise of the Christian religion.

And when the way is thus opened for the enemies of the Christian religion to oppress it, as soon as they can secure the power, everybody knows that they will secure the power at the earliest possible moment. Everybody also knows that the enemies of Christianity have no compunctions of conscience in the matter, and that they will leave no means unemployed, that they will stop at nothing, to secure the coveted power. Therefore, if the National Reformers will maintain their cause in the conflict which they shall thus have opened, they will have to do it upon the field which they themselves have chosen—the field of politics—and with the weapons which *their enemies* shall choose. They will have to meet political power with political power; they will have to meet force with force; bribery with bribery; intrigue with intrigue; chicanery with chicanery; hypocrisy with hypocrisy. This they will be compelled to do or else lose all they shall have gained, as soon as they shall have gained it.

This is precisely the course through which the Papacy was developed. And the long and constant practice of these bad methods, which the bishop of Rome was compelled to employ if the Christianity which he represented was to hold its position against its enemies and the ambitious rivals of its power—the practice of these bad methods it was which made the Papacy what it is—"the very masterpiece of human wisdom," and the most complete of all contrivances that have ever been "devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind." And if the National Reformers succeed in securing the changes in our Constitution which they propose; then by the practice of these bad methods which *they* will be compelled to employ to successfully cope with the enemies of the Christian religion, there will be developed in free America a perfect likeness of the Papacy.

On the other hand, having secured those changes in the Constitution; having empowered Congress to make laws respecting religion; and having entered upon this political contest to determine what kind of a Congress it shall be which shall make the laws respecting religion; then if the National Reformers do *not* employ the like methods with their political opponents, they will be defeated, the seats in Congress will be filled with the enemies of religion, and so the Christian religion in free America, its happiest home on earth, will be sold into the hands of its bitterest enemies, waiting to destroy.

In the one case, free Christianity will be enslaved; in the other, her beautiful form will be marred and her fair name dishonored; and in either case the unkindest thrust of all will be by the traitorous hand of National Reform. For a traitorous hand it is, because, under the First Amendment of the Constitution, *as it is*, Christianity is forever safe from all her enemies, and forever free, in free America. With the First Amendment of the United States Constitution as it is, the presidential chair and every seat in Congress might be filled with the worst infidels and the most bitter enemies of Christianity that are in the land, and Christianity could not be molested or disturbed in the least degree. But with that amendment changed as the National Reformers propose to change it, then in the filling of the presidential chair and of each seat in Congress, Christianity would have just cause for fear, because there would be no means of knowing whether those who gain the seats were really her friends or her enemies; and with a bare majority of the enemies of Christianity in Congressional seats, every Christian in the land would be in danger of losing the dearest rights known to man. Traitorous, therefore, would be the hand of any but an avowed enemy of Christianity, that would attempt to break down this safeguard of Christianity in the United States; but to sweep away this safeguard is what the National Reform Association, under the guise of the Christian name, declares that it is its purpose to do, and therefore most traitorous is the hand of National Reform.

One or the other of these evils will inevitably follow the success of National Reform in its designs upon the United States Constitution. The certain consequence will be either that Christianity will be delivered into the hands of open infidelity and atheism, or else there will be developed a new form of the Papacy to meet, and successfully contend with, the open enemies of Christianity. As to which of these forms of evil would be the worst we can form no opinion. Of the former we have an illustration in the French Revolution; of the latter we have an illustration in the Inquisition, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, and the Crusade against the Albigenses.

Yet, although we can form no opinion as to which would be the worst, we *can* form an opinion as to which form would rule—and ruin. We are fully persuaded that it would be the image of the Papacy. We are assured of this because we are satisfied that the National Reform Association, on its own part, would prove itself fully equal to the task of outdoing the open enemies of Christianity in all the political methods they might employ; and this assurance is made doubly sure, by the confessed fact that National Reform will be in close alliance with the Papacy itself. Read this:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."—*Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884.

And this:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for 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."—*Rev. S. F. Scovel*, *Christian Statesman*, August 31, 1881.

And the National Reform Association, inspired and supported by the Papacy can out-do political atheism in all the politically atheistic methods that they can employ. The Roman Church has had sixteen hundred years' practice "in resisting the progress of political atheism," and there is not a political method known to the human race, of which she is not the consummate mistress. In her presence all the political atheists in Christendom must hide their diminished heads. This is why we are certain that the success of National Reform will be to develop a new form of the Papacy. For with this alliance with Rome which the National Reformers are so anxious to complete—so anxious, indeed, that they will make repeated advances and suffer repeated rebuffs—when, under their reformed Constitution, the political conflict comes on between National Reform and the enemies of all religion, the "Reformers" will be thoroughly furnished unto all bad works. If bribery is demanded, Rome can furnish scores of eminent examples among the Popes, and ages of practice among all classes from kings and emperors to peasants and beggars. If mob violence or military force becomes necessary to the success of a candidate for office, Rome is likewise an adept in this, as the election of Pope Damasus and of many of his successors abundantly proves. If intrigue, treachery, fraud, and the most secret and deceptive wire-working are required, there are the Jesuits, whom Leo XIII. has lately restored to all their rights and privileges, and has thus prepared this strong support to National Reform.

We might follow these lines and extend these illustrations to almost any required length, but these points are sufficient to show to all thinking men that out of the success of National Reform there can come no good thing, but only evil, and that continually and continually increasing. If any of the National Reformers object to the points which we have here made, let them not blame us, let them call to account the president of their Association, and their district secretary, W. J. Coleman, whose statements, fairly quoted, we have only traced to their logical and inevitable consequences. If either President Brunot's or Secretary Coleman's statement in regard to the First Amendment are not correct, let the National Reformers call *him* to account and correct *him* not us. We have only reasoned upon the premises laid down by these leading officials of the National Reform Association; if the premises are not true, that is their fault, not ours—let them correct the premises and we will revise our conclusions. But if the premises *are* true, and we believe they *are*, then the demonstration is complete that the success of National Reform will assure in this nation the development of a *living image of the Papacy*. A. T. J.

"Trust in the Lord, and do good."

Civil Laws and Religion.

THE question of the true relation of civil law to matters of religion is generally regarded as a most intricate one; and yet in this country it has, practically, been exceedingly simple, the rule generally adhered to being to legislate only upon matters relating to the manners and conduct of men as social beings, leaving purely religious questions, such as the recognition of God as an object of worship, and right feeling toward him, to be settled by the Judge of all the earth.

This is certainly the only safe and practicable rule possible among finite beings; for, to go farther than this, and at the same time do right in each case, would require infinite wisdom; or, at least, ability to read the thoughts and intents of the heart and properly weigh the motives of all men. This, God alone can do; and since he alone can determine the magnitude of an offense against himself, he alone should pass judgment and mete out punishment in all such cases.

It is absolutely necessary that there should be laws regulating the relations of man to man, and that these laws should be enforced at a time and in a manner that will give that protection to life and property which they are designed to afford; and God has himself recognized this fact by ordaining civil government among men; but we have not the slightest intimation in the Scriptures that it is proper for human governments to legislate upon religious questions. Of the powers of civil rulers the apostle Paul says:—

"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." "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." Rom. 13 : 1, 5-7.

But it may be urged that in this the apostle condemns the action of Peter and John (Acts 4 : 19, 20), who when commanded by the officers not to speak any more in the name of Jesus answered: "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." This would indeed be in conflict with the text before quoted if both were upon the same subject; but they are not; Paul is treating of obedience in civil affairs, and the utterances of Peter and John have to do entirely with matters of religion.

The law of which Paul was speaking was, as appears from Rom. 13 : 9, that part of the decalogue which defines our duty to our fellow-men; and to it he says that we "must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." This law, says the apostle, as said also the Saviour, "is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and he adds, "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." That is, he who loves his neighbor will deal justly with him in

all things; while he who will not do this from love must do it through fear of magistrates. And Peter and John were not alone in teaching that civil rulers have no proper jurisdiction in matters of religious duty, for Paul himself says: "Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. 14:10-12.

Thus does the apostle make a plain distinction between social or civil affairs and religious duties; and in this he only follows the example of Christ, who when asked, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" answered, "Shew me the tribute money." "And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

The trouble with some people is that by making civil rulers the conservators of religion, they claim for Cæsar the things that belong to God, and thus make their ordination confer upon them powers that neither Christ nor the apostles ever recognized, and which they most explicitly disavowed. But if it were true that God has clothed civil governments with authority to define, decree, and enforce religion, then it would also be true that all who oppose them in the exercise of this God-given power resist the ordinance of God, "and they that resist" the powers that are ordained of God, says the apostle, "shall receive to themselves damnation."

But for reasons already stated, we know that this ordination must be confined to a just administration of civil affairs; for if we allow that it extends to matters of religion, either of faith or practice, we are led to such absurd and revolting conclusions as that all the so-called martyrs, instead of being saints of God, unjustly condemned by wicked men, were in fact criminals worthy of death; and that that which they suffered was only the wrath of God visited upon them by his divinely-appointed agents—the minions of the Inquisition!!

But this is not all. If by any means it were made to appear that the State is divinely authorized to exact any recognition of God, or to require a single act of worship to him, then it would necessarily follow that it could in like manner prescribe not only the practice but also the faith of all its subjects. And if any government had divine authority to do this, all would have; hence while Protestantism in one or other of its forms might be the God-ordained religion of this country, Roman Catholicism would be the equally God-ordained religion of some of the countries of Europe. And worse yet, if possible, in countries having heathen rulers it would be the bounden duty of every citizen to be a worshiper of idols! Such are some of the absurdities which adhere naturally to the National Reform idea that civil rulers are ordained of God as establishers and conservators of religion.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

Ethics of Sunday Legislation.

In quite a number of the States there is at present considerable stir over the passage of Sunday laws. This is directly in the line of National Reform work, and is a danger to American liberty, of which the AMERICAN SENTINEL, as a watchful guardian, must give warning. There are very many people who are opposed to the work of so-called National Reform, who would heartily support a law enforcing Sunday observance, not perceiving that the very argument against National Reform in general is equally valid against this particular phase of that work. We purpose to note a few features of Sunday legislation, and how it will work injustice to a large class of citizens.

There are two grounds upon which Sunday legislation is based: one the civil, and the other the religious; and the two are antagonistic, although both are often held by the same individual. On one side it is claimed that Sunday should be enforced, not as a religious institution, but as a civil holiday, and that Sunday laws are to be regarded as police regulations. Others plead for laws enforcing Sunday rest, on the ground that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath." But upon whichever ground Sunday legislation is urged, such legislation is entirely inconsistent with perfect civil and religious liberty. If it be urged that man's physical nature requires rest on one day in seven, and that the Government should set apart Sunday as a civil holiday, and restrain people from working thereon, it comes directly in conflict with all usage in respect to holidays, and cannot be consistently sustained by sound reason. There are quite a number of days that are set apart as national holidays, yet on none of them are people forcibly restrained from labor if they choose to work. This very fact shows the absurdity of the claim that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, for no advocate of Sunday laws would be content for a moment with a law placing the day on a level with other holidays.

Again, the absurdity of the idea of enforcing Sunday observance because of man's physical need for rest is equally evident. For example: It is just as certain that man's physical nature requires a certain amount of sleep in every twenty-four hours as it is that his physical nature requires rest one day in seven. It is an undeniable truth that thousands of people do not take regular rest, and that they suffer physically because of the lack of a proper amount of sleep. Now if it be granted that a State has a right to enforce Sunday observance because people need the physical rest, then it necessarily follows that the State has a right to enact that everybody shall take a given amount of rest in each twenty-four hours. And on that ground we might expect the Government to compel people to go to bed every night at ten o'clock, and to prescribe the hour when they should arise. It is certain that no one can maintain Sunday legislation from a civil standpoint, and it is equally certain that no one really has this in view.

It must be, then, that it is as the "Christian Sabbath" that the plea is made for en-

forced Sunday observance. But when it is put upon this ground, we have the State legislating on matters of religion, and thus stepping outside of its sphere. Indeed, Sunday legislation stands for union of Church and State. For if the State can legislate in behalf of one Christian institution, it may with equal propriety legislate in behalf of all of them. If it can enforce the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," it has also a right to enforce Christian baptism. But the right to enforce any religious tenet depends upon the right to decide upon matters of faith, for before the State legislates in behalf of any practice, it must first decide that that practice is correct. Indeed, such decision is implied in the very act of passing the law. Therefore we say, if the State can enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, it may also enforce baptism, and may determine what Christian baptism is, whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. It may also with equal propriety enforce the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on all within its jurisdiction, and can determine how it shall be celebrated, whether in one kind or in both. And this is union of Church and State, as much as has ever existed in any age or in any nation. So we say that all, no matter what their religious belief, who are opposed to the union of Church and State, must be opposed to the enactment of Sunday laws.

But whether the observance of Sunday be enforced from a civil or from a religious standpoint, it cannot fail to be unjust and oppressive to a large class of law-abiding citizens. We refer to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. We know that it is commonly urged that Sunday laws do not interfere with the rights of any Sabbatarian, because they leave him perfectly free to carry out his conscientious convictions by resting on the seventh day of the week. But if it is man's religious duty to rest on one day in seven, which all advocates of Sunday laws allow, then it is also his religious privilege to labor on six days in seven. Now if a man conscientiously believes that the word of God demands that he shall rest upon the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and the State compels him also to rest upon the first day of the week, it is certain that his religious privileges are interfered with.

Again, if rigid Sunday laws are enacted, and a man is punished for laboring on Sunday after having conscientiously kept Saturday, such punishment is nothing less than persecution for conscience' sake. His punishment is really as much for his observance of the seventh day as it is for laboring on the first day. Thus: Necessity compels him to labor six days in the week for the support of his family; and the divine command certainly gives him the privilege of working six days, if it does not really command it. But his conscience imperatively forbids him to labor on Saturday, the seventh day of the week, therefore necessity and religion compel him to labor on the first day of the week. That is to say, his labor on the first day of the week is made necessary by his conscientious observance of the seventh day of the week. So then if he is punished for his first day labor, he is equally punished for his seventh day rest; and so it becomes

clear that the enactment of Sunday laws, and the execution of penalties for the violation thereof, is simply persecution for conscience' sake.

We are not now concerned as to whether Sunday is or is not the Christian Sabbath; in either case the argument is the same. Neither if we take it for granted that Sunday is the rest-day enjoined by divine command, is there, as some claim, any analogy between the punishment by civil authority, of a man who quietly labors on that day, and the punishment of the polygamist, even allowing that the polygamist is conscientious in his practice; for polygamy is the violation of the seventh commandment, which is contained in the second table of the decalogue, defining the relations of men with one another, and is thus a proper subject for civil legislation. But the keeping of the Sabbath is enjoined by the fourth commandment, which is a part of the first table of the decalogue, defining man's duty to God, and is not a proper matter for civil legislation. The polygamist and the adulterer, for a polygamist is an adulterer, sins not alone against God, but against society in general, and some person or persons in particular. Like the thief, he takes that which belongs to some one else, and to which he has no right. But the man who pursues his own lawful occupation on the first day of the week, interferes with no one's rights or privileges. He deprives no conscientious observer of that day, of his Sabbath, even if he observes no day whatever; so long as he does not disturb the rest and worship of anyone else, he is answerable alone to God.

Again, Sunday legislation virtually places a premium upon crime. This may seem a bold and unwarranted statement, but we can easily show its truthfulness. I have before me the bill which it is purposed to have passed by the present California Legislature. It provides that every person that shall sell goods, keep open any store or other place of business, or shall sell or give away to be drunk any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquors, on the first day of the week, or who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gambling, or other public sport, exercises, or shows, or any person who shall keep open any place where such sports, exercises, or shows, are carried on, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor. It will be seen that gambling, rioting, fighting, and the selling of intoxicating liquor, are placed on a level with the keeping open of stores to sell goods. The sale of goods at proper times is not only legitimate, but it is absolutely necessary. It is wrong only when engaged in upon the day divinely set apart for rest. Now to pass a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors upon Sunday, saying nothing about its sale upon other days, puts that business on a level with legitimate industry, and virtually says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is all right upon any day but Sunday.

As a matter of fact, liquor selling is an unmitigated evil; it does nobody any good, but does untold harm. The only one whom it enriches is the man who sells it. It is a drain upon all classes of citizens. The man who

drinks spends his money without receiving an equivalent; his family is robbed of that which rightfully belongs to them; and the man who abstains entirely is taxed in order that the paupers, insane people, and criminals, that are made by the sale of intoxicating liquor may be provided for. And now for the State to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and declaring that the carrying on of the business of liquor selling is a violation of the "Christian Sabbath," and therefore punishable by a fine, is simply to place the infamous traffic on a level with the dry-goods or grocery business, and to say that it is all right to engage in it on any day but Sunday.

That this is putting a premium upon crime, may be made still more apparent. Suppose the State should enact a law to the effect that anyone who should steal or commit a murder upon the first day of the week, should be deemed guilty of felony and should be punished, everybody would cry out against such a law. They would say that stealing and murder are in themselves criminal, and that the perpetration of those crimes on the first day of the week does not add to the criminality of the act. They would justly claim that such legislation virtually made murder and theft legitimate acts if committed on any other day than Sunday, thus putting a premium upon crime. The case is the same with Sunday laws wherever they exist or are proposed. By specifying gambling, the selling of intoxicating liquor, etc., they virtually place such occupations in the list of legitimate employments when pursued on any other day. And so we say that Sunday legislation is not only contrary to religious liberty, but it is also against the interests of true morality.

Next month we purpose to take up this matter still further and demonstrate these propositions by actual facts. E. J. W.

Secretary Gault and the Scripture Again.

SECRETARY GAULT said that under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel" "all their rulers were elected by the people." We asked him for one instance of it, and he refers us to Deut. 1:13, and quotes: "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." But he does not quote enough. In that place Moses is rehearsing what had been done long before. The whole connection is this: "I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone; . . . how can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. And ye answered me, and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do. So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes." Deut. 1:9-15.

Now at whose direction was this done?

Mr. Gault says that it was under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel." We can easily learn whether it was or not. Moses says, "At that time." At what time? Turn to Ex. 18:13-26. As Moses sat to judge the people, he was occupied all day from morning till evening in hearing and deciding the cases of the people who came. "And Moses's father-in-law said unto him, The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone. Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, . . . thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge; so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. . . . So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said."

There can be no shadow of doubt therefore that the rulers referred to by Moses in the text cited by Mr. Gault, were those who were appointed at the suggestion of Moses's father-in-law, who was Jethro, a Midianite. Does Mr. Gault mean to say that this piece of advice given by Jethro was the model of government which Christ gave to Israel? If not, and most assuredly it was not, then what is his argument and citation of that scripture good for? It is good for nothing, but to show his utter and inexcusable ignorance of the true bearing of scripture. Of all men who have ever put themselves into print, the one who makes the most brilliant success of getting on the wrong side of every question that he touches, and every time that he touches it, is undoubtedly the "Rev." M. A. Gault, district secretary of the National Reform Association. A. T. J.

Will They Unite?

A CLERGYMAN, the pastor of a Presbyterian Church, sends us the following appreciative letter:—

"BERWICK, PENN., Jan. 27, 1887.

"AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.—*Gentlemen:* This afternoon I found the AMERICAN SENTINEL for December, 1886, and part of a copy of the *Signs of the Times*. In the former are several articles which I have read with intense interest; among which are, 'Is It Blindness or Duplicity?' 'Infidel Views of the Logic of Christianity,' 'The American Hierarchy,' and 'The American Papacy.'

"In one thing you must be mistaken, viz., that 'whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we [Protestants of the Presbyterian denomination] will gladly join hands with them.'

"Oh, but you reply, the *Christian Statesman* said so in an editorial December 11, 1884. Well, that does not make it true. And what is more to the purpose, the thing cannot possibly ever take place. To entertain the thought for a moment is the very romance of madness. Certain persons may have expressed themselves in these very words to that effect. But

that the mass of Protestant Christians have any wish so monstrous and idiotic, yes, impossible, I will not and cannot believe, the Rev. S. F. Scovel, and others, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

"But go ahead, write, protest, show all the facts upon the subject.

"I believe you are honest, sincere, in dead earnest, and if you can show me how to guide my way better than in the past, I will take it well.

"I am, gentleman, with respect, yours,
"JAMES DICKSON."

We heartily believe that our reverend brother is as earnest and sincere as we are. If all professed Protestants were like him, no doubt it would be an impossibility to unite with Catholics. But, unfortunately, instead of looking toward the light, as he is, they are looking away from it. We assure our friend that while any sort of a union between Catholics and Protestants is indeed "monstrous," the thought that it will ere long be an accomplished fact is neither "idiotic" nor "the romance of madness." To believe it requires no faith whatever; one has only to observe the signs of the times.

We do not base this belief on a single statement of the *Christian Statesman*, nor indeed upon any statement of that paper, professing a willingness for such union. As a matter of fact, however, that paper is editorially committed to just such a union. These statements in the *Christian Statesman* are, however, only the natural result of the teachings of National Reform. As we have abundantly shown, the principles of National Reform are identical with those of the Papacy. Both believe that the State should support the church. Both believe in the persecution of heretics—those who think and act for themselves contrary to the "established" religion; and both hold in the main to the same points of doctrine. Having these points of similarity, and working for the same object, it is the most natural thing in the world that the two bodies should unite their interests.

When all National Reformers see, what their leaders already see, that they cannot accomplish their purpose without the aid of Catholics, an alliance with that church will be speedily effected.

The name of Dr. A. A. Hodge, of Princeton, is an honored one among Presbyterians. He was not "idiotic," nor one who indulged in the "romance of madness," but was a clear-headed, deliberate man, who knew what he was about. In an article in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1887, he said:—

"All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants—disciples of a common Master—to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides, to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teaching of our public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics."

The article in which these words occur, which declare that Catholics have an equal amount of truth with Protestants, and that they should unite their interests, is quoted by the *Occident*, of San Francisco (Presbyterian),

whose editor calls it "a dying legacy of this able and lamented minister," and says that "these suggestions are worthy of earnest consideration." We know of few prominent religious journals which have not expressed similar sentiments.

It is a fact that must be patent to anyone who is conversant with current religious news, that among Protestants the Catholic Church is being regarded with more and more favor. There is a feeling that the Catholic Church has changed, or that at any rate it has been misjudged. That church is now counted as a branch of the Christian Church, having its specific work to do, just as the Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, etc. The barriers between Catholics and professed Protestants are continually being broken down; and when it is found that certain legislation in behalf of "religion" cannot be brought about without the co-operation of Catholics, Protestants will not only accept their aid, but will sue for it. We could give instances where this has already been done.

Let our brother remember one thing: The Catholic Church will not change its characteristics, nor abate one iota of its arrogance; and when National Reform, with the aid of the Catholic vote, shall have succeeded, Roman Catholic principles will predominate, and we shall have in this country an American Papacy, with all that that implies. E. J. W.

In the *New York Independent* of January 6, President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, has an article on "Eastern and Western Civilization," in which occur the following paragraphs, which we commend to the careful consideration of National Reformers, who hold that civil government should be paternal:—

"The idea of Eastern civilization is 'paternal government.' The people are children, not of a modern father, but of the Old World father, who was the irresponsible master of his family.

"Western civilization utterly repudiates this idea, denies the existence of any analogy between the family and the State, and seeks to make men and not children of the people.

"A paternal government, under exceptional circumstances, may for a time secure a certain amount of material prosperity and even of moral and intellectual development, but in general this system must develop a type of character where the virtues of childhood are not only exaggerated at the expense of those which are the glory of manhood, but are liable also to be extinguished by the vices of a manhood uncontrolled by reason or conscience."

THE TRUE EDUCATOR.

"The students in the industrial department of the South Lancaster Academy print the *True Educator* as a part of their school work, and it is one of the neatest papers which comes to our desk. Fortunate that parent whose child has such facilities in connection with his studies."—*New England Journal of Education*.

"The *True Educator* is certainly a credit to its editor and to the Academy. Shall try to send something for its columns."—*John C. Rolfe, Ph. D., Cincinnati, O.*, late instructor in Greek, Cornell University.

"The three great educational monthly periodicals of this time are the *True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass., the *American Teacher*, Boston, Mass., and the *Western School Journal*, Topeka, Kansas."—*Tongaxie (Kansas) News*.

We have made arrangements with the publishers of the above-mentioned sixteen-page journal, whereby we can now offer the *True Educator* (regular price 75 cents) and the *AMERICAN SENTINEL* (price 50 cents) for \$1.00. Address PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN

DURING THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

BY MRS. E. G. WHITE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

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

By U. SMITH.

AUTHOR OF "SMITH'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES," ETC., ETC.

THIS is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a *Historical, Political, and Religious Standpoint*.

The *Sunday Question*,
Modern Spiritualism, and
National Reform

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE MARVEL OF NATIONS is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

COMBINATION OFFER.—Arrangements have been made whereby those who desire can receive a copy of this Popular Book, and the *American Sentinel*, one year, post-paid, for only \$1.25. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

DIPHTHERIA:

ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

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

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

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

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

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1887.

THE *Boston Pilot* (Catholic) says: "No good government can exist without religion." That is straight National Reform doctrine, and every National Reformer would say amen to it. But the *Pilot* continues: "And there can be no religion without an Inquisition, which is wisely designed for the promotion and protection of the true faith." If the first proposition is true, the second must also be true; and no one who accepts the first can dissent from the second. If there is national religion, there must be an Inquisition, or its equivalent, and punishment for heresy. National Reform contends for national religion; hence a National Reform government will of necessity persecute.

For the last three months a large number of people have been receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL through the courtesy of friends. We should be greatly pleased to have these persons become subscribers on their own account. Many of the best minds in the country are convinced that there is urgent need of just such work as is being done by the SENTINEL, and it is the only paper in the United States that is doing the work. Let all who feel that a union of Church and State would be a calamity, rally to the support of the journal that is doing battle for liberty of conscience and for civil rights. We confidently look for a large increase in our regular subscription list.

SPEAKING of Japan, the *Christian Statesman* says: "Open opposition to Christianity has ceased; the peril is of another sort—that she will accept the form of Christianity without knowing its power." It would seem that the *Statesman* should find no fault with that, as it is just what the National Reformers propose to have done in this country. Here they even profess to believe that its accomplishment will usher in the millennium. However the climate may make some difference; and possibly something more than an act of Congress or an imperial decree is needed to convert the natives of Japan—and it is possible that the sequel may show that something more is needed to convert people here.

MANY who read this number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have been enjoying its visits for a year. Do you want it continued? Then do not delay your renewal. We do not believe that anyone who has read the SENTINEL for a whole year, would willingly forego the pleasure and profit for the future; but some may not realize that their subscription has expired. Please examine the label on your paper, and if it reads March, '87, send in your renewal at once, and thus save us the trouble of taking your name off our list and then putting it on again. Remember that your personal assurance, with the cash, is the only means we have of knowing whether you appreciate the paper, and how much.

"STATESMANSHIP cannot save the country. Christ's refusal to be made a king, and his rejection of Satan's offer of the world's scepter, ought to teach those who seek to save the world; that moral means are necessary to moral ends. Christ saw that the world could not be saved by legislation, and that only by his being lifted up could all men be drawn unto him. He saw that he could not save the world without sacrificing for it; no more can we. The saving power of the church is its sacrificing power."—*Rev. Josiah Strong*. Common sense sentiments like these cannot be given too great prominence. National Reformers stand sadly in need of them.

LET it never be forgotten by any lover of civil or religious liberty that were the Constitution of the United States to be amended as the National Reform Association demands that it shall be, it would necessarily follow that the Christian religion, which would then be the State religion, would have to be defined by law. And it would naturally follow also that the courts would be called upon to decide what is Christian, and who are Christians. For the proposed régime "would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel," and all will be considered as infidels who chance to differ with the National Reform idea of Christianity, even in a single particular.

The Case Well Stated.

THE following letter to one of the workers in the office of the SENTINEL, shows that thinking people realize that the work of the National Reform party seriously threatens the liberty of this country, and makes such a paper as the SENTINEL a necessity:—

LOUISVILLE, KY., Jan. 21, 1887.

"DEAR SIR: Yours of the 2d, and the January number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are received. I have carefully read and considered both, and would say that I fully indorse the sentiments of the SENTINEL, as being the only safe doctrine for the people of this nation and the only safe-guard for religious liberty.

"Our fathers wisely provided in the Constitution that: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' They were quickened in their wisdom by the times in which they lived (a fact which their children seem to have forgotten), and this with the knowledge of the certain fact that history will repeat itself. If the National Reform party could but substitute their proposed amendment for this wise and beneficent provision, the end of the present century would find religious persecution substituted for religious freedom.

"A State which prescribes religion, prescribes conscience, or a moral sense of duty to God, and here is the end of practical piety, the country's peace, and the people's freedom. If the omnipotence of God is not sufficient to demand acknowledgment of himself, as the author of the nation's existence, and of Jesus 'Christ as its ruler,' and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct,' then that religion is a mockery, which proposes a constitutional amendment to supply the imperfections of Deity.

"It is suggested by the amendment to make this 'a Christian nation.' It would hardly be adopted before the question would arise as to who are Christians—and this

would result in a fight more bitter than will ever be made to secure the adoption of the proposed amendment—if it ever should be adopted. There is but one conclusion to the National Reform party. They seem to have forgotten the history of every country in the world, and they also seem to have forgotten the causes that lead to the enactment of the constitutional provision before quoted. No king, prince, or potentate ever committed as many depredations upon human rights as have professed Christians under the guise of saving souls. To escape such, our ancestors came to this land of freedom. Yours respectfully,

JAMES T. MILBURN.

THE remark recently made by a writer in the *Christian Statesman* that "a Christian is one who in theory is obedient to Christ," seems to throw considerable light upon the National Reform idea of Christianity, and explains how this can be made a Christian nation by constitutional amendment. If obedience in theory is all that is required, Congress can of course furnish it in any quantity desired.

THE following suggestion by the *Catholic Review*, we find adopted into the editorial columns of the *Christian Statesman*. It is an important item in the steadily growing Sunday movement:—

"The time is near at hand when those who have so warmly advocated eight hours as a workman's day, will find it necessary to agitate for six days as a workman's week. If the labor organizations are really anxious for an issue on which they can have the help of the vast majority of the American people, let them take up this of Sunday labor. They will find enormous obstacles to contend with in the wide-spread avarice of the non-Catholic workingmen as well as of the capitalists. If the limit of a day's labor to eight hours is calculated to restrain the over-production to which they object, the cessation of Sunday labor, which is now carried on to an extent enormously in excess of what the general public is disposed to believe, would exercise a still further restraint in this direction. If the labor associations are sincere in their professions, they will find that temperance—if not total abstinence—on all days of the week, and the Christian observance of the Lord's day, will tend greatly to diminish many of the evils of which they justly complain."

We have not the least doubt that this thing will be done soon. We fully expect soon to see the labor organizations throughout the country, busily agitating for "six days as a workman's week," and the churches and preachers, both Roman Catholic and Protestant Catholic, all loudly cheering on the agitation. The *Christian Statesman* may congratulate itself for that will be a mighty re-enforcement to National Reform.

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 s. subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1887.

NUMBER 4.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE National Reformers are justly alarmed at the growth of Socialism in this country, and they fancy that legislation will prove a sovereign remedy. But Professor R. T. Ely, a political economist, says:—

"It is an undoubted fact that modern Socialism of the worst type is spreading to an alarming extent among our laboring classes, both foreign and native. I think the danger is of such a character as should arouse the Christian people of this country to most earnest efforts for the evangelization of the poorer classes, particularly in large cities. What is needed is Christianity, and the Christian church can do far more than political economists toward a reconciliation of social classes. The church's remedy for social discontent and dynamite bombs, is Christianity as taught in the New Testament."

But that is a commodity of which National Reformers, at least those who write for the press, seem to be woefully destitute. Lacking that, they are forced to use an inferior and useless weapon.

THE Catholic 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."

If heresy and unbelief are crimes against the State, they ought to be punished as other crimes. And when, under National Reform manipulation, this country shall uphold and maintain that which they call "the Christian religion," unbelief and heresy will be crimes in this country, and will be punished as such. The only difference between National Reform and Catholicism is that the former attempts to conceal its intolerant spirit, while the latter boasts of it.

In his Lenten letter of March, 1873, Bishop Gilmour (Catholic) said: "Nationalities must be subordinate to religion." The Rev. J. W. Foster said in the *Statesman*, March, 1884, "The State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the church." Who knows but that Mr. Foster learned his National Reform principles from Bishop Gilmour?

What Is the Harm?

WHEN the cry of warning is raised against adopting the proposed Religious Amendment to our National Constitution, we are met with the query, What is the harm? If this is a Christian nation, why not say so? Or, seeing that it is desirable that it shall become a Christian nation, if there is the least hope that we can effect such a desirable object by changing the Constitution, and thereby the form of our Government, why not do so? And if Christ is really the King of nations, the King of our nation, why not acknowledge him in the "fundamental law of the land"?

All this appears very harmless and very plausible, to some, but we emphatically say, not to us. We think there is danger in the scheme. This is not a Christian nation; and no constitutional provisions, general elections, or legislative enactments, will ever make it a Christian nation. Any legal declaration that we are a Christian nation would be sheer mockery—a legal falsehood. And, as a Scripture fact, Christ is not yet constituted king of nations. We propose to show, next month, that the arguments of National Reformers on this subject are inconsistent, and contrary to the Bible. Their confident assertions are based on misapprehensions of the present position of Christ, and of the nature of his mediatorial work.

The theory of "National Reform," as now advocated in our country, is the doctrinal theory of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This their teachers openly avow. Now, they may suppose that they, as prime movers in the scheme, will have the highest seats in "the coming kingdom." But we predict, and we think with safety, that they will be sadly disappointed. There is another church power, holding the same theory, which is far in advance of them in every way, as far as concerns any prospect of religio-political preferment. Of course we refer to the Catholic Church.

Our zealous Reformers may scout this idea, but we have good reasons for our belief.

1. The Reformers are perfectly willing to unite with the Catholics in their effort to change our Constitution. This has been a plea of the Catholics for a long time, as some of them have said in conversations on the future of our country and of their church. The Reformers laud the Catholics for their Church and State principles. The *Christian Statesman* said:—

"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."

Of course, and why not? Is not the Pope—the head of the church—"higher than the kings of the earth"? Has not "power over the nations" been committed to him? And this shows what grade of Christianity will be satisfactory to these Reformers, if only it be "National,"—such Christianity as Rome has upheld in South America, in France, and other European countries, as Spain, Italy, and Austria, and in Mexico. It is the Christianity of persecution, of the Inquisition, of the *auto da fe*, of the extermination of heretics or dissenters. It is Church and State, the State subordinated to the Church. Catholics have always been firm in the faith of the modern Reformers, that "the State and its sphere exist to serve the interest of the Church." The history of the Romish Church is replete with illustrations of the principles of the National Reformers! Call up the millions of martyrs, and they will testify that the Catholic Church has been, for centuries, a most powerful advocate and administrator of National Christianity! The *Statesman* further says:—

"In a world's conference for the promotion of National Christianity, many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics."

Yes, Spain, for instance. In that highly-favored kingdom, where National Christianity has flourished and held undisputed sway for many centuries, there could hardly be found a Protestant to raise his voice in its favor. It is "represented only by Roman Catholics." And a further reason is, that Protestants are exceedingly scarce in that country, for, in almost every part of the kingdom, National Christianity is so highly successful that people can only avow their dissent at the peril of their lives. And the Catholic Church is cordially, gladly, recognized as the advocate and representative of National Christianity by the National Reformers of America, who take delight in avowing themselves as the ardent opposers of Church and State! Consistency has no place in that association.

Rome is politic; she is persistent, but she knows how to "bide her time." She is rather coy when other bodies make advances; and she never makes advances to them. She is too self-assured for that. What are the probabilities for the future? The Reformers have answered the question. Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel is one of the ablest of the modern Reformers. We have considered him one of the coolest and most conservative. Speaking of the common interest of the great religious bodies to uphold Sunday-keeping by law, he said:—

"This common interest ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first 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."

That they will be subjected to rebuffs is certain. Rome feels her strength, and will do nothing that can be construed into a concession. Of late many of the Protestant denominations have been "speaking to the hearts" of the Catholics, throwing out compliments, as the *Statesman* has done, pronouncing the Catholic Church "a branch of the Church of Christ;" all of which causes the Catholics to smile in derision. Among the foremost of those who send compliments to Rome, stands H. W. Beecher. Yet in the controversy between the bishop and his priest, McGlynn, the bishop charged the priest with attending a public meeting and sitting on the platform with Mr. Beecher! But, as Mr. Scovel says, the necessities of the situation compel the Reformers to co-operate with Catholics on their own terms. They are willing to compromise, but Rome never makes compromises to her own disadvantage. If the Romish diplomats do not make all this turn to the interest of "the church," then they will make a new page in history.

2. The Romish Church is a *political power* in the United States, and other churches are not. It is a common thing, and has been for years, to hear of efforts being made by politicians "to secure the Catholic vote." If the people were half awake they would look upon this state of things as a standing menace against our republican institutions. Who ever heard of any effort to secure the Methodist vote, the Presbyterian vote, or the Baptist vote? Why not as well as the Catholic vote? Because the right of private judgment accorded to Protestants, prevents their acting in so close concert. It is understood that the Catholics are acting "under authority"—an authority outside of considerations of duty to the country; outside of regard for American institutions; that their votes are not strictly their own, if the church authorities require them to vote *in a body*. Their system and church discipline require all this. Inducements have been held out to them by political parties, and, consequently, the Catholics today really govern our large cities, and these cities are great centers of political influence.

In the controversy with McGlynn, the bishop said that Catholics must avoid socialistic and *irreligious* organizations. But, as the report says, from which we copy: "This does not mean that they are not to take an active part in politics whenever the authorities direct them to do so."

Here is the secret of the whole matter. Their political affiliations and movements are directed by "the authorities." Their votes are cast in the interests of "the church"—a foreign power. And our short-sighted public men have pursued a course to unify this

vote, and to strengthen its influence. And now, worst of all, the over-blind and misnamed Protestants are working in the same line, and serving the same foreign cause, for the sake of—what? Of fastening "National Christianity" upon our land, even such as Catholic Rome has bound upon the nations of Europe. "Tell it not in Gath . . . lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice." And yet we are met with the query, "What is the harm?"

3. Not only are the Catholics courted by politicians and the "Reformers" (was ever a name so misapplied?), but our Government itself is debasing itself before Rome. The following is of sufficient interest to publish entire. It is from the *Christian Statesman*:—

"Politicians are already beginning to set their sails for breezes from the Vatican, which are to decide the next presidential election! A Roman Catholic journal quotes, with tokens of exultation, the following extract from a political newspaper:—

"WORTHY OF NOTE.—The fact that President Cleveland sent Cardinal Gibbons a letter of congratulation on the occasion of that prelate's investiture with the purple, is worthy of note, as indicating the change that has taken place since the time when it would have been considered a grave offense for a chief executive to notice in any way, *not to speak of felicitating*, a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church. One need not go back many years to arrive at such a time, and no longer ago than during the presidency of the late General Grant, considerable unfriendliness existed at Washington, in certain quarters at least, towards Catholicity. The speech on the school question, which President Grant himself delivered at Des Moines, is sufficient proof of that assertion."

"Yes, indeed! Worthy of note and of comment too. No American citizen has any moral right to assume 'the purple' here spoken of. The Cardinalate is not an order of the Christian ministry, but a princedom in an alien and anti-republican court, a court which, by the *Syllabus*, has made war on every principle of the American Constitution. By accepting its 'purple,' Bishop Gibbons has accepted the yoke of this alien and odious despotism, and President Grant did right in repelling all advances of the kind. I am a friend of President Cleveland's administration, but this must be stopped. CITIZEN."

Now that sounds very well; the comment is truthful. But indignant "citizen" must not forget that this "anti-republican court" was making war upon nothing but a "godless Constitution"—a Constitution which, the Reformers say, it is criminal to uphold! Besides, the power that has thus made war upon our infidel Constitution is the best representative of National Christianity on earth! And National Reformers are anxiously waiting for the time when that power will condescend to "strike hands" with them; and they have already expressed a willingness to co-operate in any form which Rome may be willing to exhibit or dictate! O Reform! what a sweet-sounding word, and how appropriately applied to the work of the "National Reform Association"!

But one more proof we have to offer; and it is enough. We will let the *Christian Nation* tell the story in its own language:—

"A REMARKABLE AFFAIR.—The revenue cutter, *W. E. Chandler*, attracted a good deal of attention on Monday morning, June 21, as she steamed down the bay to Quarantine. The *Chandler* had been seen frequently in

these very waters. There was nothing unusual about her, except that she carried a strange flag—a flag not in the international code. No vessels carry it, and in fact it is only the second flag of its kind that has been displayed in the United States. It was made especially for this occasion. What was it? A large banner bearing the symbol of the Holy See upon a white field. A Papal flag floating to the breezes from the bow of a United States revenue cutter!

"The facts are these: Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, has been elected to succeed Cardinal McClosky. The investiture of the new Cardinal is attended with great ceremony. Ambassadors are sent from Rome to officially inform the new Cardinal of his election and to confer the beretta. These ambassadors were among the passengers on board the Cunard steamer *Servia*. A committee of reception had been appointed to go down the bay to meet them. They went, and they went on the revenue cutter. 'Surveyor Beattie accompanied the party as the representative of the Treasury Department.' The United States Custom flag floated at the stern, and the Pope's flag was flying at the bow of the cutter. As the *Chandler* drew near, the *Servia* dropped her ensign twice in salute to the Papal banner, and received an acknowledgment in return.

"It was this strange flag flying from the cutter that attracted so much attention, and since it has aroused questions in many minds. Why was the Pope's flag displayed on an American ship in American waters? Why was a revenue cutter placed at the disposal of a private committee? Why was the Treasury Department represented? Why was such unusual respect shown these Pontifical ambassadors who were coming on ecclesiastical business? They were in no sense representative men coming on public business. Our country is far famed for its religious toleration, but there is perhaps just a little too much pandering to Popery, which is, in spirit and in principle, the enemy of genuine liberty. The Roman priesthood has ever been one of the most oppressive, absolute, and degrading despotisms exercised over the minds of men. The chains of priestly domination are so strongly riveted that there can be no liberty of opinion or freedom of conscience.

"When Popery had the power it persecuted, and when it has been the weaker power it has ever aimed at the ascendancy, and its votaries have become either restless agitators or the ready tools of arbitrary power and oppression. It is alarming to see so much attention paid to the leaders of a system which has been essentially despotic, which never appeared but as a persecutor, and has ever been the ally of tyranny and the foe of liberty."

The story is well told. Just one sentence we wish to notice. It says: "Our country is far famed for its religious toleration." Yes, it is too tolerant—quite too tolerant. It is time this error was corrected. "Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion." (Speech in Reform Convention.) Again: "There is perhaps just a little too much pandering to Popery, which is in spirit and in principle the enemy of genuine liberty." Oh, no; it was just well-merited respect paid to the highest representative of National Christianity on earth! We have the word of the "Reformers" for it; and as for the Pope being "in spirit and in principle the enemy of genuine liberty," will the Reformers please to tell us when and where was "National Christianity" anything but the enemy of genuine liberty? They profess so great knowledge of history, let them cite the

page of history where National religion proved itself the friend of genuine liberty.

Our point is proved. Romanism is a political power, such as the Reformed Presbyterian Church will never be. It needs no special wisdom to foretell which will be the dominating church influence when this Government is turned into a religious government, and the most popular form of so-called Christianity is placed "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Reader, American citizen, can you have confidence in the professions of the National Reformers, with such evidences of their duplicity—of their willingness to "pander to Popery" for the sake of planting in this land that form of Christianity with which Popery has so long used to enslave the masses of Europe? Yes, there is harm—there is danger ahead. If you do not wish a restoration of the Inquisition, a revival of the terrors of the Dark Ages, then turn "to flight the armies of the aliens" by preserving our liberties from the insidious attacks of the "advocates of National Christianity." J. H. W.

The National Reform Idea of Tolerance.

IN several numbers of the SENTINEL reference has been made to the speech made by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., in the New York National Reform Convention, but that speech is so fully representative of the principles of National Reform, that we feel justified in giving it a more extended notice than we have yet done. There are two or three points in it which we wish here to notice. Said the Doctor:—

"We want State and religion—and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require religion, it shall be revealed religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land 'an undeniable legal basis.' We use the word religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God."

Here, then, is the National Reform definition of religion, officially declared. *Religion is a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.* And they are going to have in this Nation "State and religion." That is to say, they are going to have "State and a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." In other words, they are going to have the State to associate itself with every man in his "personal relation of faith and obedience to God;" and the State must see to it that every "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God" shall be none other than the *Christian* relation of faith and obedience. For it is the State that rules; it is the State that bears the responsibility; it is the State's, and not the individual's, personal relation of faith and obedience to God that must take precedence. Therefore under their own definition, it is clear that the direct aim of National Reform is to have the State to interfere with, to regulate, and control every man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. And that is nothing else than a religious despotism. Yet they affect to deny that under such an order of things there would

be any oppression. But oppression is absolutely inseparable from the success of the scheme. For to deprive every man of his own choice and the exercise of his own personal relation of faith and obedience to God, is the National Reform idea; but without coercion all men are not going to yield this right; while coercion in such a matter is only the cruellest oppression.

Well indeed might Mr. Edwards say, as he does:—

"We are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists, who would be sufferers under it."

Whether he be atheist, deist, Jew, Seventh-day Baptist, or what not, every man who has a particle of respect for personal right, freedom of thought, or liberty of conscience, *must be* a sufferer under it. And we cannot avoid the impression, that when these men set forth such abominable doctrine, it must be that the loudest warning comes from their own hearts and consciences, unless, indeed, by the constant assertion of such outrageous principles, they have deadened their consciences.

But what reply does Mr. Edwards make to this warning? This:—

"The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language. And then, further, they are almost wholly of foreign importation, and that of comparatively recent date, so that they did not share in the first settlement of this country; they did not brave the hardships; they did not profess the principles which have made that first settlement memorable. . . . They breathed no protests; they suffered no martyrdom."

His reply to the "warning" is as atrocious as is the doctrine that gives rise to the warning. He replies to an objection by reasserting the doctrine, and adding to it a deliberate insult.

It might not be altogether impertinent to inquire, just here, To how great an extent did the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., or any of the National Reformers, "share in the first settlement of this country"? Of the hardships that made that settlement memorable, how many did he brave? What kind of a martyrdom has he ever suffered? and how many times has he suffered it? If these are the things upon which alone rests the surety of the title to the honor and dignity of American citizenship, what part was there enacted by the National Reformers that in *them* should be lodged the sum total of all such honor and dignity, and *that* to such a sole and transcendent degree of merit that to them and them alone it should be granted to bestow the privileges and immunities of citizenship in this great nation?

But Mr. Edwards continues his kind endeavor to relieve the minds of the people of all fear that "to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive." And, after giving a clear definition of the

terms, atheist, deist, Jew, and Seventh-day Baptist, he says:—

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our Amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together. . . . The first named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. 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. Now look at it—look at the controversy. The question is not between opinions that differ, but opinions that are opposite, that are contradictory, that mutually exclude each other. It is between Christianity and infidelity. It is between theism and atheism, between the acknowledgment of a God and the denial that there is any God."

Notice: the question is "between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial of any God." This in the face of his own statement just before, that "the deist admits God;" and "the Jew admits God, Providence, and Revelation;" and "the Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity." All this, and yet the contest is between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial that there is any God; between theism and atheism; between Christianity and infidelity! How does it happen then that a people who "believe in God and Christianity," must be classed with atheists and treated as atheists? Here is how:

ACCIDENTAL ATHEISM.

They "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."

So then, bear in mind, fellow-citizens, that to "differ with the mass of Christians" is atheism. You may believe in God, and the Bible, and Christianity; you may practice in accordance with this belief ever so consistently; yet if you "differ with the mass of Christians" on a single point, you are an atheist; you may believe and practice all this, yet if you use a single argument against National Reform, the question instantly resolves itself into a contest between Christianity and infidelity—and *you* are the infidel; between theism and atheism—and *you* are the atheist; between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial that there is any God—and *you* are the one who denies that there is any God. If they will do these things in a green tree, what will they not do in a dry? If this is the result of a difference with this National Reform "mass of Christians" now while they are simply grasping for power, what will the result be when once they shall have secured the power that they want? What right then shall the "atheist" have? Mr. Edwards tells us. Here are his words of comfort and assurance to those who fear oppression under the National Reform rule:—

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic. . . . So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him."

How blessedly tolerant a National Reform régime would be! If you differ with it on a single point, you shall be tolerated as is a

lunatic; that is, kept under surveillance, so long as, like a craven, you allow yourself to be cowed into silence. But as soon as you begin to speak your sentiments, then you are "dangerous," then you are "raving," and the gentle National Reform rulers will have such a tender regard for you that they will supply you with bars and doors securely fastened.

But Mr. Edwards proceeds:—

"I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . 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. And we are aiming, not to increase, but to render definite his disqualification."

That would be a model government indeed that would allow a *conspirator* to "go free, hold his lands, and enjoy his home, and even vote." It is not the custom of governments to allow these privileges to persons who are plotters against the life of the government. Nor does National Reform propose really to do anything of the kind. We know, and in former numbers of this paper have abundantly shown in their own words, that National Reform does not intend to allow dissenters to vote nor to be citizens. No doubt Mr. Edwards means that he will tolerate him as he would a conspirator, and allow him these privileges "so long as he does not rave," and "is not dangerous," and so long as it is not known that he is a conspirator. But as soon as the "atheist" begins to utter any sentiments that "differ with the mass of Christians," then he is raving, is dangerous, and a conspirator, and they will "tolerate" (?) him as such. Yes, continues this Reverend Doctor of Divinity:—

"Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith."

After the expression of *such* principles, there is no just ground for surprise that after a few more words he should exclaim: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

NATIONAL REFORM GOLDEN RULE.

That is to say, He does not tolerate me, and I must not tolerate him. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith; therefore I must make him grieve in lamentation and woe *because of* my faith. He hates me and my faith, and I must hate him and his unbelief.

And *this* is National Reform "Christianity." This gentleman is one of the worthies to whom is committed the interpretation of Scripture on all "moral and civil, as well as ecclesiastical points," and whose decision must be "final." This is the way that the sublime principles of the sermon on the mount are to be exemplified when this nation becomes the National Reformed "kingdom of Christ." But to correspond to such an exposition and exemplification, the sermon on the mount will have to be "re-enacted." It now reads, in the words of Christ, as follows: "I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for

them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven."

But National Reform says unto you, Hate your enemies, curse them that curse you, do evil to them that hate you, and persecute them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may agree "with the mass of Christians," and be true children of National Reform; those who do not tolerate you, why should ye tolerate them? Therefore all things whatsoever ye would *not* that men should do to you, do ye *that* unto them; for this is the law of National Reform.

EXALTING THEMSELVES ABOVE GOD.

This idea of re-enactment is not altogether hypothetical in this connection, for in the same speech Mr. Edwards said that,

"If there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out—there cannot be many of them—and we are prepared to accept them *and have them re-enacted.*"

That is to say, They were enacted by the Lord of Heaven and earth, and if they have not been abrogated, please point them out and WE will have them re-enacted.

How much higher does arrogance need to exalt itself before it becomes dangerous? These men assume the authority to reckon and denounce as "atheists" all who oppose National Reform, and plainly assert that under the power which the "Reformers" would wield, all such "atheists" shall be relegated to the place and condition of the lunatic and the conspirator. But as though that were a small thing to do, they boldly usurp the place of the Most High, and consequentially inform us that in certain portions of the word of God what has not been abrogated *they* will have re-enacted.

Can it be possible that in all this land there is anybody who sees no danger in clothing with civil power such an association of men? Could anything be more intolerant than that which they deliberately propose to do? And yet all this is only the expression of their idea of *tolerance!* We wish they would convey to us some idea of what in their estimation would be *intolerance.*

It is high time that all understand that National Reform is a standing menace to human liberty; and that the success of National Reform will be the utter destruction of human liberty in free America. A. T. J.

"MANIFESTLY there is an irreconcilable difference between Papal principles and the fundamental principles of our free institutions. Popular government is self-government. A nation is capable of self-government only so far as the individuals who compose it are capable of self-government. To place one's conscience, therefore, in the keeping of another, and to disavow all personal responsibility in obeying the dictation of another, is as far as possible from *self-control*, and therefore wholly inconsistent with republican institutions, and, if common, dangerous to their stability."—*Rev. Josiah Strong.*

When we remember that National Reform principles are essentially Papal principles, we see in the above a strong indictment of so-called National Reform.

Natural Result of Rigid Sunday Laws.

LAST month in an article on the "Ethics of Sunday Legislation," we showed that, since Sunday is an institution of the church, the enactment of laws enforcing its observance is the first step toward a union of Church and State, and that the enforcement of such laws can be nothing else but persecution for conscience' sake. We promised to give in this number of the SENTINEL a demonstration of these propositions by actual facts. We can fulfill our promise no better than by reprinting the following from the speech of the Hon. Robert H. Crockett in the Arkansas Senate, in behalf of a bill which he had introduced for the granting of immunity from the penalties of the Sunday law to those who observe the seventh day. The facts therein stated, coming as they do from a disinterested party, except as he is interested in liberty and justice, and in the good name of his adopted State, must have much weight on this question. Mr. Crockett's sense of the outrages perpetrated in Arkansas was so vivid that he overlooked the fact that similar ones had been perpetrated in Tennessee. But the arraignment against legislation which allows religious bigots to wreak their spite on those whose only offense is that they are in the minority, is sufficiently strong, even though he did not mention a tithe of the persecutions. Following is the speech:—

Sir, I take shame to myself as a member of the General Assembly of 1885, which repealed the act of religious protection which this bill is intended to restore. It was hasty and ill-advised legislation, and like all such, has been only productive of oppressive persecution upon many of our best citizens, and of shame to the fair fame of our young and glorious State. Wrong in conception, it has proven infamous in execution, and under it, such ill deeds and foul oppressions have been perpetrated upon an inoffensive class of free American citizens in Arkansas, for conscience' sake, as should mantle the cheek of every lover of his State and country with indignant shame.

For nearly a half century the laws of our State, constitutional and statutory, were in accord with our national Constitution, in guaranteeing to every citizen the right to worship God in the manner prescribed by his own conscience, and that alone. The noble patriots who framed our nation's fundamental law, with the wisdom taught by the history of disastrous results in other nations from joining Church and State, and fully alive to so great a danger to our republican institutions and their perpetuity, so wisely constructed that safeguard of our American liberties that for forty years after its ratification there was no effort to interfere with its grand principle of equal protection to all, in the full enjoyment and exercise of their religious convictions. Then petitions began to pour in from the New England States upon the United States senate "to prevent the carrying and delivery of the mails upon Sunday"—which

they declared was set aside by "divine authority as a day to be kept holy."

The petitions were referred to the committee on postal matters and the report was made by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, one of the fathers of the Democratic party. I quote the following from that report, which was adopted unanimously and "committee discharged:"—

"Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has withheld the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen. And while he respects the rights of others he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions. . . . The obligation of the Government is the same on both these classes; [those who keep Saturday and those who keep Sunday] and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority."

Listen to that last sentence—but again I quote:—

"What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any of its citizens, however small. Despotism may invade these rights, but justice still confirms them. And again:—

"Let the national Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World. Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances."

Sir, it was my privilege during the last two years to travel through our Northwestern States in the interest of immigration. I delivered public lectures upon the material resources of Arkansas, and the inducements held out by her to those who desired homes in a new State. I told them of her cloudless skies and tropical climes, and bird songs as sweet as vesper chimes. I told them of her mountains and valleys, of her forests of valuable timber, her thousands of miles of navigable waters, her gushing springs, her broad, flower-decked and grass-carpeted prairies, sleeping in the golden sunshine of unsettled solitude. I told them, sir, of the rich stores of mineral wealth sleeping in the sunless depths of her bosom. I told them of our God-inspired liquor laws, of our "pistol laws," of our exemption laws, and oh, sir! God forgive me the lie—I told them that our Constitution and laws protected all men equally in the enjoyment and exercise of their religious convictions. I told them that the sectional feeling engendered by the war was a thing of the past, and that her citizens, through me, cordially invited them to come and share this glorious land with us and aid us to develop it.

Many came and settled up our wild lands and prairies, and where but a few years ago was heard in the stillness of the night the howl of the wolf, the scream of the panther,

and the wail of the wildcat, these people for whom I am pleading, came and settled, and behold the change. Instead of the savage sounds incident to the wilderness, now is heard the tap, tap, tap, of the mechanic's hammer, the rattle and roar of the railroad, the busy hum of industry, and softer, sweeter far than all these is heard the music of the church bells as they ring in silvery chimes across the prairies and valleys and are echoed back from the hill-sides throughout the borders of our whole State.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE UNSCRIPTURAL.

These people are, many of them, Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists. They are people who religiously and conscientiously keep Saturday, the seventh-day, as the Sabbath, in accordance with the fourth commandment. They find no authority in the Scripture for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week, nor can anyone else. All commentators agree that Saturday is and was the scriptural Sabbath, and that the keeping of Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, is of human origin, and not by divine injunction. The Catholic writers and all theologians agree in this.

These people understand the decalogue to be as binding upon them as fully to-day as when handed down amid the thunders of Sinai. They do not feel at liberty to abstain from their usual avocations, because they read the commandment, "Six days shalt thou labor," as mandatory, and they believe that they have no more right to abstain from labor on the first day of the week than they have to neglect the observance of Saturday as their Sabbath. They agree with their Christian brethren of other denominations in all essential points of doctrine, the one great difference being upon the day to be kept as the Sabbath. They follow no avocations tending to demoralize the community in which they live. They came among us expecting the same protection in the exercise of their religious faith, as is accorded to them in all the states of Europe, in South Africa, Australia, the Sandwich Islands, and every State in the Union except, alas! that I should say it, Arkansas! Sir, under the existing law there have been in Arkansas within the last two years three times as many cases of persecution for conscience' sake, as there have been in all the other States combined since the adoption of our national Constitution.

PERSECUTION FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE.

Let me, sir, illustrate the operation of the present law by one or two examples. A Mr. Swearigen came from a northern State and settled a farm in — County. His farm was four miles from town, and far away from any house of religious worship. He was a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and, after having sacredly observed the Sabbath of his people (Saturday) by abstaining from all secular work, he and his son, a lad of seventeen, on the first day of the week, went quietly about their usual avocations. They disturbed no one—interfered with the rights of no one. But they were observed, and reported to the grand jury—indicted, arrested, tried, convicted, fined—and, having no money

to pay the fine, these moral, Christian citizens of Arkansas were dragged to the county jail and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days—and for what? For daring in this so-called land of liberty, in the year of our Lord 1887, to worship God.

Was this the end of the story? Alas, no, sir! They were turned out; and the old man's only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his children, was levied on to pay the fine and costs, amounting to \$38. The horse sold at auction for \$27. A few days afterward the sheriff came again and demanded \$36, \$11 balance due on fine and costs, and \$25 for board for himself and son while in jail. And when the poor old man—a Christian, mind you—told him with tears that he had no money, he promptly levied on his only cow, but was persuaded to accept bond, and the amount was paid by contributions from his friends of the same faith. Sir, my heart swells to bursting with indignation as I repeat to you the infamous story.

ANOTHER INSTANCE.

Another, and I am done. Sir, I beg you and these senators to believe that these are neither fancy nor exaggerated sketches. Five years ago a young man, newly married, came to — County, from Ohio. He and his wife were Seventh-day Baptists. The young girl had left father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all the dear friends of her childhood to follow her young husband to Arkansas—to them the land of promise. The light of love sparkled in her bright, young eyes. The roses of health were upon her cheeks, and her silver laugh was sweet music, of which her young husband never wearied. They purchased a little farm, and soon, by tireless industry and frugal thrift, their home blossomed like a rose in the wilderness. After awhile a fair young babe came to them to brighten the sunshine, and sweeten the bird songs. They were happy in each other's affection and their love for the little one. For them "all things worked together for good;" for, in their humble, trusting way, they worshiped God and loved their fellow-men.

Two years ago the law under which their prosperity and happiness had had its growth was repealed! Accursed be the day which brought such a foul blot upon our State's fair fame! A change, sudden, cold, and blasting as an arctic storm came over their lives and pitilessly withered all their bright flowers of hope. Under this repeal, persecution lifted its ugly, venomous head. The hero of my sad story was observed by an envious, jealous neighbor, quietly working, as he believed God had commanded him, on Sunday. He was reported to that inquisitorial relic of barbarism, the grand jury—indicted, tried, convicted, and thrown into jail because his conscience would not let him pay the fine.

Week after week dragged its slow length along. Day after day the young wife, with baby in her arms, watched at the gate for his coming, and like Tennyson's Marianna—

"She only said: 'My life is dreary—
He cometh not,' she said.
She said: 'I am aweary—aweary—
I would that I were dead.'"

Then baby sickened and died—the light in

the young wife's eyes faded out in tears—her silvery laugh changed to low, wailing sobs. Pale-faced Misery snatched the roses from her cheeks and planted in their stead her own pallid hue. Sir, how can I go on? At length the cruel law was appeased, and this inoffensive citizen (except that he had loved God and sought to obey him) was released from prison and dragged his weary feet to the happy home he had left a few short weeks before. He met his neighbors at the gate bearing a coffin. He asked no questions, his heart told him all, No, not all! He knew not—he could never know—of her lonely hours, of her bitter tears, of the weary watching and waiting, of the appeals to God, that God for whom she had suffered so much, for help in the hour of her extremity, of baby's sickness and death. He could not know of these. But he went with them to the quiet country burial-place and saw beside the open grave a little mound with dirt freshly heaped upon it, and then he knew that God had taken both his heart's idols and he was left alone. His grief was too deep for tears. With staring eyes he saw them lower the body of his young wife into the grave. He heard the clods rattle upon the coffin, and it seemed as if they were falling upon his heart. The work was done and they left him with his dead, and then he threw himself down between the graves with an arm across each little mound, and the tears came in torrents and kept his heart from breaking. And then he sobbed his broken farewell to his darlings and left Arkansas forever. Left it, sir, as hundreds of others are preparing to leave if this General Assembly fails to restore to them the protection of their rights under the Constitution, national and State.

On next Monday, at Malvern, six as honest, good, and virtuous citizens as live in Arkansas are to be tried as criminals for daring to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences; for exercising a right which this Government, under the Constitution, has no power to abridge. Sir, I plead, in the name of justice, in the name of our republican institutions, in the name of these inoffensive, God-fearing, God-serving people, our fellow-citizens, and last, sir, in the name of Arkansas, I plead that this bill may pass, and this one foul blot be wiped from the escutcheon of our glorious commonwealth.

The Christian Cynosure on National Reform.

THE *Christian Cynosure*, it appears, has partially read—very partially indeed—the December number of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, and is thereby moved to make some comments upon it, its aim, and its work. As the *Cynosure* is itself an advocate of National Reform, some of its comments are worth a passing notice. Of the *SENTINEL* the *Cynosure* says:—

“Its one sole aim is to antagonize and resist those who would have our national Constitution amended by inserting the single word ‘Christian’ so as to distinguish between the ‘free exercise’ of the *Christian* religion, and the ‘free exercise’ of child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and whatever crimes are called religion. . . . The sole object of the promoters [of the Religious Amendment]

being to prevent the Constitution from covering crime.”

Although one of the editors of the *Cynosure* is a Vice-President of the National Reform Association, yet that paper has a very poor understanding of the National Reform movement, if it really supposes that the design of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution is the insertion of “the single word Christian.” Perhaps we can enlighten the *Cynosure* somewhat. We shall try. Therefore we would inform it that in the first National Convention for National Reform that was ever held, a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking for the adoption of measures by that body, for amending the Constitution of the United States. This memorial asked that the Preamble to the Constitution should be amended to read as follows—the amendment in brackets:—

CHRISTIANITY THE TEST OF CITIZENSHIP.

“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,” etc.

This of itself is a good deal more than the insertion of “the single word ‘Christian;’” but this is not near all that they propose, not by a long way. This memorial continues:—

“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 the Amendment, in the Preamble.”

That is to say that the Constitution throughout shall be subjected to a revision so as to make it conform, and give effect, to this amended Preamble. In other words, the whole Constitution shall be revised to suit the National Reformers. It is evident that National Reform involves a vast deal more than the insertion of “the single word ‘Christian’” in the Constitution. If the *Cynosure* will read the November *SENTINEL*, 1886, it can get some idea of how much more. The *Cynosure* needs to be a good deal better acquainted with National Reform, before it undertakes to comment upon the opposition to that movement. Therefore read the *SENTINEL*, Mr. Editor, read the *SENTINEL*.

Even though it were true that all that is intended by National Reform were the insertion of the single word “Christian,” we should yet oppose it just as much as we do, so long as the effect of such insertion would be to give to Christians the sole right to citizenship and its privileges and immunities. We have as much regard for Christianity and the Christian name as anybody has, but we do not believe that any set of men have the right to a monopoly of that name, nor under it the monopoly of all human right.

But says the *Cynosure*, the insertion of this “single word” in the Constitution is “to distinguish between the ‘free exercise’ of the *Christian* religion, and the ‘free exercise’ of child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and whatever crimes are called religion.” In this expression the *Cynosure* shows as great destitution of a knowledge of the Constitution as

in the other it showed of National Reform. Does that paper mean seriously to assert that the Constitution of the United States guarantees the free exercise “of child-murder, polygamy, assassination,” and other “crimes” as it guarantees the free exercise of religion? Does the *Cynosure* know no distinction between crime and religion? If it does *not*, it is time that it understood that the National Constitution does know such distinction. It might be well also to inform the *Cynosure* that there are now both State and United States laws prohibiting child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and other crimes, and even misdemeanors. Therefore if its further statement be true, that the sole object of the promoters of the Religious Amendment is “to prevent the Constitution from covering crime,” then the “sole object” of the National Reformers is wholly purposeless; for when their “sole object” should be accomplished, they would have only what they now have.

But to prevent the Constitution from covering crime, is *not* the sole object of the promoters of the Religious Amendment. Their object is to so amend the Constitution that it shall recognize and define *as* crime, that which is not and cannot be crime. They want the Constitution so amended that under it there shall be no distinction between *sin* and *crime*; but that all sins shall be crimes, and punishable by the civil law. If it be admitted that all sin is crime, then we freely confess that the *Cynosure* is strictly correct in saying that the “sole object” of the promoters of National Reform “is to prevent the Constitution from covering crime.” That is, their “sole object” is to so amend the United States Constitution, that under it the National Reformers may put themselves in the place of God to pass upon, to define, and to punish, sin.

Then the *Cynosure* mentions Masonry and Mormonism, and says that these are “a sort of gentlemen whom our *AMERICAN SENTINEL* seems to treat with silent respect, though surrounded by them.” So far as Mormonism is concerned, any person who is a reader of the *SENTINEL* knows by these words that the *Cynosure* has not read it to any appreciable extent. As for Masonry, if there were on foot a movement to establish a Masonic hierarchy in this Government, as there is to establish a National Reform hierarchy; or if we should see in Masonry any such menace to civil and religious liberty, as there is in National Reform; then we should endeavor to ventilate such iniquity in Masonry, as we do now that in National Reform. But we do not propose to spend any of our time to so little purpose, as the *Cynosure* has spent all these years.

Next, the *Cynosure* undertakes to tell exactly what the National Reformers want. That we may the more clearly set forth these wants we shall number them.

1. “We want a Bible oath in our courts, and chaplains, and Thanksgivings such as we now have and have had from the first.”

That is to say, we want a religious amendment to the National Constitution, to give us what “we now have,” and what we always “have had from the first!” In other words, they want what they already have, and they

will subvert the Constitution to get it. That seems to us a queer sort of proceeding for men of sound minds.

2. "A recognized standard of law and morals so as to know by what God to swear witnesses, and to furnish definitions for public vices and crimes."

As there has never yet been any difficulty in knowing by what God to swear witnesses; and as the law already furnishes definitions for all public vices and crimes, it would seem that this want stands on about the same level as the other one, and that agitation to obtain it is agitation to get what we already "have and have had from the first."

GROUNDLESS FEARS.

3. "We wish for a Constitutional barrier against the religion of Dahomey, which celebrates the king's birthday by piling up human heads."

Well did anybody ever! What in the world has our Constitution to do with erecting a barrier against the celebration of the birthday of the king of Dahomey? Is the editorial staff of the *Cynosure*, or are the National Reformers, afraid that the king of Dahomey is going to send an expedition all the way to the United States to get human heads to pile up in celebration of his birthday? and are they afraid that he will select *their* heads out of all the sixty-five millions here? If they are very sore afraid, we can re-assure them by assuring them that such an attempt on the part of the king of Dahomey, or any other king, would be an invasion of this country; and there is now a "Constitutional barrier" against invasions. Clause 16, of Section VIII of Article I, declares that Congress shall have power, "To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions."

But should the terrible king of Dahomey succeed in sinking our navy, and in eluding our militia, and should he actually capture the editorial staff of the *Cynosure* or some other of the National Reformers, there is still another "Constitutional barrier" against him, for clause 11, of the same Section before cited, declares that Congress shall have power, "To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water." Oh, dear *Cynosure*, you and all your fellow "Reformers" are perfectly and constitutionally safe from being compelled to bear any part in the sanguinary celebration of the birthday of the king of Dahomey. As for the rest of us we will all willingly take our chances, rather than to risk the rule of a National Reform régime. So as this seems to be the most instantly and really urgent of all your "wants," and as there is now a double "Constitutional barrier" to protect you, you might just as well stop all further agitation for your National Reform Amendment.

But there is yet one more want that the trembling and affrighted *Cynosure* utters.

4. "We wish to exclude from our court-houses Chinese oaths, sworn by yellow paper and dead cocks' heads, and the secret oaths to have throats cut and bodies mangled to enforce partiality or protection for criminals and concealment of crime."

We cannot possibly see how the ends of justice would be promoted by compelling the

Chinese to testify upon an oath that would be no more to him, than one "by yellow paper and dead cocks' heads" would be to the editor of the *Cynosure*. To the Chinese such an oath is as sacred, as is the regular judicial oath to the average American; and to compel him to abandon an oath which to him is sacred, and take one which, if anything at all to him, is profane, what more surety, what more ground, would there be upon which to rest confidence that he was telling the truth? Instead of there being any *more*, there would be a good deal less,—in fact there would be no such surety at all. The trouble is, the National Reformers cannot see anything but that all our courts must be courts of theology and tests of faith, instead of courts of law and tests of truth and justice.

As for "the secret oaths to have throats cut and bodies mangled" etc., we did not know before that there was any need of a Constitutional Amendment to exclude these from our court-houses, because we never before heard, nor do we now believe, that either our courts or our court-houses, administer, entertain, or include any such oaths. It is probable, though, that in this the *Cynosure* intended a stroke at Masonry, but it is made in such a blundering way that unless the reader were acquainted with the reason of the existence of the *Cynosure*, he would not detect the object of its aim. We do not believe that there is either righteousness or propriety in secret oaths, but even though there were a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting them, we should like to know how it could be made effective without the establishment of an inquisition to pry into the secrets of every man's life, and worm out of him, or force from him, the confession of his secret oath. And as between Masonry and even such an inquisition, we desire rather to take our chances against the danger from the secret oath, rather than against the danger which would inevitably inhere in such an inquisition.

WHO IS SINCERE?

The *Cynosure* closes by saying:—

"We can scarcely regard him [that is, the SENTINEL] as sincerely believing that we would 'call all the bayonets of this mighty nation' to aid us in voting into our Constitution what our fathers intended to and supposed they had put there."

That is not exactly what the SENTINEL said. We did not say that they would call all the bayonets of the nation, to aid in voting into the Constitution what they want, but in support of their National Reform "kingdom of Christ" after they have voted it in. But the difference is very slight, and we are not sure but that they will do the one as well as the other, before they get through with their National Reform scheme.

As for the sincerity of our belief on this point, we can assure the *Cynosure* that our belief of it is just as sincere as is the National Reform avowal of it. And that avowal by no less an authority than National Reform District Secretary, Rev. M. A. Gault, is made in these words:—

"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."

And again:—

"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."

Now we do sincerely believe that bloody revolutions are not accomplished without the use of bayonets; and we actually know that slavery was not blotted out without calling into active and bloody use all the bayonets of this mighty nation. Therefore as the National Reformers coolly and deliberately contemplate the alternative of a bloody revolution, and a war as terrible as our civil war, we do sincerely believe that, if it could not be done without, they would call all the bayonets of this mighty nation to aid in the accomplishment of that wicked work upon which they have set their hearts.

Dear *Cynosure*, you ought to read up on National Reform. You don't understand it very well. For your own benefit, and that you may really understand the principles of National Reform, we urge you to read the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We "sincerely believe" you ought to.

A. T. J.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS AND GENERAL HISTORY.

BY ROBERT H. LABBERTON.

AS A CLASS TEXT-BOOK it is superior to any other in Unity, Brevity, Clearness, Logical Arrangement, and Suggestiveness.

AS A REFERENCE BOOK it should be in the Library of every school-room in the country; every Student of History should possess a copy.

In your Reading Circle or at home when you wish to consult an Atlas you need a map for a particular date. Your modern Atlas will not give it. This is the only Atlas which has a map for every period.

A MAP for any particular date can instantly be found by anyone, each map having over it in figures, the year or period it covers.

It is the only Atlas in which each nationality has, and always retains, its own distinctive color; hence every period has a map, and they are progressive, forming in themselves a panorama of events effective in the highest degree.

NEW MAPS OF ANCIENT EMPIRES.

It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires.

The text is brief, suggestive, fascinating, but gives in an attractive form the leading events in the history of the world (not a bundle of particular histories), free from unnecessary details. It has an index.

Labberton's New Historical Atlas and General History is indispensable to Libraries, Reading Circles, School Officers, Teachers, Students, etc. It contains 193 Maps, printed in colors, 30 Genealogical Charts, and is complete in one volume, 4to. Cloth, 312 pages. Sent by Mail or Express, prepaid, for \$2.50.

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.

THE TRUTH FOUND.

THE NATURE AND OBLIGATION OF THE SABBATH
OF THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

BY ELI. J. II. WAGGONER.

THE title of this little book sufficiently explains its character. It contains more scriptural information in regard to the Sabbath than any other book of twice the size, and yet it is so simplified as to be easily comprehended. The author quotes the opinions of many learned men concerning the Sabbath, and their conflicting theories are strongly contrasted with the clear, straightforward teaching of the Bible. 64 pp. Price, 10 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1887.

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

No one who sees this number of the SENTINEL should pass by the article on pp. 28-30, which is chiefly a reprint of a speech by the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, of the Arkansas Senate. We are very sure that whoever begins to read it will finish it. The circumstances of its delivery were these: In 1885 the Arkansas Legislature repealed that section of the Sunday law which granted to observers of the seventh day the privilege of laboring on Sunday without being molested. Immediately a bitter persecution began against those who conscientiously rested on the seventh day of the week, and labored the other six. At the last session of the Legislature, Senator Crockett introduced what might be called a religious liberty bill, and it was in support of this bill that he made the speech which we quote.

The cause of religious liberty owes a great deal to Senator Crockett. He made this bill the object of his special care, and so successful were his efforts that it passed both Houses by a large majority. The effect of his noble efforts in behalf of religious liberty is not confined to Arkansas, whose citizens reap the immediate benefit; but his eloquent words will stir up honest people in all parts of the United States, to protest against the iniquity of interference by the State in matters purely religious. Senator Crockett is a grandson of Col. David Crockett, the hero of the Alamo, of whom he has shown himself to be a worthy descendant.

THE *Christian Cynosure* says:—

"The Arkansas Legislature has passed a bill repealing the law punishing for engaging in secular pursuits on Sunday those who religiously observe one day each week as Sabbath. Under the existing law there have been numerous prosecutions of Second Adventists for working on Sunday."

At last the *Cynosure* has awakened to the fact that there have actually been persecutions in the United States, for conscience' sake. Several months ago a statement of the persecutions under the Sunday law in Arkansas and Tennessee, was made in a sermon in Chicago, and the editor of the *Cynosure* called loudly for proof. He didn't believe that anybody had been persecuted, but said that if such things had been done, the matter ought to be investigated. The matter was investigated. The one who preached the sermon went South a few weeks later, and wrote to the *Cynosure* a statement of the facts in the case. Some of them are given in the speech published on another page of the SENTINEL. The *Cynosure* published the statement, but said no more about putting a stop to such proceedings. Having been assured that per-

secutions had actually taken place, the editor seemed to be satisfied. He did say, however, that the report "lacked confirmation." Still it seems, from his tardy acknowledgment, that he really believed it all the time. He could hardly have helped doing so; but not a word in condemnation of the persecutions has appeared in the *Cynosure*. Is it necessary to add that the editor of the *Cynosure* is one of the Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association?

National Reform Physicians.

In his "clashing voices" department in the *Christian Statesman* of February 3, Mr. Gault quotes the following voice from James E. McGinnis, in the *St. Louis Republican*:—

"This is not a Christian State, nor is it under a Christian Constitution, but one made for Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, Infidels, and Christians alike; and that this may long remain the land of perfect religious liberty, is the fervent aspiration of every patriot and real lover of his kind."

True enough; but among patriots and real lovers of their kind your ardent National Reformer is not to be classed. And so Mr. Gault lifts his voice and causes it to "clash" against the one just quoted, as follows:—

"You forget that it is impossible for our Government to show the same favor to every system of religion. It must discriminate in favor of one or the other. Christianity furnishes the only perfect system of morals, the only system that secures perfect liberty. This is why the Government does and must discriminate in favor of Christianity. For instance, if our Government would abolish Sabbath laws, it would disfranchise every Christian citizen. Such religious liberty is far from being perfect."

One peculiarity about the writings of M. A. Gault is that there is never any connection between his propositions and the proofs which he adduces in support thereof; between his premises and his conclusions. So in the above quotation; taken as a whole it is meaningless, but the detached statements may be understood. He says: "You forget that it is impossible for our Government to show the same favor to every system of religion." We do not forget it, because we never knew it; and the writer in the *Republican* evidently is as ignorant as we are on that point, for he asserts that our Constitution as it is, does grant equal liberty to all religionists, and that therein its fairness lies. We would like to have some National Reformer demonstrate why this Government cannot treat all systems of religion alike.

According to Mr. Gault's statement, the National Reformers are working for what already exists. For, (1) He states that it is impossible for this Government to show the same favor to every system of religion. Then it must be that the United States does not show equal favor to men of all beliefs. (2) Mr. Gault goes farther, and declares that this Government does discriminate in favor of Christianity. If that is so, the National Reformers' occupation is gone, for that is just what they profess to be working for.

The story goes that a man was induced to believe that he needed a physician, and upon

consulting one he was asked about his condition. In reply to questions, he stated that his strength was good, that he had a good appetite, and that he slept well. To which the physician replied, "Very well, we shall soon change all that." Just such physicians the National Reformers will prove themselves to be for this country. There is freedom now; every man has liberty to worship God in whatever way he thinks God requires; but the National Reformers propose to change all that, so that no form of religion shall be tolerated except the one they think is right. When that time comes, then know that the ruin of the nation is at hand.

At the Wooster, Ohio, Convention the National Reformers adopted the following as a part of their platform:—

"The rights of man are properly understood and maintained only where responsibility to God is deeply felt. This is sufficient guarantee that our movement cannot infringe upon any just conception of individual liberty."

The self-assurance of these model Reformers is something to be admired. We protest that this is no guarantee at all. All history attests that individual liberty has not been secured, in any instance, by uniting religion with the State. The following proposition, timely three centuries ago, is as conclusive as that copied above:—

"The rights of man are properly understood and maintained only where responsibility to God is deeply felt. This is sufficient guarantee that the supremacy of the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ, and the establishment of the holy inquisition cannot infringe upon any just conception of individual liberty."

To "the Church" this was a very reasonable proposition, and "very full of comfort." But to dissenters and genuine Reformers, it had a different look. In the light of what we have read from the "National Reformers" we are inclined to believe that the "true inwardness" of the movement and the platform is concealed in the phrase, "just conception of individual liberty." It was shown in the SENTINEL, from their own avowals, that with them, "just conceptions" of individual rights are that no one shall be a *bona fide* citizen and eligible to office who is not in full sympathy with "the characteristic faith" of the nation! With this understanding their platform is quite consistent!

"JESUS answered, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." John 18:36.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address,

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MAY, 1887.

NUMBER 5.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

In the *Christian Statesman*, January 20, was published an article by Dr. T. K. Davis on "Using the Ballot for the Glory of God," in which he inquires, "Could any method of confessing and honoring Christ be more significant and emphatic than to vote for him?" And the italics are his. This article the *Statesman* says "ought to waken earnest reflection in multitudes of Christian minds." We think it ought; especially in view of the National Reform efforts to make this the popular method of "confessing and honoring Christ."

In the *Christian Nation*, February 9, 1887, Rev. W. J. Coleman says that Senator Sherman is credited with favoring an appropriation of one hundred millions of dollars for coast defenses, and then remarks as follows:—

"The hundred million which the Senator would expend on earth-works and great guns, if put at interest, would yield as much every year as all the Christians in the United States give to foreign missions. And why would not that be a wiser way to expend it? It would soften our hearts at home until we would not want to fight, and it would raise our reputation abroad so that our neighbors would not want to fight us."

What a wonderful efficacy there must be in National Reform prescriptions. Why don't some of these Reformers persuade the European nations to adopt this method of raising their reputation? It would be a splendid missionary triumph if they only could do it.

THE SENTINEL frequently receives letters from people who want it to advocate this, that, or the other reform. Now we heartily sympathize with all true reformers. We know that intemperance is a horrible curse, that the devil has agents circulating vile literature in every place possible, and that unnamable vice is stalking through the land. But there are thousands of good people who by voice and pen are working with might and main to check these evils, while the AMERICAN SENTINEL is the only paper in existence whose sole object is to combat a rapidly-growing movement which, if successful, would make us a nation of slaves, not simply slaves in body, but what is far worse, slaves in conscience. And so while we bid all true reformers God-speed, we must confine ourselves to exposing the sophistries of those who under the name of reform would rob us of all our liberties.

Is Christ King of the Nations?

In the February number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL we published an article entitled, "National Reform Principles Exemplified," in which it was proved, by quotations from the publications of the "Reformers," that their professed intention is to "enthronize Christ," to "bring him into his kingdom," to "accept him as the nation's king," to make this Republic "one of the kingdoms of our Lord," etc. They assert that Christ is, by virtue of his office, king of the nations, but that this nation is depriving him of his right, in not acknowledging, in the Constitution, his kingship and sovereignty. They affirm that he is constituted king of the nations by virtue of his mediatorial office. This we emphatically deny. Here the issue is squarely joined. Their error is strenuously held and taught by the Covenanters; it is fundamental with the National Reformers—the corner-stone of their system.

They endeavor to uphold their error by fallacious reasonings and by erroneous interpretations of prophecy. We will notice these points.

1. Fallacies in reasoning. In an article in the *Christian Nation*, September 15, 1886, are the following words:—

"It is objected that Christ is anointed king of Zion; he is the organic Head of the church, only; how then can he, as mediator, be king of nations? This, to some, seems to be an unsolvable problem. We will, however, refer the reader to the reign of Solomon for a solution (see 1 Kings 4:20-25). While Solomon was the proper organic head of the kings of Israel alone, yet it is recorded that 'he reigned over all kingdoms from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents and served Solomon all the days of his life.' If Solomon could rule in a twofold capacity as king of Zion and king of nations, unquestionably Christ Jesus is competent to exercise dominion in the same manner."

The fatal defect in this reasoning is, that there is not the shadow of a likeness between the reign of Solomon and the present reign of Christ. The writer starts out to meet the query, How can Christ be both mediator and king of nations? and proposes to answer it by referring to the reign of Solomon, who never was mediator at all! He solves nothing; he does not touch the question. Uzziah, a king on the throne of Solomon, once essayed to act as priest, and the Lord smote him with leprosy (2 Chron. 26:16-21); and so would he have smitten Solomon if he had attempted to intrude upon the office of the priests, for that was given to the family of Aaron, and

the penalty of death was threatened against anyone who trespassed upon it. Num. 3:10. So inconclusive are their reasonings.

Another article in the *Nation*, which is highly commended by the editor, speaks of Christ as follows:—

"He is not divided; he is at once a prophet, a priest, and a king. The prophet is a king, and speaks with authority. On the cross Christ is a king, accepts an address as a king—'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom'—and answers as a king—'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'"

This is equally faulty, as to its reasoning and to the facts. Christ was filling the office of prophet on earth, but not of priest or king. Paul, to the Hebrews, makes an intended argument on the priesthood of Christ, and sums up as follows:—

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Heb. 8:1-5.

He has before declared that Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but of Melchizedek, and, according to the flesh, he was of the same tribe as Uzziah, who was smitten of the Lord for essaying to act as priest, "of which tribe," says Paul, "no man gave attendance at the altar."

The points in the apostle's summary are these: (1) Christ's priesthood is in Heaven, in a sanctuary not made by man. (2) He was not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah. (3) Therefore, he could not be a priest on earth; he could not officiate in the sanctuary where earthly priests officiated. (4) The earthly sanctuary and service were but an example and shadow of heavenly things. As is said again in chap. 9:24: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." The earthly priests, service, and sanctuary were types; if Christ had officiated as a priest on earth, he must have acted as a type of his own work in Heaven! But argument on this point is not necessary; the words of Paul are plain, and must be decisive. Christ was not, and could not be, a priest on earth.

Neither was he a king on earth. His

kingship or reign was always spoken of prospectively. The very petition relied upon by the writer quoted above, disproves his point; "Lord, remember me *when thou comest into thy kingdom.*" If he were reigning a king at that time—if he had already come into his kingdom—then the language of the petition was very inappropriate. He was born of the lineage of David, but he has not yet taken his throne and his kingdom. Let us examine the Scriptures on this point.

In Luke 19 it is recorded that Jesus "spoke a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." He represented himself thus: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. . . . And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom," then he reckoned with his servants, and destroyed his enemies.

Of course the "far country" into which he went to receive his kingdom, is Heaven. He receives it from the hand of his Father. The kingdom is on the earth; here he commits the talents to his servants; here his citizens reject his authority; here he will come to reckon with his servants; here he will destroy his enemies. Here he had to come to take "on him the seed of Abraham," and to be born heir to David's throne. But the gift he receives in Heaven, and has not received it yet. Certainly he did not have it on the cross nor in the grave.

It is also proved by the prophet Daniel that he had to go into the presence of his Father to receive the kingdom. This opens the second point.

2. They misinterpret the prophecies. Dan. 7:13, 14, reads:—

"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."

This proves that he shall receive his dominion at the throne of the Ancient of days, in Heaven. But that scene is laid after, not before, his resurrection and ascension. By referring to verses 9, 10, it is seen that this part of the vision of Daniel is fulfilled in the time of the Judgment: "The Judgment was set, and the books were opened." And with this agree the words of Rev. 11:15-18. The announcement of verse 15,—"*The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever,*"—is much quoted by National Reformers, but they utterly ignore the fact that it is made under the seventh trumpet, which closes up this dispensation. In this chronology of this trumpet, expositors are well agreed. It is also located by verse 18: "*And the nations were angry, and thy wrath 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 the earth." There can be no question about the Judgment; it is not a past event. When he will give reward, Jesus himself informs us: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. And again: "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14.

In Rev. 11:18 the expression is used, "and thy wrath is come." This leads us to quote again from a writer in the *Christian Nation* of March 10, 1886. He said:—

"The careless reader of the word of God seems to see two opposite and irreconcilable representations of the divine character. On the one hand, severe holiness, exact justice, supreme law, resistless wrath; on the other hand, winning patience, tender mercy, infinite love, boundless grace. Even the Saviour has a twofold character—himself a paradox, whose most startling contradiction is *the wrath of the Lamb.*"

The writer of the above has proved himself a very careless reader of the word. The careful reader of the book of Revelation knows that it is given in lines or series of symbols, each and all culminating in one point, the Judgment, the coming of Christ, and the end of this world. Turning to Rev. 6:14-17 we read:—

"And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captians, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great *day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?*"

Here we see the condition of things on the earth when the day of the wrath of the Lamb comes. To claim that the day of his wrath comes during his priesthood and mediation is the sheerest absurdity; it is a gross perversion of the Scriptures. But it seems that no absurdity is too great to be set forth by these model Reformers. Paul's words of hope and promise to the Thessalonians also locate this day of wrath: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled [to recompense] rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction," etc. 2 Thess. 1:6-9.

No truth is more clearly taught than this, that Christ will come to reward his saints and to punish his enemies. But the "day of his wrath" does not come—he will not appear to take vengeance on his foes—while he is mediator or intercessor. There is no paradox in the case. It is simply a question of *time*, as to when he fulfills the several offices assigned to him by his Father. To forward their illusive theories and schemes, the National Re-

formers present the work of Christ, and even himself, as a paradox—a "most startling contradiction"—when the contradiction is all their own.

We must trace a little further the gift of the nations to Christ. See Ps. 2:7-9. It says:—

"Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen 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."

He does not convert them; he breaks them and dashes them in pieces. How is this? He does not receive the gift until the Judgment, until his mediation is closed, when "the day of salvation" is ended, and the "day of his wrath is come." That we are not mistaken in this view is further and fully proved by the following scriptures:—

"The Lord [Jehovah] said unto my Lord [Adonai], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. He sits at his Father's right hand—he is sitting there now—as priest or mediator, and will continue to sit there until the time comes to take authority over the nations, to put off the robes of his priesthood, and to "put on the garments of vengeance." Isa. 59:17. See Paul's comment on this: "But this man [Christ], 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. That is, till his foes be put under his feet; till the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth shall be given to him; until the kingdoms of this world are become his. But, mark; while he is sitting on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, a priest or mediator, he is *expecting* till his foes are made his footstool. He is looking forward to the fulfillment of the promise of the Father, to give him the kingdom and the dominion under the whole heaven.

We think none can fail to see the harmony of the testimony on this point. The nations are not yet given to Christ, and he will never receive the sovereignty by the votes of men; he cannot be "enthroned" by legislative enactments.

The proof in this article is complete in itself, yet there is much to be said in confirmation of this view, and we will resume it next month.

J. H. W.

The Logic of It.

THE National Reformers insist that the law must give the people the rest of the Sabbath. And not only give it to them, but compel them to take it. By the authority of civil law they must take the Sabbath rest whether or not they wish it. But in commenting on the meeting of locomotive engineers, held on a Sunday, the *Statesman* said:—

"Have they yet to learn that the Sabbath cannot be had for rest, unless we keep it sacred for worship?"

By putting "this and that together," we shall learn that it is the intention of our model Reformers to give us a legal or compulsory Sab-

bath rest, "sacred for worship." This is the plain evident meaning of the language. They will compel all classes to take a Sabbath rest, but they cannot have it for rest "unless they keep it sacred for worship." Hence, they will compel all to keep a day "sacred for worship." This is the inevitable logic of their position. They may, indeed, make a law to compel all classes to rest from labor on a certain day, and they may make a law that all shall attend places of worship on that day. But, alas, they cannot make them worship. They may enforce some "form of godliness," but "the power thereof" is beyond human legislation. They may compel men to act the hypocrite, but they cannot compel them to be devotional or worshipful. But we are fully aware that nothing is too wild for such theorists to attempt.

National Reform Interpretations of Scripture.

As the leaders of the National Reform propose to make themselves the interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points," under the Government of the United States, it becomes important to the American people to know somewhat about the National Reform manner and method of interpretation. As the people of this nation are asked to amend their Constitution so as to open the way for these men to make themselves the national interpreters of Scripture, the people ought to know what qualifications these self-nominated candidates possess for the high dignity to which their laboring souls aspire. That we may do our part toward enlightening the people on this subject, we propose, as far as possible, to give examples of National Reform interpretations of Scripture.

The Scriptures clearly enjoin the obligation of subjection to civil government, of obedience to civil authorities: "To be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates," and to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." In Romans 13:1-10 this duty is set forth at greater length than in any other one place in the Bible. The first verse reads thus: "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." In the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, there is quite an extended comment—more than a page—upon this text, written by Rev. David Gregg—the same who was lately installed as pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston. Mr. Gregg interprets this verse as follows:—

"The authorities that be are ordained of God. 'There is no authority but of God.' All authorities that are not of God and are not in allegiance to him are usurpers. This is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that 'there is no authority but of God.'"

There stands the plain declaration of the word of God that "there is no power but of God." At this Mr. Gregg gravely observes that all powers that are *not* of God are usurpers, and that this is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that there is no power but of

God. Well it certainly is a fact, for the word of God says it. Therefore, it being a fact that there is *no* power but of God, then how *can* there be any powers that are not of God? As the powers that be are ordained of God, and as there is no power but of God, it is impossible that there can be *any* power but of God. Therefore Mr. Gregg's comment amounts to just this and no more: All powers that are not powers are usurpers. We think it altogether likely that that is "self-evident."

But, more than this, the National Reformers will not admit that the powers that be are ordained of God. Although the Scripture says as plainly as language can say anything that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and although the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and sense of the statement, the National Reformers "interpret" it to mean, the powers that *ought* to be are ordained of God. And as the National Reform power is what ought to be, it follows that National Reform is ordained of God, and when it shall secure that power it will be exercised by a right absolutely divine. That such is the National Reform interpretation is shown by Dr. Gregg's own words. In telling what Paul was doing in writing the words of Romans 13:1-10, he says:—

"He was giving us God's ideal of civil government. He was holding up a picture of what civil government *ought* to be. He was teaching Christians *what they should strive to make Governments.*"

And again:—

The object was "to furnish then, as now, a standard by which to try existing Governments. It gives us God's ideal of civil government. If Governments conform to this divine ideal, then we are bound to recognize them as divine ordinances, and to give them conscientious support and homage, but if they do not, *we are bound to inaugurate moral reforms and revolutions which will conform them to God's ideal.*"

By this style of interpretation, therefore, we are to understand that when the Lord speaks of the powers that be, he means the powers "that ought to be." When the word of God directs every soul to be subject to the higher powers, it means that every soul shall erect a tribunal and sit in judgment upon those powers. When God directs that we shall not resist the power but *shall be subject* for conscience' sake, he means that we "are bound to inaugurate revolutions." Where the Scripture sets forth the duty to be law-abiding citizens, leading quiet and peaceable lives, the National Reform interpretation of it demands that men, Christians too, shall be revolutionists, with their eyes constantly on the Government, weighing it in the National Reform balances, and watching for opportunities to inaugurate revolutions. In short, whereas the Scripture directs that men shall be Christians and law-abiding citizens, the National Reform interpretation of the Scripture demands that they shall be scheming politicians and revolutionists. Now could any interpretation possibly be further from the truth of the Scripture, or more directly opposed to the text under consideration? But we are not surprised at it; indeed we do not see how it

could be otherwise, in view of the fact that the National Reform conception of the Saviour of the world is that he is a "divine politician." With such views of Christ, it would be impossible to hold any other views of the duty of the followers of Christ than such as are expressed in the above interpretations.

A. T. J.

The Powers that Be Are Ordained of God.

We stated above that the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and the obvious sense of the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." We have not space to present all the texts that might be given in direct proof of it, but we shall give enough to show that Paul when he wrote this declaration was only doing as was his wont, reasoning out of the Scriptures.

Everybody knows that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, and that he was a heathen. Yet God spake by his prophet directly to Nebuchadnezzar, and said, "Thou, O King, art a king of kings; for the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all." Dan. 2:37, 38. Through the prophet Jeremiah, the Lord sent yokes and bonds to the kingdoms of Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Sidon, by the messengers that came from these kings to Jerusalem, and with them also he sent this message: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; . . . and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand." Jer. 27:4-8.

Now as Nebuchadnezzar was a heathen, and as his kingdom was a heathen kingdom, we can hardly think that even the National Reformers would pronounce his authority to be exactly "God's ideal of civil government." Yet there can be no shadow of doubt that the power possessed by Nebuchadnezzar and exercised by him over all the kingdoms and peoples round about, was a power that was ordained of God, for the word of God says so, and said so to him. In the time of Nebuchadnezzar the power that was ordained of God. Nor was it only in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The word of the Lord by Jeremiah asserted not only that this power was

given to him, but to "his son and his son's son" as well; and this succession covered the whole period of the kingdom of Babylon from Nebuchadnezzar to its fall. Therefore the proof is positive that the power of the Empire of Babylon was ordained of God.

The grandson of Nebuchadnezzar—Belshazzar—in the midst of the riotous feast of Tamuz, was told by the prophet of the Lord, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it;" and, "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." The commander who led the forces of the Medes and Persians was Cyrus the Persian. And of him the Lord had said: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure." Isa. 45:1; 44:28. When Babylon fell, the rule of the Medo-Persian Empire fell first to Darius the Mede, instead of to Cyrus. And the angel Gabriel said to Daniel, "I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him." Dan. 11:1. Therefore the word of God is clear that the power of the Medo-Persian government was ordained of God.

But not to multiply instances by noting them in detail, we will quote the scripture that sums up the whole subject in few words: "Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are his; and he changeth the times and the seasons; *he removeth kings, and setteth up kings.*" Dan. 2:20, 21. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:25. These texts assuredly demonstrate the principle declared by Paul in Rom. 13:1, that "there is no power but of God;" and that "the powers that be are ordained of God." But if these texts should not be enough to demonstrate it, then we may add the crucial text of all Scripture. When Christ stood before Pilate, "Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that *I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?* Jesus answered, *Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.*" John 19:10, 11.

The demonstration is complete, therefore, that the words of Rom. 13:1, are a statement of *fact* and not of *theory*; that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and that "there is no power but of God." As the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will; when he has given the power to whom he will, whether to Babylon, to Medo-Persia, to Grecia, to Rome, to England, or to the United States; whether that will be direct or permissive, who shall say that that power is not of him? and who shall say that that is not the power that ought to be? And to such powers Christians are taught to be respectful, quiet, peaceable, obedient subjects, and not revolutionists. The following from Macaulay is to the point:—

"The powers which the apostle . . . pro-

nounce to be ordained of God, are not the powers that can be traced back to a legitimate origin, but the powers *that be*. When Jesus was asked whether the chosen people might lawfully give tribute to Cæsar, he replied by asking the questioners, not whether Cæsar could make out a pedigree derived from the old royal house of Judah, but whether the coin which they scrupled to pay into Cæsar's treasury came from Cæsar's mint, in other words, whether Cæsar actually possessed the authority and performed the functions of a ruler.

"It is generally held, with much appearance of reason, that the most trustworthy comment on the text of the Gospels and Epistles is to be found in the practice of the primitive Christians, when that practice can be satisfactorily ascertained; and it so happened that the times during which the church is universally acknowledged to have been in the highest state of purity were times of frequent and violent political change. One at least of the apostles appears to have lived to see four emperors pulled down in a little more than a year. Of the martyrs of the third century a great proportion must have been able to remember ten or twelve revolutions. Those martyrs must have had occasion often to consider what was their duty towards a prince just raised to power by a successful insurrection. That they were, one and all, deterred by the fear of punishment from doing what they thought right, is an imputation which no candid infidel would throw on them. Yet, if there be any proposition which can with perfect confidence be affirmed touching the early Christians, it is this, that they never once refused obedience to any actual ruler on account of the illegitimacy of his title. At one time, indeed, the supreme power was claimed by twenty or thirty competitors. Every province from Britain to Egypt had its own Augustus. . . . Yet it does not appear that, in any place, the faithful had any scruple about submitting to the person who, in that place, exercised the imperial functions. While the Christian of Rome obeyed Aurelian, the Christian of Lyons obeyed Tetricus, and the Christian of Palmyra obeyed Zenobia. 'Day and night'—such were the words which the great Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, addressed to the representative of Valerian and Gallienus—'day and night do we Christians pray to the one true God for the safety of our emperors.'" —*History of England, chap. 14.*

These, however, were law-abiding subjects and citizens, and not National Reform revolutionists.

A. T. J.

National Reform Principles Despotic.

We have received an address which a gentleman of Quincy, Mass., has addressed to the Legislature of that State. The writer strongly objects to making the Sunday laws any less strict, or to making concessions in favor of any, and says:—

"The greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens, demands that the Sunday laws shall remain unchanged. They may be slightly oppressive in some respects, but the Legislature which is capable of pruning them just enough to make them perfect, and stopping at that point, has, in my humble opinion, yet to be elected. Better let well enough alone."

This is the idea that underlies all National Reform would-be legislation,—the idea that laws are simply for the majority, that if the majority are satisfied it matters not if a few are oppressed. Such an idea of law is in

harmony with despotism, but not with a republican, or any other just form of government. A despotism is simply the rule of the majority, only the majority of strength is lodged in one man. But the principle is the same, no matter whether the majority of strength be lodged in one man, or whether the numerical majority has the majority of strength. Five hundred men have no more right to unite to oppress one man, than one man has to oppress five hundred men.

It is not true that a just law is ever oppressive to a few. A law that does injustice to one man, is an unjust law. We heartily agree with President Cleveland, who, in a recent interview on the land laws, said:—

"If by any construction of a law, seeming injustice is done to the humblest farmer in the furthest corner of the land, then that law ought to be changed, and changed at once."

If a law oppresses a single honest man, it has in it the elements of oppression, and so is an unjust and oppressive law. Just laws cannot by any possibility be made to oppress an upright man. This is the principle upon which our laws are framed. It is a legal maxim that it is better to let a guilty man escape than to punish an innocent man. This does not imply that a just law will sanction the escape of a guilty man, but it simply recognizes the fact that men are fallible, and are liable to improperly execute even a just law; and therefore it provides that the failure, if there be any failure, shall lean to the side of mercy.

The fact that National Reformers claim that majorities should have their way, even though it might oppress some citizens, shows that if they should gain control oppression would certainly follow. Let us beware of a despotism, whatever form it may assume.

E. J. W.

Personal Liberty.

THE editor of the *Christian Union*, Dr. Lyman Abbott, is writing in his paper a series of "Letters to Workingmen," in which he is discussing the labor problem. In the issue of March 10, he considers the principle of strikes and boycotts, and among other illustrations he gives the following:—

"My friend Michael S. owns a horse and cart. He goes out to work with his horse and cart, and for a day's work receives \$3.50. He is a capital workman, and is always in great demand. . . . His horse and his cart are his own. I have no right to tell him where or how he can use them. If he should choose now to get a Pole to help him load his cart, and I should not like Poles, and should say to him, 'Mr. S. you must not have a Pole to help you; you must have an American or an Irishman,' I should expect the same answer from him, 'Mind your own business. This is my horse and cart,' he would say, 'and I am one free man, and this Pole is another free man, and if he chooses to help me, and I choose to have him help me, it is none of your business.' And it would clearly be none of my business. And it would not dignify or materially improve my impertinence, if I should go round our village and stir up the people to demand of Mr. S. that he only use his horse and cart so many hours a day, or get only Irishmen or Americans as helpers.

I might perhaps succeed in making life so uncomfortable for Mr. S. that he would yield. But if he did, it is palpably clear that he would yield to an impertinence and an injustice.

"There is also in our village a steam saw-mill. The men who own it have built it up by hard work, thrift, and economy. They have acquired it just as Michael S. has acquired his horse and cart, by honest industry. It is theirs, honestly theirs. Suppose I should undertake to tell them how many hours they may work their mill, and whether they may employ a Pole in it; this would be no less an impertinence. I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own when or how I work, or what I do with my tools. And it is nobody's business but their own when or how my friend Michael S. works with his horse and cart, or my friends, the owners of the steam-mill, work with their steam-mill, or whom they get to help them."

This is sound doctrine, and nobody can gainsay it. That every man is of right master of his own actions, so long as he does no injury to his fellow-men, is self-evident. This is in harmony with our famous declaration of human rights: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And this was but the enunciation of the Golden Rule, the divine law which says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That means that in every transaction with a fellow-man you should "put yourself in his place." I love liberty, and do not like to be dictated to arbitrarily; therefore I must allow others the same freedom by not presuming to interfere in their affairs.

If I have hired myself to another man, I have the liberty to leave his employ if I do not like the work or the wages. But here is B., who is satisfied with both the work and the wages. Now if I say to him, "I am dissatisfied, and am going to leave, and therefore you must leave too," all right-minded people can see that it would be insufferable impertinence on my part, which B., if he has the spirit of a man, will resent or ignore. If I bring influences to bear which he cannot resist, and force him to leave, I make him my slave. In so doing I violate the fundamental principles of all morality; for I certainly do to him what I would not like to have him do to me, thus showing that I do not love my neighbor as myself; and "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

THE RIGHT TO REST.

Dr. Abbott says: "I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own how or when I work, or what I do with my own tools." Now suppose we make a little broader application of the principles above laid down. Dr. Abbott's neighbor across the street has a garden also, in which he works when occasion demands. Some fine summer morning while Dr. A. is working in his garden, neighbor C.

comes over, and says: "Dr. Abbott, you must not work in your garden to-day." "Why not?" "Because I am going to take a holiday to-day," says C. "Very well," says the Doctor, "go ahead, and have your holiday; I have no objection; but I don't feel as though I could afford a holiday to-day, for I took one yesterday; therefore I shall continue work." Everybody will say that Dr. A. does just right, and most people will say that if neighbor C. should insist on his laying off for the day, the Doctor would be justified in politely signifying to him that he better mind his own business.

The case would be none the less absurd if Mr. C. should come over to Dr. A.'s garden, and say: "Doctor, I want you to stop work to-day, for I have worked very hard for several days past, and I feel as though it would be an injury to my physical system if I should work to-day. It is a law of nature that man should have regular periods of rest, and I am going to take mine to-day, and so you must rest too." Dr. A. would say: "I rested all day yesterday, and feel perfectly refreshed. My system is in good condition, and does not at present require rest; if you need rest, I would certainly advise you to take it at once; my corn needs attention, and it would be wrong for me to neglect it, when I can attend to it as well as not; but I will not lay a straw in the way of your resting; go right home and rest."

Will not everybody say that C.'s request is very unreasonable, and that if he should insist upon it, and should force Dr. A. to leave his quiet work in his garden, he would be acting most unjustly? None could say otherwise; for Dr. A.'s working does not in the least interfere with Mr. C.'s resting.

The reader sees by this time that we are not discussing the labor problem, in the generally accepted sense of that term; and yet the principles which apply in the matter of strikes and boycotts, apply equally to the matter of Sunday rest or labor. If I choose to rest on Sunday I have that privilege, but I have no right to say that somebody else must rest just because I do. If my neighbors choose to work in their shops or gardens on Sunday, they do not hinder me from resting. In like manner if I choose to rest on Saturday, I have no right to request or demand that others shall likewise rest, unless they feel free to do so.

We know that the plea is constantly being made that observers of Sunday must be protected in their right to rest. We readily agree. No man on earth, nor any company of men, has the right to say that another man shall work on Sunday. To do so would be a gross interference with his rights. But, by the same rule, no man, or set of men, has the right to say that another man shall not work on Sunday. A man may say, "You shall not work for me on Sunday;" a corporation may say, "You shall not work for us on Sunday;" and they have the right to say so to any man any day in the week. But when they undertake to say, "You shall not work for yourself, or for some other man if he wishes to hire you," they are going beyond their rights.

THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE.

But the case is put as a matter of conscience. Thus, A. says, "My conscience requires me to rest on Sunday, and it offends and grieves me sorely to see others working on that day. To be sure, it doesn't hinder me from resting, but it disturbs my peace of mind." Well, suppose we interview your neighbor who thus disturbs your peace of mind. B. says, "My conscience and my understanding of the Bible demand that I should rest on Saturday, and consequently labor on Sunday. It grieves me sorely to see neighbor A. working as I am going to church, and my worship is often disturbed by the rattling of his heavy wagon, or the sound of his hammer." Now is there any principle which can be invoked to uphold the State in compelling B. to rest on Sunday, so that A.'s feelings shall not be ruffled, while it allows A. to go his way on Saturday, regardless of the feelings of B.? We have never heard of any, except that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people want to rest on Sunday, while only about one one-hundredth of the people care to rest on Saturday. But this is the principle that the wishes of the majority must be gratified regardless of the wishes, or even the rights, of the minority. It is the principle of tyrants,—the principle that might makes right. It is the principle which protects the lion from the lamb; which grants concessions to the rich, who can take care of themselves, at the expense of the poor, who have not power to protest. It is the principle which directly contravenes the divine command: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish."

But it is urged that Sunday is the day divinely appointed for rest, and that, therefore, the State in enforcing its observance, is compelling men simply to do what is right, and what they ought to do voluntarily. Well, suppose that men really ought to keep Sunday; here are some honest, conscientious men who cannot see it so; they read their Bibles carefully, and can see no command for Sunday observance, but think that they are plainly commanded to observe the seventh day. They cannot rest on Sunday without working on Saturday, and their conscience will not allow them to do that. If now the State steps in and says that they must, because it is right, the State becomes conscience for them, and Paul's declaration, "To his own Master he standeth or falleth," is ignored. And if the man submits in this, he becomes the worst kind of a slave. One may by force of circumstances yield his bodily strength to another, and still be a free man, but he who submits his conscience to another, parts with his manhood. We think no one who has a mind capable of deciding a case upon its merits, can deny the simple principles which are here laid down. They are in harmony with the law of God and our own charter of liberty; and therefore they who seek to compel even a single individual to violate his conscience, proclaim themselves the enemies both of God and of man.

For What Are the Powers That Be, Ordained?

HAVING shown, in another place, that the powers that be are ordained of God, the question comes up for consideration, For what are these powers ordained? The National Reform theory claims that because the powers "that ought to be" are ordained to God, it follows that those powers would be ordained to minister in all things pertaining to God and man. But such an interpretation is just as far from the truth as is the average National Reform interpretation.

The powers that be are ordained of God *in things that pertain to civil government and in that alone*. The magistrate is "the minister of God" solely in things civil and in nothing else. And men are to be subject to the higher powers in things civil, and in nothing else, for those powers have to do with things civil and nothing else. It is admitted by the National Reformers that Romans 13:1-10 treats "of civil government and of civil duties." Now the definition of *civil* according to Webster is, "*Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State.*" Civil government, therefore, pertaining solely to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State, in the very nature of the case can have nothing at all to do with the relations of the citizens to God. And as the National Reform definition of *religion* is, "Man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God," this is to say that civil government can, of right, have nothing whatever to do with religion. That these propositions are correct, we have decisive proof in two notable instances.

We have shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar was ordained of God. Now this same Nebuchadnezzar took upon himself to play the *role* of the grand National Reformer of his day. It was not enough that he should be ordained of God to rule in the relations of men with their fellow-men or with the State, but he must take it upon himself to rule in men's relations to God. It was not enough that his power was ordained of God in things civil, but he must exercise his power in things religious. It was not enough that he should rule men's bodies, he must rule their consciences as well. He would compel men to worship the god that he should choose and as he chose. Accordingly he made a colossal image, and set it up in the plain of Dura, not far from Babylon, and then sent and gathered together "the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers" to the dedication of the image. Then when all were assembled, he published an edict by a loud-voiced herald, that at a signal sounded by all the musical instruments together, everybody should fall down and worship the great golden image, and this under penalty, upon whosoever refused, of being pitched into a fiery furnace.

But in the crowd there happened to be three "political atheists"—Jews they were then called—who chose to worship God accord-

ing to the dictates of their own consciences, and so refused to obey the law. They were called up and asked about it, but they persisted in their opposition to National Reform, and said plainly, "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." But according to President Seelye's National Reform principle, the State, *i. e.*, Nebuchadnezzar, was both "courageous" and "wise," and therefore did "not falter," and into the burning fiery furnace intensely heated the "political atheists" were thrust.

NO POWER OVER CONSCIENCE.

Then King Nebuchadnezzar "rose up in haste" and cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast *three* men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O King. He answered and said, Lo, I see *four* men *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Then the king called to the men to come out, and they did so, untouched by the fire. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, *except their own God.*" Thus God not only brought Nebuchadnezzar to the kingdom and ordained him a power over all the kingdoms and nations round about, but he also demonstrated to him that although his power was ordained of God, that power was not ordained in things pertaining to God. The Lord showed him that although God had given him power over all kingdoms and nations, he had not given him power over the worship, the faith, or the conscience of a single individual in any nation.

The Lord not only showed this to Nebuchadnezzar, but by having it recorded in his word he has shown it to all people to whom that word shall come. And it is one of the most surprising things, that in the end of this nineteenth century, in this land of Bibles and consequent light and liberty, there should arise a set of men who will go about to put in practice in this Government the principles of the heathen Nebuchadnezzar. There might be allowed some excuse for a poor, blind heathen doing such a thing twenty-four hundred and sixty-seven years ago; but what shadow of excuse can there possibly be for men who will do it now, with the Bible in their hands, and in the face of a miracle of God wrought expressly to show the iniquity of it?

Nor is this case of Nebuchadnezzar the only instance in which God has shown to men that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are ordained only in things pertaining to men, in their relations to their fellow-men as citizens, and to the State. Under Darius, the Mede, whose power was ordained of God, some envious officials grew so jealous of the prime minister, that they determined to get him out of the way. But in all their searching and spying they utterly failed to

find any fault at all in him. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But there was no State law by which they could interfere with his rights of conscience or his liberty of worship. So like the true National Reformers they were, they set to work to "inaugurate a revolution." They pretended to be greatly interested in the honor of the king, and the good of the State. Darius, suspecting nothing, but supposing their representations were made in good faith, fell into the trap, and enacted the law which they had framed. At their solicitation he established a statute, and signed a decree that nobody should ask any petition of either God or man, save of the king, for thirty days; and that, too, under the dreadful penalty of being made food for lions.

But Daniel knew that the power of Medo-Persia was not ordained to any such work as that; and when he "knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and, his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Then those men found Daniel praying, as was a foregone certainty, and rushed to the king with the report. Suddenly the eyes of Darius were opened; he saw that he had been trapped, and took shame to himself that he had allowed himself to be so terribly hoodwinked, and immediately began to try to deliver Daniel out of their persecuting hands. "And he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him," but there was no remedy; the thing was law and the law had to take its course, for it could not be changed, and consequently to the lions Daniel had to go. But so far as Daniel was concerned the result in this instance was the same as the other, for when Darius hastened to the den in the morning and called out to him, Daniel answered him cheerfully and said, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before him *innocency was found in me*; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

DON'T TRUST THEM.

Now the same evil principle illustrated in this case, is being practiced in the United States to-day. And it is being worked in the same way precisely. Preachers professing great interest in the workingman, or great regard for the safety of the State, will go to the Legislature with a petition, and get some one of their kind to introduce a bill, for the enactment of a rigorous Sunday law, or for the repeal of a protective clause in an already rigorous law, and all this professedly as a "police regulation" or "in the interests of prohibition," or anything else but what it really is. And by pious pretensions, honeyed phrases, and fair speeches, they conceal their real purpose, succeed in hoodwinking the Legislature, and secure the passage of their innocent appearing bill. But as soon as their will has been made law, their interest in the "workingman," or in "prohibition," etc., sud-

denly ceases, and the whole tide of inquisition, prosecution, and persecution, is turned against a few innocent people who choose to worship God on Saturday instead of on Sunday. This thing was actually accomplished two years ago in Arkansas, and in all the working of the Sunday law so secured, we have not been able to learn of a single case in which the person prosecuted was not a Seventh-day Adventist or a Seventh-day Baptist. By the efforts of the lawyers of that State, and the earnest leadership of Senator Crockett, the Legislature has remedied the iniquitous statute.

Nor is this evil spirit confined to Arkansas. In California the present year, the same scheme was tried on the Legislature, but it failed. The same thing was tried in the Legislature of Minnesota, about the same time as in California, and there too, at almost the last moment, the real intent of the thing was discovered, and the scheme frustrated. In Texas, also, and other States, it has been attempted, and all within the present year, but so far we believe all have failed, because the evil was discovered before it was too late. And what those men did in the law of Medo-Persia, and what these parties have done, and have tried to do in the laws of these States, that is precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to do in the Constitution and laws of the Nation.

If the Legislatures of the States, or the national Legislature, will guard against persecution, let them beware of all preachers, people, parties, or associations, who try to secure the enactment of Sunday laws, or the repeal of exemption clauses in Sunday laws already enacted.

Nor is it only in the cases of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar that God has shown that civil government is not ordained of God in things pertaining to God, but only in things pertaining to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens and to the State. Christ laid down the principle that severs forever the connection between the State and religion, and which shows conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God only in things civil, and have nothing whatever to do with any man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Certain of the Pharisees came to Jesus and asked:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

With that read the following from Paul's words in Romans 13:1-10, and compare the italicized words:—

"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. . . . For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually

upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

CIVIL GOVERNMENT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE FIRST TABLE OF THE LAW.

Now what man can read these two passages of Scripture together, and honestly or truthfully say other than that Paul had in view the word of Christ, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's? and that Romans 13:1-10 is an inspired comment upon the words of Christ, showing not only that the powers that be are ordained of God, but also showing in what they are ordained of God?—No one, assuredly. This is made even clearer still by the fact that Paul in referring to the duties that devolve upon men under the powers that be, makes not a single reference to any of the first four commandments; but says, "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," thus referring solely to the second table of the law, and showing conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God in things civil,—in things pertaining to the relations of man with his fellow-man,—and in those things alone.

As in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the first table of the law of God. Again, as the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duty that men owe to the powers that be there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties contained in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say again that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with them the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God—not to Cæsar, nor by Cæsar—that which is God's.

Therefore the proof is conclusive, and the truth absolute, that the National Reform ideas of civil government are utterly at fault, and that their interpretations of Scripture on the subject of civil government are only perversions of Scripture. A. T. J.

BIBLE SANCTIFICATION: A CONTRAST OF TRUE AND FALSE THEORIES.

By Mrs. E. G. WHITE.

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

CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS, —OR—

The Life of our Lord in the Words of the Evangelists,

By JAMES P. CADMAN, A. M.

Is, as its Name Indicates, a Compilation in which the four Narratives of

THE LIFE OF CHRIST

ARE WOVEN INTO ONE CONNECTED STORY, MAKING A COMPLETE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EXACT LANGUAGE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The text is that of the Revised Version, and while every word in the four Gospels appears, the work is so arranged that the reader can tell at a glance the words used in each Gospel. Those who have tried to gather all the facts concerning some miracle, or other event, and at the same time properly locate and credit the various parts of the narrative, will appreciate this book, which is the very best of its kind and gives evidence of an immense amount of careful and painstaking labor.

The book is fully indexed so that any text or subject can be readily found; and the maps, notes, and diagrams which it contains are alone well worth the price of the volume. The following partial (less than half) TABLE OF CONTENTS will give an idea of the scope of the work:—

Index to chapter and verses; Life of Our Lord (333 pages); Index of persons, places, and subjects, with dictionary of proper names; Explanation of maps and diagrams; Map of the pathway of Jesus; Diagrams illustrating the principal events of crucifixion week.

This work is invaluable, and all who love the Bible should have a copy. It contains 394 pages, is well printed on good paper, and is neatly and substantially bound in cloth.

Price, post-paid, - - - - - \$1.50
With gilt edges, - - - - - 2.00
Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 1, PRICE, 10c.

Which Day Do You Keep, and Why—Who Changed the Sabbath—The Sabbath in the New Testament—Eihu on the Sabbath—God's Memorial—Sunday Not the Sabbath—Why Not Found Out Before—One Hundred Bible Facts about the Sabbath.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 2, PRICE, 25c.

This package contains all the tracts in package No. 1, and the following in addition:—

Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined—The Ten Commandments Not Abolished—The Seventh Part of Time—The Definite Seventh Day—Perfection of the Ten Commandments—Address to the Baptists—The Sunday Law.

OTHER WORKS ON THE SABBATH.

- The Truth Found.—A comprehensive exposition of the nature and obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. 64 pp. 10c
 - Sunday Seventh-day Examined.—A critical examination of the claim that Sunday is the true seventh day of the fourth commandment. 88 pp. 10c
 - Brown's Review of Gilfillan on the Sabbath Question. 64 pp. 10c
 - Appeal to the Baptists.—An address from the Seventh-day Baptists to their first-day Baptist brethren, urging a restoration of the Bible Sabbath from the standpoint of Baptist principles of argument and interpretation. 48 pp. 10c
 - Vindication of the True Sabbath.—By a former missionary of the Presbyterian Church (Morton), 68 pp. 10c
 - Morality of the Sabbath.—Showing that the Sabbath commandment, being found in the midst of the nine acknowledged moral precepts, is, like the others, moral in its nature. 96 pp. 15c
 - Testimony of the Fathers of the first three centuries concerning the Sabbath and first-day. A candid examination of both sides of the question. 112 pp. 15c
- Address, PACIFIC PRESS, 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, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 6. PRICE, 25c.

The Plan of Redemption—The Sufferings of Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—Scripture References—The Spirit of Prophecy—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The End of the Wicked—The Two Thrones. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1887.

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

THE National Convention for National Reform meets in Chicago, May 11, 12. The SENTINEL will be represented there and our June issue will have a full report of the most important of the proceedings.

NATIONAL REFORM has bestowed upon the Saviour a new title. He is now "The divine politician." Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, is said to be "full of names of blasphemy," and this, her youngest daughter, is fast following in the steps of the mother.

THE National Reformers are determined to have the nation a moral person, even though they have to create it such. In the Cincinnati Convention, 1872, Prof. J. R. W. Sloane said of a nation, that its "true figure is that of a colossal man," having "consciousness," "will," "purpose," and "a soul." "District Secretary" Rev. J. M. Foster, carries forward the conception after this sort:—

"The executive department of Government is the *head*, the judicial the *arms*, and the legislative the *legs*, through which this sovereign body exercises its will."—*Christian Statesman*, July 24, 1884.

We are waiting to see who of them will complete the absurd idea. There is here an excellent opportunity for the Rev. M. A. Gault to display the creative power of his sublime genius.

SAID Rev. D. McAllister, in the New York Convention, 1873:—

"Had Mohammedans settled this country, they would have incorporated Mohammedanism into its civil and political institutions. Had pagans come here at first, and continued in the ascendancy, the political body formed and developed would have taken on distinctively pagan features."

He then went on to argue that as the country was settled by Christians the body politic should take on distinctively Christian features, and incorporate Christianity into its political institutions. That is to say that Christians should act upon the same principles that Mohammedans and Pagans do; and that Christianity should be no more liberal and enlightened than is Mohammedanism or Paganism; and shows the model upon which a National Reform Government would be formed, and the principles by which it would be actuated.

THE librarian of a "Henry George Club" in Cincinnati, Ohio, writes us that we may be sure that anyone who writes under that heading is "opposed to the union of Church and State—particularly under our present social conditions." He thinks, however, that we are

wasting our time fighting an "improbable bugaboo," while a far deeper social wrong, viz., land monopoly, exists, and that, "under a *proper social system*, the evil that you so much dread would amount to nothing, *even if it did take place.*"

Our friend may be very sure that it will take place, when so many people are ignorant as to the progress it has already made, and are indifferent as to whether it does or not. And when it does come, he will find that a "proper social system" will be just the thing that cannot possibly exist in connection with it. A proper social system would keep National Reform pretensions from becoming actual facts.

IN the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, National Reform President Brunot said:—

"Where States undertake by statute laws to compel men's consciences in their relation to God, there is a condition of affairs indicated as a 'union of Church and State.'"

It would be impossible to compel men's consciences in any other relation than their relation to God, because conscience has to do alone with man's relation to God. Yet to have the State by statute laws to compel men's consciences is precisely what the National Reformers propose to do. PROOF: Rev. David Gregg in the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, said of "civil government:—

"It has the right to be, and the right to command the consciences of men."

Therefore, by their own premises, the conclusion inevitably follows that under a National Reform Government there would be "a condition of affairs indicated as a union of Church and State," and they can't disprove it.

IN the last *Statesman*, Mr. Gault, of the National Reform Association, reports from Gridley, Illinois, where he lectured to a fair audience in the M. E. church. He says: "An Advent brother was much aroused, and wanted the church to answer my arguments for the change of the Sabbath, but the pastor refused. I assured the brother that we never designed to prohibit him from keeping his Sabbath, and only asked that he might not disturb us on ours."

For cool, calculating selfishness under the guise of a desire for justice, that takes the lead. The National Reform Association, through Mr. Gault, says to the observer of the seventh day: "We do not intend to force you to labor on your Sabbath, but in the interest of justice and good order, we intend to entreat you with the strong arm of the law, not to disturb us on ours." But do they propose to reciprocate, and not disturb the seventh-day keeper on "his" Sabbath? Oh, no! Why not? Because *we* are National Reformers; *we* are the people; *we* are in the majority, and no man has any business to differ with us. National Reform laws are intended only to protect the strong majority from the annoyance of the weak minority; according to National Reformers, those who are few and weak cannot have any rights. It is by such logic as this that they evade the charge of infringing upon the rights of people.

Is it possible that the thinking people of this land can be deceived so as to think that a party which has selfishness as its foundation and superstructure, is a Christian Association?

AND now we have the climax to the National Reform argument for a change in the Constitution of the United States; Mr. John Alexander, of Philadelphia, sometime president of the National Reform Association, has been unburdening himself to a correspondent of the *Universalist*, to whom he affirms that our Constitution "is not in harmony with the State constitutions, which do confess God and his law"! That is equivalent to charging the United States Constitution with being unconstitutional, because some State constitutions have not been framed in harmony with it. Which is the larger, the State of Pennsylvania, or the United States? His argument is on a par with the objection to the Bible, because it does not agree with the latest developments of modern science. But Mr. Alexander's pathetic plaint is valuable to this extent: It is an admission from National Reformers themselves, that those States which frame laws in favor of religious tenets, and which persecute conscientious dissenters from those tenets, are acting unconstitutionally.

NO DOUBT there are many who think that the SENTINEL has set out on a fool's errand, and that the National Reform party is no more formidable an opponent than were those which Don Quixote so valiantly assailed. The editor of one of the leading journals in a capital city in an Eastern State, recently wrote upon this subject and said that all the religious journals are opposed to it. Those who really love liberty cannot too soon disabuse their minds of such ideas. A movement which numbers among its officers and supporters some of the leading clergymen, college presidents, and jurists in the land, which has the support of the National W. C. T. U., and some of whose principles the Knights of Labor and even Socialists are beginning to endorse, is not a "bugaboo." Nothing is to be gained, but everything to be lost, by underrating the strength of an opponent.

I EXHORT that prayers be made for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.—*Paul*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1887.

NUMBER 6.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL.

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

J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

JUST so soon as the State presumes to pass a defining and discriminating judgment on spiritual things, it exercises powers which are foreign to itself, and thus passes out of its legitimate sphere of action.—*Schuette.*

SOME will say, "Well, if the National Reform Association is supported by such eminent men and women, it cannot be a bad thing, so no matter how strong it is." That is a very uncertain way of judging. Members and names are a good index of the strength of a party, but they are no real index as to the character of its principles. It is a well-known fact that the institution of slavery had as able, and no doubt as pious, men for its zealous supporters as could be found fighting for its overthrow; and many of the eminent and eloquent ladies of the W. C. T. U. were most earnest advocates of that institution. If they were mistaken then, it is not out of the range of possibilities that they are mistaken now. It has passed into a proverb, that "great men are not always wise;" and when we see learned judges of the same court, giving decisions upon the same point, which directly conflict, we are warranted in concluding that wise men are not always infallible in their judgment. The only way to judge of anything is by its principles. Judged in this way, so-called National Reform is found to be a thing that is dangerous just in proportion as it has strength. We are very certain that a great many of the honorable men whose names appear as vice-presidents of that association, have given it the support of their names and influence on the strength of what working National Reformers have claimed for their movement, without closely examining its principles to see their tendency. For we are obliged to say that no man eminent for learning or soundness of judgment (we cannot say as to piety) is an active worker in the National Reform cause. This makes the situation the worse, for if the movement should succeed, these who are foremost as agitators would come to the front as legislators, while the learned men who are now silent partners, would still retain the back seats.

Religion in the Public Schools.

DR. WM. M. TAYLOR said: "It looks very pious to say that we should have religion taught in our schools; but it is terribly short-sighted, and exceedingly unstatesmanlike." The more the subject is examined, the more clearly will it be seen that this remark is just. We are every day admonished, especially in religious concerns, that it will not do to trust to appearances. Paul said his countrymen had a zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge. The truth, Christianity, has had no greater obstacle to its success than the blind zeal of misguided friends. Zeal, earnestness, are the criteria of merit with some people. But loud harangues and long prayers are no proof of Christian standing. Fanaticism and self-confidence are always zealous, and never disturbed with doubts. Self-complacency is almost synonymous with pleasurable feeling, and many mistake *good feeling* for *strong faith*, though they may be as far apart as two things can possibly be.

To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public schools seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous. So short-sighted, so illiberal and unjust, are the self-styled "National Reformers," that they accuse all of pandering to "the demands of liberalism," or even of favoring atheism, who do not assent to their propositions, and especially if they do not favor the introduction of the Bible and religion into the public schools. Our feelings—we might say our prejudices—were once all enlisted on that side of the question. We changed only when we became thoroughly convinced that the plan is altogether impracticable. To carry it out, one of two conditions is necessary: 1. The people must be all of one mind; of one religious belief. But, practically, this is out of the question. Communities of that kind will be so small and so rarely found, if ever, that they cannot be taken into account in providing for general action. 2. One part or class in the community or the State must enforce the teaching of their religious opinions or convictions at the sacrifice of those of other classes. But this is outrageous and inquisitorial, as all must concede, as all will concede at once, except those who are actuated by selfish motives, and have no regard for the golden rule.

This view of the case is no new thing, gotten up to meet the necessities of the present occasion. It contains the very essence and spirit of the Reformation; not of the sham National

Reform of this day, but of the genuine Reformation of three centuries ago. In it is embodied all human rights of conscience and religious liberty. Horace Mann was one of the noblest educators that Massachusetts ever produced. He was a Christian of unquestioned integrity. In his Twelfth Report on the Schools in Massachusetts he used the following language:—

"But if a man is taxed to support a school where religious doctrines are inculcated which he believes to be false and which he believes that God condemns, then he is excluded from the school by the divine law, at the same time he is compelled to support it by the human law. This is a double wrong. It is politically wrong, because, if such a man educates his children at all, he must educate them elsewhere, and thus pay two taxes, while some of his neighbors pay less than their due proportion of one; and it is religiously wrong, because he is constrained by human power to promote what he believes the divine Power forbids. The principle involved in such a cause is pregnant with all tyrannical consequences. It is broad enough to sustain any claim of ecclesiastical domination ever made in the darkest ages of the world."

Here is a plain statement of the case in few words; an argument which cannot be successfully met. It was a very good idea of Rev. Dr. Tiffany, that "when our Lord said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' he drew a sharp line between the two;" and, "Cæsar can only give what is his own." The Doctor touched an important point in the following remarks:—

"The reason why so many of the people of the church act no better than the world's people is that so much of that divine institution of teaching religion has been taken out of the family and put into the hands of Sunday-school teachers. It is, I think, one of the crying evils of the time, not that we have Sunday-schools, but that so much of the function of the family is delegated to them. And when you say that the State shall teach religion you cut the sinews of the church. The divine institution of the church which Christ himself appointed is not in mere teaching, in a series of doctrines, but in the atmosphere of prayer and devotion which it creates, with the authority of the Master in the institution founded by him for that purpose. The church is an institution not merely to state a fact, but to environ us with an atmosphere. When my brother says he cannot send his child to a public school because religion is not taught there, why I would as soon say that I could not send my boy to a restaurant for a beefsteak because they do not give him a chapter of the Bible while he is there. This is a perfectly illogical conclusion from the premises and it is a perfectly impracticable plan in our circumstances. It is a mistake to put the teaching of religion in the hands of the State and

not keep it where Christ has put it, in the hands of the church."

This, we believe, is solid truth. The more the State is intrusted with the work that God has committed to the church, the weaker the church becomes in vital power; and soon the State becomes a dictator to the church in regard to both its teachings and its methods.

And, with such a state of things as is demanded by the National Reformers, it is impossible for the State to be less than a dictator in religious matters. Thus Mr. Gault, in the *Christian Statesman*, marks out the duty of our Government as follows:—

"Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

To appreciate the above, the reader must consider that Mr. Gault is a very loose writer, making no distinction between the moral law and religious tenets. We have said, and we repeat, that the State will teach, not the Bible, but "somebody's construction of the Bible;" and then it must "lay its hand" on the construction of all others! And the construction which it will teach will be that of those who happen to be in authority at the time when the scheme takes effect. Now, of course, when the political complexion of the nation changes, when another class of rulers comes into power, a religion of another type may become the standard, "with God's authority behind it," according to the stereotyped phrase.

In view of the fact that the religion and the church having the most *political influence* in the country is the Roman Catholic, and that, while the National Reformers profess great abhorrence of the Romish religion, they are willing to work with the Catholics *on their own terms* in favor of establishing a national religion, the following remarks of Dr. Howard Crosby are well worthy of consideration:—

"How are we going to take the first step as to the character of the religious instruction that is to be given to the children of the land? Are we to find a sort of average that all will agree upon? Where is the average that all will agree upon? There are in this country between one-fourth and one-fifth of the whole population who have not the slightest sympathy with the forms of religion represented in this room to-night. Are we to leave them all out entirely and say to them, You are a minority and we have nothing to do with you; we are the majority and we are going to rule? Gentlemen, if the State is to furnish religious instruction, there is another thing that it will have to furnish, and that is the Inquisition. That will be the legitimate outcome of religious instruction by the State. It will be the logical issue to which you must come. If the State is going to teach religion, it will have to compel the people to receive that religion, and in order to do that it will have to have the strong arm of the Inquisition. But not only that. In your attempt to find out what sort of religion you are going to have taught in your schools and what kind of teachers you are to get to instruct, you have got to deny and destroy the foundation of American independence, which is our boast, and the boast of our fathers, which brought us, under God, through the Revolution. The foundation of it all before God is individual independence and mutual equality. Every man on this continent

stands exactly on the same platform with his neighbor, and no mere majority clothes any man in that majority with power to say, You must be taught my religion."

The thoughtful reader may wonder how the Reformers will meet all these arguments. In truth they do not meet them; they affirm and re-affirm their figments, and, as Dr. Taylor says, they put forth propositions which *seem* to be pious, but are very short-sighted and unpracticable. Let them say what they will, they never can disguise the fact that their scheme, if successful, would result in continual contentions and religious disputes, until one party had proved itself conqueror in a struggle which would leave genuine piety trailing in the dust.

To delegate the teaching of religion to the State is as great an incongruity as to turn a church meeting into a political caucus; and, in truth, the latter will follow the former, for the Reformers have already decided that, in their millennium, the final decisions of *civil*, as well as ecclesiastical, questions will be made by the church. According to their plan, as has often been shown, the church will be the dominant power. And yet, it must be tramed in its religious activities by being bound to the civil power. Such an alliance must prove unprofitable to both the State and the church.

Dr. Spear, in his work on "Religion and the State," has given us most excellent thoughts on this subject. Instance the following:—

"One would think that so simple a proposition as that which affirms the existence and inalienable character of the rights of a religious conscience as above and beyond all human authority, ought to have been among the earliest and most widely-extended discoveries of the race. The fact, however, is sadly the reverse. Of all the forms of wrong which men have suffered from each other, none have been less reasonable or more merciless and unrelenting than those of religious zeal armed with the civil power. There is no darker chapter in the history of Governments than that which chronicles their misdeeds in the attempt to administer and propagate religion. The attempt is a horrible human tyranny begun, and every step of the process is that tyranny continued."

Dr. Spear also quotes from the decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio in the somewhat celebrated Cincinnati school case, from which we copy the following in regard to teaching religion in the public schools:—

It "violates the spirit of our constitutional guaranties, and is a State religion in embryo; that if we have no right to tax him [the citizen] to support worship, we have no right to tax him to support religious instruction; that to tax a man to put down his own religion is the very essence of tyranny; that, however small the tax, it is the first step in the direction of an establishment of religion; and I should add that the first step in that direction is the fatal step, because it logically involves the last step."

All of which confirms the declaration of Horace Mann, that "the principle involved in such a course is pregnant with all tyrannical consequences."

And yet our modern Reformers insist that that is just what we need,—religious instruction by the State, and a State religion,—to cure

all the ills of the body politic. In answer to this it is enough to say that many if not most of the great criminals of the day were brought up under religious instruction. Let them ponder the following statement from the *Church Union*:—

"Chaplain Bass, of the penitentiary in Brooklyn, says that twenty years ago only about five per cent. of prisoners had previously been Sunday-school pupils, but that now seventy-five per cent. of actual and suspected criminals have been such. It is a sad showing. Pastor Crafts gives an account of an inebriate asylum where the per cent. is eighty, and another of fallen women where all have been in Sunday-schools. This is a growing evil. It is a most ominous one. A generation in Sunday-schools of habitual neglecters of the sanctuary is growing up. The term formerly applied to the school, 'the nursery of the church,' is getting to be a ghastly satire. What shall be done? A hearty recognition of these facts and of the extent of the evil is of prime importance."

It is not *more* religious instruction, certainly not *compulsory* religious instruction, that is needed, so much as a *higher standard* of religious instruction. Compulsion in religious instruction never wins respect, and State religion is necessarily of a low type, as may be easily shown. We cannot possibly have any guaranty that the State will teach *the true* religion; that will depend altogether on the standing of the majority who decide *whose* religion shall be taught. And when we consider that the largest and most powerful religions in the world are the most corrupt, we leave it with the reader that, to take religion from the domain of individual conscience, and make it a subject of legal decisions, is a most hazardous proceeding.

J. H. W.

The Pope in American Politics.

THE following remarks we select from an article by James Powell, D. D., under the above heading, in the *Advance*. The article was called out by the action of the Pope summoning priest McGlynn to Rome to answer for his part in the Henry George campaign for mayor of New York City, last fall.

"The fact is, the Pope claims the right, and exercises it, to interfere directly with American politics. This fact ought to be a startling message to the whole country. If any queen, king, or emperor on the face of the earth were to interfere with the politics of the country, as the Pope has done in this case, the war fever would take possession of the land inside of twenty-four hours. The silence of the press on this point is almost entirely owing to the dangerous character of the political teachings championed by the priest in advocating the electing of Henry George. Socialism is a justly dreaded evil because of its destructive doctrines, but the truth or falsity of political doctrines affects not the principle that *foreign powers must not be allowed to interfere with the rights of American citizens*. We give that principle away, when, without protesting against the interference, we commend the Pope for dealing with Father McGlynn as he has.

"Suppose that the priest had been silenced, and ordered to Rome to answer for openly defending our public-school system in opposi-

tion to the direction of his archbishop, where would be the difference so far as the principle is concerned? It would not be any more an interference than in the case under consideration; yet had it been so, from one end of the land to the other, the press and pulpit would have been heard speaking out. Interference of any kind, and to any degree, with American politics, on the part of the Pope, should be resented not only by popular protest, but by the State Department of our Government at Washington. The Pope should be given to understand that when he summons an American citizen to answer in Rome for political acts and words performed and spoken in the exercise of his political rights, he assails the Republic.

"No jugglery of word definition should be allowed. Rome is well up on that little trick. She knows how to make the word religion elastic enough to mean anything that is wanted. She can easily make a definition to mark any political theory she wishes as "contrary to the teachings of the church," and then, under the pretext of discriminating between religion and politics, proceed by anathema and excommunication to carry out her purpose. The Republic is not called upon to accept her definitions. It is intelligent enough to make its own, and strong enough to stand by them. This incident of Father McGlynn is a providential opportunity to hold up the Papacy before the people as it really is,—a foreign power claiming the right to interfere with Governments. It is the old story.

"It will not do to say that Rome does not allow its priests to mix in politics. It does. It has done it. Priests are all the while mixing in politics. So long as they are fighting our common-school system, the very bulwark of our free institutions, not a word is heard from the bishops; they are all in it themselves. Nor from the Pope; that is in the line of his temporal policy. But when a priest takes a political position that antagonizes the theories of Rome, then politics becomes religion—a definition does it—and the poor priest, if he fails to see it in this light, is declared to be disobedient to the holy mother church, and exposed to all the censures and punishments that belong to the heretic. And what is that? The loss of his soul. So he himself and all good Catholics must regard it. What a terrible engine this for working mischief in the Republic! Whatever the outcome, whether Father McGlynn submits or leaves, the incident is full of meaning and significance. Press, pulpit, and platform ought to give it full ventilation."

Yes, the press, the pulpit, and the platform ought to give it full ventilation, but they will not. Instead of giving this menace full ventilation or any ventilation at all, press, pulpit, and platform will pay assiduous court to Rome, and invoke her further interference. Rev. C. C. Stratton, D. D., one of the foremost men of the Methodist Church on the Pacific Coast, visits the Archbishop of San Francisco to form an alliance, in a political measure. The late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., one of the

foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in all the country, only a little while before his death proposed a like alliance, to force religion into the public schools. The National Reform party, composed of "all evangelical denominations" and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, bids for the help of Rome, and pronounces itself willing to suffer rebuffs to gain her help to amend the Constitution of the Nation so as to make it recognize and enforce a national religion. The press of the Nation publishes whole columns of cablegrams from Rome, telling how imposing are the parades and ceremonies of the Pope, what crowds of people attend, how they fall on their knees as the Pope enters in state, how many kiss his hand, and to whom is granted the sublime dignity of kissing his toe. Government vessels of the United States, carrying official representatives of the Government, put the Papal flag in the place of honor, instead of the Stars and Stripes. And this is the way in which the pulpit, the platform, the press, and the Government, give "full ventilation" to the interference of the Pope with American politics!

A. T. J.

Remains of Popery.

It is curious to observe how tenaciously the ecclesiastical mind still holds to some of the principles of Popery which were not uprooted by the Reformation. In the minds of many Protestants the functions of civil rulers are in part spiritual, and they are ready to invoke the sword of government in the enforcement of religion.

The *Christian Instructor*, published at Philadelphia, and representing the conservative wing of the United Presbyterian Church, looks with a jealous eye upon every ritualistic innovation as a dangerous step toward Rome. In particular it deprecates the introduction of the organ in the praise service of the church as Romish in its origin and tendencies; and with a fidelity to its convictions that does it honor, gives the organ a sturdy opposition. It is however to be feared that the *Instructor* is going Romewards in another direction much faster than its contemporaries of ritualistic tendencies.

Last year the governor of North Carolina issued a Thanksgiving Proclamation over which the *Instructor* rejoices, and expresses its approbation by saying, "We could wish we had more governors like him." The features of the proclamation that call forth this ardent indorsement are as follows:—

"Believing that God Almighty is the source of all authority and power in civil government, and recognizing him in the person of his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind and the giver of every good and perfect gift," etc.

The confession the governor makes which so greatly pleases the *Instructor* is: (1) A confession of the governor's faith individually, and (2) a declaration by whose authority he appoints a day of worship.

As to the governor's formal confession of his faith to the world, we have only to say that if that duty is inseparable from the functions pertaining to civil office, then it fol-

lows that no one but a saint of God can perform the duties and be eligible to civil office. That the governor's confession is one that no one but a Christian can make, is clear from the declarations of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures. In Romans 10:10 it is said: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Also 1 John 4:15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God."

It will be seen, therefore, that no one but a Christian, except he be a detestable hypocrite, can act as a civil officer, if his duties are such as Governor Scoles has performed to the intense gratification of the *Instructor*. Let it be known generally that National Reform principles, if fully carried out, would make every man ineligible to office, who is not a professed Christian, and it would instantly fall to the ground. A government founded upon National Reform principles would simply offer office as a bounty for the most detestable and Heaven-daring hypocrisy.

The *Instructor*, in indorsing Governor Scoles's avowal that his appointment of a day of worship "by the authority of almighty God, through Jesus Christ his Son," goes Romewards further than the Ritualists can do, for it is the very essence and foundation of Popery. Do not misunderstand us; we recognize God Almighty as the source of all power and authority; we know it, and do not quarrel with Governor Scoles about that. What we deny is that God has ever given the civil ruler power to appoint days of prayer, thanksgiving, praise, or any other part of divine worship. The assumption by Governor Scoles of this power is the same in kind, and only differs from that of the Pope in extent.

That Christ, the king and head of the church, has commissioned his church to appoint such days as are indicated in the providence of God, there can be no doubt. In thus doing they have the promise of the presence of Christ to direct them by his Spirit, and he binds in Heaven what is thus bound on earth. Has Christ, the head of the church, given the same authority to the civil ruler? We compassionate the man who has so little brains or is so hopelessly swayed by prejudice as to so assert.

If the civil ruler has power to appoint one day for worship, he may appoint any number of days, and the church as an organization separate from the State is useless. His government being purely spiritual, in a conflict of prerogative with the State, she must succumb, or the State carries the sword to compel obedience to its appointments. The power assumed by Governor Scoles is the same as is described in 2 Thessalonians as the man of sin, "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." We do not unite with the *Instructor* in the wish that we had more such governors.

Let the *Instructor* present any argument possible for the right of the civil ruler in the name of Almighty God through Christ as

Mediator, to appoint days of worship, the argument will be equally valid for the appointment of any worship that men can render. We think, therefore, that those who are laboring to inaugurate a system of civil government, the avowed object of which is to interfere in spiritual things, and to enforce them by penal enactments, are further on their way to the Papacy, and infinitely more to be feared, than the Ritualists. It is clear to the writer that if the civil ruler is clothed with authority in the smallest particular in spiritual things, *to that extent he is Pope.*

ORIENT.

Morality and Religion.

AS RELATED TO THE STATE—SHOULD SUNDAY OBSERVANCE BE COMPULSORY?

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-religionist. But religion is a voluntary matter; under coercion it is worthless and a mockery. Nations, States, or individuals cannot be voted pious. 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 an 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 class of their subjects. It is no more the duty of Government to protect the religionist than it is 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 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 in their rights, whatever their religion may be, or whether or not they have any at all.

In its broadest sense religion is any system or method of worship, without regard to what the object of worship may be. 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 a revelation of God to man. But religion is not to be confounded with morality.

Morality is obedience to the revealed will of God, whose law is a moral law, the only moral rule. Had man retained his innocence, he would still have been a religious being, according to the primary sense of the word, and would have worshiped God as the angels now do. But religion in the commonly-accepted sense would not have existed. There would have been 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 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 which does not contain pardon can recover from guilt and its consequences; law cannot pardon; Christianity does. Therefore the law is not a religious instrument in this sense.

The ten commandments as a whole are the moral law. Each one contains an elementary principle or truth. Though they are all moral, they are also religious, using religion in its primary sense only; that is, obedience to, or worship of, God, such as holy and un-fallen 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.

But Christianity is a religion in quite another sense. It is purely remedial; it grows out of the sole fact that man sinned. 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 a 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." We now come to an important consideration, namely, the relation of the State to religion and morality.

Though the ten commandments are moral, only a moral governor can enforce them on a moral 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 violation 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 eighth 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.

The sentiment that the State should support Christianity is not a new one, but this does not demonstrate that it is not a dangerous sentiment. Dr. Talmage, in a recent sermon upon the subject of God in our politics and in our Government, to the supposed objection that there may be somebody who does not believe in God, says:—

"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 have a regard for the Bible and Christianity, 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 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. The present efforts to secure a stricter Sunday law are "straws" in the direction indicated above. Mr. Cook, in the prelude to a recent Monday lecture, said: "You will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest unless you preserve it as a day of worship. Unless its observance be founded upon religious reasons, you will not long maintain it at a high standard." Shall the civil law enforce a religious

institution? Will such a course increase men's piety? Can the people of Massachusetts be made Sabbath-keepers by a few strokes of the pen by our legislators? Nay, verily. Compel a man by law to perform a religious act contrary to his convictions, and you make a hypocrite of him. If he resist the law and it be enforced upon him, you have inaugurated persecution. If my conscience impresses upon me the conviction that I should observe Sunday, let me do it as best I may, but never should I lift my hand to compel my neighbor to pursue the same course. If I can convince him that it is right, that it is a Christian act, and he ought to do it, well and good, but coercion is not the prerogative of the individual or of the State in such matters.

Mr. C. says: "Let us bring the whole population to the church and Sunday-school." Now if we are right in "compelling all, by law, to rest so that we may secure the liberty of each to rest," why not compel all by law to attend the church and Sunday-school? Yes, why not go a step farther and compel all to be baptized?

Again Mr. C. says: "Let church members be instructed in the full scientific as well as biblical significance of Sunday observance." Here we apprehend is where a difficulty will arise. The conscientious Sabbatarian intrenches himself behind the fourth commandment of the decalogue, which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work." But Sunday is the first day, and he insists that its "biblical significance" is a myth. Shall such be compelled to observe a day which to them has no religious significance whatever?

Again, will the unbeliever, the infidel, or atheist be made pious by compelling him to religiously observe the Sunday?

We can but admire the first amendment of our national constitution. 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 establishing 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.

Neither Congress nor the Legislature has any right to erect a false standard of religion, and it is not their prerogative to enforce a true one.—*D. A. R., in Worcester (Mass.) Daily Spy.*

It is interesting to observe that our Master, though several times importuned to declare himself to take issue with public evils of the most patent enormity, and to exert his influence on pressing politico-moral questions, on every occasion palpably declined to do anything of the kind.—*W. W. Harris, D. D.*

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Titus 3: 1.

The Doings of National Reform.

We herewith present to our readers a report of the doings of National Reform assembled in convention in the city of Pittsburgh, and also a summary of the work of the Association for the past year.

The Convention assembled Wednesday evening, May 11, at 7:45. After the formalities of opening there was a speech by Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and one by Rev. J. P. Mills, the Methodist Episcopal "District Secretary" of National Reform; after which Dr. McAllister closed the evening meeting with a statement and an appeal. The statement was that the Association began the year with a debt of between \$2,500 and \$3,000, and that the work had been carried forward on so broad a scale that there had been a little added to the debt, although the receipts had been over \$7,000. Four men had been laboring all of the time, and three others a part of the time. One man had preached 150 sermons, delivered 60 addresses, and had written articles by the score.

He stated that the successful work in the South had awakened enthusiasm in the North, especially in Pittsburgh. He said: "There is developing one of the grandest movements the world ever saw,—a work that is to bring the North and South together. It will bring together all patriots. If we can unite the Christian sentiment of North and South, we shall bridge what has been called the 'bloody chasm.'" The appeal was then for funds to carry on the work. "In the South men of all the different denominations are ready to take hold. There ought to be three or four men to go all through the South, to organize the work. The cause is worthy of your confidence and your means."

"Secretary" Weir is the man who has just made a tour through the South, and an account of his trip was made the special order for the evening session on the morrow.

The first thing after the opening exercises on the morning of the 12th, was the annual report of the Corresponding Secretary. He stated that "the past year has been memorable in the history of the cause, because never before was there such a readiness to receive our speakers. We had speakers at Ocean Grove, at Chautauqua, and at Saratoga. At Saratoga was the most hearty reception. Arrangements have been made for an all-day session at Ocean Grove the coming season, also at a popular resort in Maryland, and near Chicago, and for a three days' session at Lakeside, Sandusky, Ohio. The *Christian Statesman* has been placed in 289 reading-rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association. More than 30,000 of the old series of National Reform documents, and 5,000 of the new series, have been distributed. So that, including the *Christian Statesman*, there has been circulated by systematic and habitual distribution 2,710,000 pages of National Reform literature."

"Besides the regular lectureship of the Association, there have been nearly fifty volun-

teer lecturers, who have given about 100 lectures. The greatest help has been by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Two years ago the Union established a department of Sabbath observance. One year ago, at the suggestion of National Reform, the Union established a department on the Bible in public schools." The secretary himself had addressed their National Convention, and they had thanked him. "Of the monthly responsive readings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, three were in the line of National Reform—one on God in Government, one on Sabbath observance, and one on national sins. Miss Willard loses no opportunity to declare that the Government rests on His shoulders. Both Miss Willard and Mrs. Woodbridge addressed the workingmen and introduced National Reform ideas. And not the least gratifying sign is the fact that for the first time in our history the fear of God has found a place in political platforms. And that this opportunity might be made the most of, the following memorial had been framed, and is to be sent to every person that can be reached; to be signed and returned:—

"The undersigned, who has sympathized and acted with the ——— party, desires that the future platforms of that party shall not fail to contain an acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of authority and power in civil government, of Christ as the king of all nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws; together with declarations favoring the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the defense of the Sabbath, the Christian features of our public education, and a national marriage and divorce law in harmony with the law of Christ. The names of women are desired as well as the names of men!"

"This with the special design of pressing the subject upon the attention of all parties at their next National Convention."

Also last fall an "admirable draft" for thanksgiving proclamations in the name of Christ had been sent to all the governors, but the request had been complied with in only one instance, and that was Governor Scales, of North California. In conclusion he stated that "never before were there echoes of National Reform from so many, nor so influential, quarters," and referred to statements made by Dr. Talmage, "Sam" Jones, Joseph Cook, and others.

Next there was given the reports of District Secretaries. Secretary Foster reported 135 sermons, 65 lectures; interviewed 10 presidents of colleges, 30 professors, and 12 editors; preached in 12 Presbyterian and 11 Methodist Churches, and lifted collections averaging \$109.78 a month. And the people ready for National Reform!

Secretary Wylie reported for "three months," spent mostly in Michigan and Indiana, especially in connection with the Prohibition Campaign in Michigan. Delivered 25 sermons, 39 lectures, visited 2 annual conferences of the United Brethren Church, and 1 of Free Methodist, and 3 colleges. No difficulty to get a hearing in colleges."

Secretary Weir reported that from April 1, 1886, to February 4, 1887, he had addressed in the aggregate over 7,000 people, received

over \$500, traveled 6,400 miles, held 97 interviews, and addressed 4 synods, 2 colleges, and W. C. T. Unions in 3 places. All signs he said point to this as the hour when these things should be pressed upon political parties. "If our enemies say these things shall stay out, we must be determined that they *shall go in*." He spoke of "the workingmen, whom Socialism, and Anarchism, and Catholicism, are all trying to catch." But in the Executive Committee the day before it had been decided that National Reform must secure the workingmen, and that they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath, for workingmen do not want to work on the Sabbath.

Secretary Mills reported seven months' work principally in his own conference, Northern Ohio, and chiefly among M. E. Churches. He published a small sheet himself to help spread his views; gave 12 lectures a month on National Reform direct; collected in all \$375.

Secretary Coleman had addressed 9 meetings, 2 ecclesiastical bodies, and 5 colleges. The coming year the way is open to reach twice as many colleges. He said, "The bad are growing worse, and the good are growing better."

A series of about twelve resolutions was introduced. But neither in the resolutions nor in their discussion was there anything developed that had not been covered in the speeches and reports, except in the one in which the convention complimented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. One speaker caused a good deal of sparring by saying that he "would not have the ballot put into woman's hands." Mr. Stevenson remarked that he foresees far larger results from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union influence in National Reform than even they themselves realize. Within five years they have laid their hand on the legislation of twenty States, and have secured scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. Another speaker said: "This movement is bound to succeed through the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

Another said: "When we get women and Christ in politics, *and they will both go in together*, we shall have every reform, and Christ will be proclaimed King of kings and Lord of lords."

The chairman closed the debate on this resolution by saying that "when woman undertakes anything good she will do it. And if she attempts anything bad she will accomplish that. What Ahab would not do Jezebel did. And what Herod would not do to John the Baptist otherwise, his wife caused him to do." No one attempted to explain just exactly where, in this observation, there lay the compliment to the W. C. T. U. It seemed to the SENTINEL representative that the compliment was rather backhanded. And yet we could not help wondering whether in the end the observation might not prove true and the simile appropriate, even though it be not preeminently complimentary as it stands.

Rev. Mr. McConnel, of Youngstown, Ohio, proposed the formation of "a Praying League,

to be composed of all who are interested in this movement, to covenant together to offer a prayer at the noon hour, wherever they may be, every day till our prayer is answered in the abolition of the liquor traffic, and till this nation is made God's kingdom." The proposition was heartily endorsed by the convention, and Mr. McConnel was given charge of the concern.

Thursday evening, the closing meeting, Secretary Weir occupied in giving the account of his Southern trip. It began February 24 and closed May 11. During this time he delivered 42 addresses, visited 7 States, traveled 2,800 miles, addressed 7,700 people, collected \$157.07, and held 103 interviews, three of which were with the governors of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The others were with preachers, professors, officials of Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, and editors. Meetings were held in 6 churches of different denominations. Out of the 42 meetings 24 were in these churches; some were even union National Reform meetings. In Raleigh, N. C., the Methodists and Presbyterians united. He gave addresses in 16 educational institutions, 9 of which were colored, and he never had, he said, more attentive listeners. His reception throughout was cordial. "Never," said he, "was I better treated than by the people of the South. All denominations, *every one of them, all* gave a hearty welcome to the cause of National Reform." He only met three people who flatly opposed National Reform, and all three were ministers.

Mr. Weir described the outlook as most promising. He said: "Any man can take National Reform principles and carry them safely and satisfactorily all through the South. In Atlanta, among all the leading people, there was no need to *explain* National Reform. They understand it, and are ready to join hands with us. I believe it is going to be a walk-over in the South. A confederate brigadier said, 'I am a Southerner, was a confederate soldier, a secessionist. But all that is past now, and I am ready to join hands with you at once.' And nine out of every ten will do the same thing."

Mr. Weir then closed with the impressive appeal: "Don't we see in this our opportunity—an opportunity such as seldom comes to any cause? It will have a welcome everywhere. Don't we see how it will build for the unity of the nation? Don't you see in this the unifier of this nation? Some say prohibition will unite them, but *this it is that is to do it*."

And we could not possibly say but that it is true. We have not space for any further comment, but only to remark, that in view of these plain statements of fact in the progress of the National Reform movement in a single year—all given in sober earnest, and none with any air of extravagance nor of braggadocio—how much longer shall the movement have to prosper so, how much longer will it have to grow, before the American people will awake to the fact that the National Reform movement, which bears in its train the union of Church and State, with all the evils that

accompany such an illicit connection, is on the eve of a fearful success? How long shall the AMERICAN SENTINEL have to stand alone amongst the journals of the nation in pointing out the dangers that threaten religious liberty in this land of freedom? How long?

A. T. J.

What Is the Remedy?

AN appreciative reader of the SENTINEL, in Hamilton County, New York, who says that he has read the SENTINEL from the first of its publication, and has also read everything that he could get hold of on the National Reform side, sends us the following clipping from the *New York Times*, as an indication of the great straits to which men in high positions are driven "in order to avoid the show of religious persecution in the enforcement of the Sunday law:"—

SUNDAY LAW FOR JEWS.

"J. P. Solomon, the editor of the *Hebrew Standard*, recently wrote to the mayor regarding the enforcement of the Sunday law against those Hebrews who kept Saturday as the Sabbath. In his response the mayor says:—

"The Sunday law has been the subject of judicial construction, and it has been decided that it is not based upon religious principles, but upon public policy, and that it is to be observed by all citizens without regard to condition or religious belief. It does not deny to any portion of our citizens the right to observe the Sabbath-day, and it does not compel them to do so. It merely provides that one day in seven shall be a day of rest, and inasmuch as that day cannot be made to suit everybody, a day is selected which suits the majority. Doubtless this inflicts a hardship upon the minority, but under our theory of government it is a hardship which cannot be avoided. . . . The remedy is for these citizens, whom you regard as unoffending, to obey the law which will give them immunity from arrest. I can assure you in conclusion that I have a great respect for the rights of conscience, but if the doctrine were once admitted that the law is to give way to every man who puts in the plea of conscience, the law would become a nullity."

Dr. Franklin said that it is a very convenient thing to be a *reasonable creature*, "since it enables one to find or make a *reason* for everything one has a mind to do." There is not the slightest doubt but that any good Catholic could demonstrate to his own satisfaction the reasonableness of attending mass every Sunday, and if the majority of the people of the United States were Catholics, they could compel the minority to conform to their custom; but in such case the rights of conscience would be outraged, although not more than in the enforcement of Sunday rest upon those who do not believe in it.

Mayor Hewitt admits that the enforcement of the Sunday law will necessarily inflict a hardship upon the minority who observe Saturday, but he says: "Under our theory of government it is a hardship which cannot be avoided." With all respect for his honor, we must say that that statement indicates a very slight knowledge of our theory of government. Has he never read the Declaration of Independence? Does he not know that that declaration, which made us a nation, and of

which the Constitution of the United States is but the outgrowth, was based upon the self-evident truth that "all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" Perhaps he has read that statement without knowing what it means. It means that in this country the laws must give equal protection to all; it means that the powerful majority must not pass laws to suit their own convenience, regardless of the rights of the feeble minority. The Declaration of Independence is founded upon the principles of justice, and justice works no hardships to a man simply because he is in the minority. A law that works injustice to a single individual is an unjust law.

We can tell exactly how to avoid inflicting a hardship upon the minority who observe Saturday; do not enact Sunday laws. "But this would not meet the minds of the majority." Perhaps not; but it would not hinder the majority from keeping Sunday, and why should one man be compelled to do a thing which he does not want to do, simply because two other men wish to do it? The injustice of such a proceeding is the more marked when we learn that the two can do what they want to, whether the one does it or not.

But reasoning will have no effect to stop a proceeding which outrages reason. Just because there can be no just reason produced for laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, or any other religious ordinance, those who are committed to the enactment of such laws will carry them through. We write with the hope of increasing the number of the minority who will at least *protest*.

What Sophistry!

WHEN we consider the course of action marked out by the National Reform Association, and the object at which they are aiming, and compare them with their avowed statements that the success of their work will not produce a union of Church and State and bring about religious persecutions, we are all led to exclaim, What sophistry!

In a pamphlet published by the association we find that Article 2 of their Constitution reads thus: "The object of this society shall be to obtain such an amendment of the Constitution of the United States as shall suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs." The *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the association, also declares that one object for which they are working is to "place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Mark their statements: "The Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations;" "the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs;" "all the Christian laws" on a "legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." It is indeed surprising and not a little

amusing to hear any organization put forth such statements as the foregoing, and then watch their ebullitions of apparent indignation when we tell them their work will produce a union of Church and State. We have never heard them say so, but it is quite evident from their platform that if they are *not* working for a union of Church and State, they mean to have it *all* Church and *no* State. Perhaps that is a secret of the organization as yet in the background.

There is one point that we cannot get clear in our mind, and that is, If the Reform party succeeds in getting all Christian laws and usages on a legal basis in the law of the land, do they not also intend to enforce them by civil power? And if they do not intend to enforce them by civil power, why put them on the basis of civil law? Again we ask, *Why?*

If Christian laws are enforced by civil enactment, there is no reasoning that can show that such a condition would not be a union of Church and State. *Sophistry* might think to show differently; but unsound reasoning has no blushes, and what it lacks in reasoning it makes up in bombast and ridicule. Let the leaders of the movement step forward and tell us why they want "all Christian laws" on a civil basis if they do not mean to inflict civil punishment upon the transgressors of those laws? And if they do want to inflict civil punishment upon the transgressor of Christian laws, how is it, then, that the Church is not in union with the State. The Church decides the penalty, and the State inflicts it. If this is not a *union* of the two, will some one kindly show us wherein is the *disunion?*

Some more of this sophistry is shown in the following: Pres. J. B. McMichael, D. D., of Monmouth, Ill., made the following significant statement: "To kiss Him (the Son) in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens, the nation wouldn't survive the wrath of God an hour longer than though it hadn't kissed Him at all." To which the Rev. M. A. Gault replied through the *Statesman*: "There is no one proposing to have the nation kiss Him in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens, except you and other enemies of National Reformers, who persist in thus misrepresenting the movement in order to excite opposition to it. The movement is laboring to first educate in the minds and hearts of the people submission to Christ; and it does not want the national confession until it comes through the regenerated hearts of the people."

This is only a sample of their sarcastic indignation. Laying aside the sarcasm, let us apply a little reasoning and see how it comes out. We fully agree with President McMichael. But if, as Mr. Gault says, the National Reform does not propose "to have the nation kiss Him in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens," why have the Christian laws on a legal basis in the law of the land? Will not the regenerated hearts obey all the requirements of God's word without being forced by civil authority? If a man is regenerated in *fact* and not in *name* only, he surely will. Then wherein is the need of

having the Christian laws on a civil basis?

In place of uselessly spending our time and talent trying to *legislate* the "Lord Jesus Christ" into the position of "ruler of nations" in this world, would it not be well to listen and give heed to some of Christ's own words? "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. To undertake to legislate Christ into the position of king of the nations of this world, when God in his word has given us such plain statements as the above, would be the most absurd folly. It would be as foolish as the action of France during the "Reign of Terror," when they passed a law that there was no God. Yet God existed, and still exists, the French law to the contrary notwithstanding. And when Christ has expressly said, "My kingdom is not of this world," can finite man *legislate* to the contrary, and cause the Son of God to acquiesce in opposition to what he has so positively and plainly declared? O sophistry, where is thy blush!

A. O. TAIT.

Time to Renew.

PLEASE examine the address label on your SENTINEL and if it reads *June* or *July* please send us your renewal this week. Our terms are, cash in advance, only *fifty cents* per year, or if you will send us two *new* subscriptions we will send *you* the paper one year *free*.

Assorted Back Numbers.

Now is the time to do missionary work with the AMERICAN SENTINEL as most everybody is willing to read about the Sunday Question, Constitutional Amendment, National Reform Party, etc.

We will send assorted back numbers of the SENTINEL, post-paid, for \$1.50 per hundred copies. Address, Pacific Press, Publishers, Oakland, California.

Religious Liberty,

A SPEECH of the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, in the Arkansas Legislature, in behalf of a bill which he had introduced into the Legislature, granting immunity from the penalty of the Sunday law, to those who observe the seventh-day Sabbath. The speech itself explains the situation which made the bill a necessity. We have compiled an *eight-page tract* from the speech as it appeared in the *Signs* and AMERICAN SENTINEL (April number) and will send the tract, post-paid, for \$1.00 per hundred copies, or that issue of the SENTINEL at three cents per copy. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

Sentinel Tracts.

THE Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., has just issued some new tracts treating upon the subjects discussed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, which they will send, post-paid, at the rate of one cent for each eight pages.

Religious Liberty, 8 pages; National Reform is Church and State, 16 pp.; The Republic of Israel, 8 pp.; Purity of National Religion, 8 pp.; What Think Ye of Christ? 8 pp.; Religious Legislation, 8 pp.; The American Papacy, 8 pp.; National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, 16 pp.; Bold and Base Avowal, 16 pp.; National Reform Movement an Absurdity, 16 pp.; The Salem Witchcraft, 8 pp.; National Reform Constitution and the American Hierarchy, 24 pages.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1887.

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

THOSE who wish to learn what "National Reform" really is, and who wish to become thoroughly familiar with every phase of it, should read the AMERICAN SENTINEL. A single issue of the SENTINEL contains more National Reform argument (always refuted) than both of the National Reform organs do in a month. The *Statesman* has now taken to copying from the SENTINEL articles which National Reformers have sent to us, and which we have reviewed. It is perhaps needless to say that the *Statesman* never favors its readers with the reply of the SENTINEL. It well knows that its only strength consists in keeping its readers ignorant of the argument against its theories. In this respect National Reform closely follows its exemplar, the Papacy. The SENTINEL will still continue to publish "both sides," always being careful to indicate clearly on which side truth and justice stand.

In his report from North Carolina, "Secretary" Weir takes occasion to eulogize Governor Scales, because he alone accepted the sample thanksgiving proclamation which the National Reform Association sent last fall to the governors of the various States. Mr. Weir says of him: "He is, of course, greatly interested in National Reform, although not yet familiar with its doctrines and work. To use his own language, he is for 'whatever will advance the honor of the Lord Jesus.'"

If that is the case, he will do well to let National Reform alone. Christ cannot be honored by any such cheap means as voting him king, even of all the earth. Whatever power Christ has or ever will have is solely by virtue of his being the Son of God, and any action that man may take will not affect his state in the least. If every man on earth should say, "We will not have this man to rule over us," his power would not be diminished; and if they should all vote to make him king, they would not add a feather's weight to his power and glory. On the contrary, a vote to recognize the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, would be dishonoring in the extreme; for it is inconceivable but that in the most perfect campaign possible among mortals, some would vote through policy or desire for gain. And in no way is Christ more dishonored than by hypocritical professions of loyalty to him.

WE stated above that it would be impossible but that in any general election that could be held, some votes would be cast, not from principle, but from hope of gain. The following quotation from a speech by a Dr. Browne, in the Pittsburgh National Convention of 1874,

shows that the National Reformers themselves do not expect that all who join their movement will do so from purely unselfish motives:—

"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."

And when with such help as this they have voted Jesus Christ king of this republic (!) then they think they will have given him all the honor that is his due. We can only pity the blindness of those who have so low a sense of the honor due to Christ the Son of God. The only way that he can be honored is by humble obedience to his requirements, and this must be the voluntary tribute of each individual for himself. Says Christ: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Legislation by Clamor.

It is already evident that one feature of the "new time" into which we are hastening will be the subjection of Legislatures to the pressure of groups of persons who are capable of controlling newspapers or combining votes. Under the old notions of Legislation, the duty of legislators was to study carefully the details of proposed legislation, to debate and discuss measures, and so, by deliberation, to arrive at decisions as to what should be enacted. The notion was that the statesman should know what he intended to do and should consider the proper means of reaching the desired result. This theory of legislation never has been very thoroughly put to practice anywhere, but now the idea seems to be that it is antiquated, that we do not intend to seek a more complete realization of it as a reform in legislation, but that we abandon it altogether.

At the same time, therefore, that there is a vast extension of the field of legislation, we abandon all sound traditions as to the method of legislative activity. Legislative bodies not only lay themselves open to be acted upon by outside influences, but they submit to clamor more than to any other influence. The tendency can be traced through the legislation of France, England and the United States, during the last twenty years. If a faction of any kind assails the Legislature with sufficient determination, they carry their point, although the sincere opinion of nearly all who vote for the measure may be that it is foolish, or idle, or mischievous, or crude, or irrational, or extravagant, or otherwise improper to be passed.

Opinions differ greatly as to what it is which is "falling" or "going to decay" just at present. These phenomena support the notion that it is "the State" which is passing away. On the one hand, the highest wisdom of those who

want anything now is to practice terrorism, to make themselves as disagreeable as possible, so that it shall be necessary to conciliate them, and those who appeal to reason find themselves disregarded. On the other hand, the public men seek peace and quiet by sacrificing anyone who cannot or does not know enough to make a great clamor in order to appease a clamorous faction. It is thought to be the triumph of practical statesmanship to give the clamorers something which will quiet them, and a new and special kind of legislative *finesse* has been developed, viz., to devise projects which shall seem to the clamorous petitioners to meet their demands, yet shall not really do it.—Prof. William G. Sumner, in *Independent*.

If the triumph of National Reform theories were dependent upon the efforts of the body known as the National Reform Association, the lovers of "pure religion and undefiled" would not be called on for very strenuous opposition, for although it boasts a great many names, it cannot boast many original ideas. Both the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation* seem to have long ago exhausted the argument for National Reform, for were it not for the Constitution of the National Reform Association, which they keep standing, the reader would often be at a loss to know why the papers are printed. But what are called National Reform principles are not confined to the National Reform Association. There are individual women of the W. C. T. U., who are doing more for the advancement of those principles than all the men connected with the National Reform Association. And the W. C. T. U. is not the only additional factor in the work. George Parsons Lathrop, writing of national Christianity, in the May number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, said: "It has not been tried yet, and it is not one of the least hopeful signs of the times, that a disposition to give it a serious probation is developing simultaneously in several quarters." The movement will receive some of its most powerful assistance from quarters where it would least be expected, for politics makes strange bedfellows. National Reform heresy is developing as though, like a physical pestilence, the germs were in the air, and men who love liberty need to be awake and guarding every point.

"ONLY he who respects the liberty of others is worthy of liberty."

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1887.

NUMBER 7.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL.

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

J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

RELIGION, and this really includes morality, is a matter which from its original nature, and object, lies entirely beyond the reach and control of the State proper.—*Schuetz*.

In his speech at the late National Reform Convention, Rev. T. P. Stevenson remarked that,—

"Every reform is rooted in some principle. The Reformation was rooted in the great principle of justification by faith. The great doctrine of religious liberty rests upon the basis of the inviolability of the conscience—that God alone is Lord of the conscience."

That is all true. The progress of the Reformation in the sixteenth century and onward has been but the progress of truth. Each successive step in reform has been but the development of one more principle of truth. No movement can be a genuine reform if it subverts or repudiates any principle of reform already developed. Now the great doctrine of religious liberty is inseparable from the Reformation. It is just as essential a principle as justification by faith, itself. It rests indeed upon the *inviolability* of the conscience, and upon the truth that God *alone* is Lord of the conscience.

But this so-called National Reform repudiates this fundamental principle of the Reformation. It declares that the State has "the right to command the consciences of men." It refuses to be comforted with a Constitutional acknowledgment of God, because such acknowledgment would not "impose any restraint on the conscience." But if the State has the right to command the consciences of men, then God is not alone Lord of the conscience. And if men have the right by civil enactment to impose restraint upon the conscience, then there is no such principle as the inviolability of the conscience.

Therefore this so-called National Reform, in repudiating this fundamental principle of the Reformation, shows itself to be not a reform at all, but subversive of the Reformation and a return to both the ante and anti-Reformation principles of the Papacy.

The Prospects of National Reform.

To THE regular readers of the SENTINEL we need offer no argument here to prove that the success of National Reform will be the union of Church and State in this Government. This has been amply proved in preceding numbers of this paper; yet if there are any of our new readers who have not seen the proofs of it, we are prepared to furnish the evidence, upon demand, in any quantity, and at short notice. Knowing therefore that the success of the National Reform will be the union of Church and State, it becomes important to all people to know what are the prospects of its success. This is especially important in view of the fact that the movement is even now on the very eve of success. To set this fact forth as it shall be the purpose of this article.

1. The movement is supported by "all evangelical denominations." The Association has one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, eighty of whom, including Joseph Cook, are Revs. and Rev. D. Ds., and Rev. D. D., LL.Ds., and some are even *Right Rev. D. D., LL.Ds.* Of these eighty, *eleven* are bishops made up from the Episcopal, Evangelical, and United Brethren Churches. Besides these eighty divines, there are in the list *ten* college professors, *one* governor, *three* ex-governors, *nine* justices of Supreme Courts, *two* judges of Superior Courts, *one* judge of the United States District Court, *one* brevet brigadier-general, *one* colonel, and *seven* prominent officials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

2. The W. C. T. U. is counted, both by themselves and the National Reformers, as one with the National Reform Association. Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. Clara Hoffman, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrop, and Mrs. W. I. Sibley, of the Union, are all vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, May 11, 12, 1887, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman* and corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, in his annual report made the following statement of the co-operation of the W. C. T. U. with National Reform:—

"Two years ago Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, suggested the creation of a special department of its already manifold work for the promotion of sabbath observance, "co-operating with the *National Reform Association.*" The suggestion was adopted at the National Convention in St. Louis, and the department was placed in charge of Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, of Ohio, as national super-

intendent. Mrs. Bateham has since, with her own cordial assent, been made one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association.

"One year ago your secretary placed in the hands of President Willard a memorandum suggesting the creation of another department 'for the retention of the Bible in the public schools,' and assigning reasons for such action. This step was recommended by Miss Willard in her annual address before the late National Convention at Minneapolis, and was adopted in so far that a committee was appointed to make preliminary inquiries during the coming year, with Miss Willard herself at the head of the committee.

"It was your secretary's privilege this year again to attend the National W. C. T. U. Convention, and it would be unjust and ungrateful not to acknowledge here the cordiality with which for the sake of the cause he was received. A place was kindly given for an address in behalf of the National Reform Association, and thanks were returned by vote of the convention. A resolution was adopted *expressing gratitude to the National Reform Association* 'for its advocacy of a suitable acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in the fundamental law of this professedly Christian nation.'

"In the series of 'Monthly Readings' for the use of local Unions as a responsive exercise, prepared or edited by Miss Willard, the reading for last July was on 'God in Government,' that for August on 'Sabbath Observance' (prepared by Mrs. Bateham), and that for September on 'Our National Sins.' *Touching the first and last-named readings* your secretary had correspondence with Miss Willard before they appeared.

"A letter has been prepared to W. C. T. U. workers and speakers, asking them, in their public addresses, to refer to and plead for the Christian principles of civil government. The president of the National Union allows us to say that this letter is sent *with her sanction and by her desire.*

"The heartiness and intelligence, the faith and courage, with which these Christian women embrace and advocate the fundamental principles of Christian government are most gratifying. Mrs. Woodbridge chose for her theme at Ocean Grove and Chautauqua, 'Shall the United States Acknowledge Christ as Sovereign?' Miss Willard loses no opportunity of declaring that 'the Government is on his shoulder.' Similar expressions are constantly on the lips of their leading speakers and writers. . . . Mrs. Woodbridge, in her address to the Workingmen's Assembly in Cleveland, appealed to them to join hands with the temperance forces in placing this 'Government upon the shoulder 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.'

3. The workingmen. It will be seen by the above that the National Reform Association

has not only gained the Union itself, but that through the Union it is making strong bids for the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations. Indeed, it was stated in the late convention that "the Anarchists, the Socialists, and the Catholic Church are all trying to catch the workingmen, but *National Reform must secure the workingmen.*" And we are safe in saying that National Reform will secure them. Even though the Roman Church should secure the workingmen's associations, bodily, that will be no hindrance to National Reform's securing them, for of all the bids for support that the National Reform Association is making the strongest are made *for the support of*

4. *The Catholic Church.* Thus says 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."

And again:—

"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.*

Now let us read a word from Rome. In his Encyclical published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart and soul and body and mind in defense of the church and Christian wisdom."

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 remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel 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. 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 of course they will "gladly join hands."

5. The Prohibition party as such. The National Reform report before mentioned says on this point:—

"The national platform of the Prohibition party adopted in Pittsburg in 1884, contained an explicit acknowledgment of Almighty God, and of the paramount authority of his law as the supreme standard of all human legislation. The Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner, D. D., of Boston, an eloquent and devoted friend and *one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association*, was a member of the committee *which framed the declaration.* After that presidential campaign was over, and before the State conventions of 1885, Professor Wallace, of Wooster University, wrote to your secretary, suggesting that all diligence be used to secure similar acknowledgments and kindred declarations on related points, in the Prohibition platforms of the several States. Under this most judicious and timely suggestion, a large correspondence has been held with the leaders of the party, and its chief workers in many States."

And then of the State and county Prohibition Conventions that have "incorporated into their platforms" distinct acknowledgment of National Reform principles, there are named the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut; and the counties of Washington, Lancaster, and Chester, Pa., and Belmont, Ohio.

WHAT SHALL BE THE ISSUE?

Now take the voters of "all the evangelical denominations;" the voters of the Prohibition party; the voters of the workingmen's associations; and the voters of the Catholic Church; and it is perfectly clear that they compose an overwhelming majority of all the voters in this nation; and much more would it be so if the W. C. T. U. should secure their demanded right of suffrage. *And against this thing there will be no "solid South."* Take, then, all the voters that are here represented; take with them an issue upon which all will heartily unite; veil National Reform under that issue; then bring that issue to a vote at the polls, and it is absolutely certain that it will carry by a vast majority.

Is there then any such issue in view? There is such an issue, and that already clearly defined and well developed. That issue is THE UNIVERSAL DEMAND FOR SUNDAY LAWS, or, as otherwise expressed, laws enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath." Every one of these bodies that we have named will almost unanimously support whatever demand may be made for Sunday laws, even to the subversion of the national Constitution to secure them. The reader needs not to be told that all the churches are in favor of rigid Sunday laws. It is well known that one grand aim of the W. C. T. U. is to secure the enactment and enforcement of strict Sunday laws. The Baltimore Plenary Council, indorsed by the Pope, commands the observance of Sunday, and the Romish Church will heartily support any movement to enforce its observance by national laws. It is this very thing that makes the National Reform Association so anxious to secure the help of Rome.

Both the Catholic and the National Reform papers urge upon the workingmen that as they have already struck for eight hours for a day's work, now they must strike for six days for a week's work, and Sunday secured by law.

In the late National Reform Convention, it was not only stated as we have quoted that "National Reform must secure the workingmen," but it was also said that "they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath." And they are securing them by this very means. The Illinois Legislature, which we believe is yet in session, had before it for passage a Sunday law framed by the preachers of Chicago—it might well have been framed by the Inquisition itself—and a petition, said to represent 25,000 Knights of Labor, was sent up urging its passage. Nor does the movement stop with the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations, but even the Socialists join themselves to the movement and are welcome, as the following from the *Christian Union* testifies:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath [Sunday, of course] is to be preserved at all—and we are sanguine of its preservation—the *non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to re-enforce the religious demand* for Sabbath [Sunday] rest, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o' nights in fear and trembling."

Are not the Legislatures of all the States already being besieged at every session with demands for the enactment of rigorous Sunday laws with no respect whatever to the rights of conscience? Only the past winter such demands were made upon the Legislatures of California, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Illinois, and we know not how many other States. Such laws were secured in Massachusetts and Tennessee, and passed the House in Illinois—sweepingly and with cheers—we have not learned the result in the Senate. But State laws will amount to but little while national statutes are wanting. And now Congress itself is to be besieged. Reformed Presbyterianism and National Reform are identical—each is t'other—and of the action of their Synod held last month, the dispatches tell us this:—

"The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of America, in session here, has adopted a resolution declaring that the violation of the Sabbath by the Post-office Department is one of the greatest sins of the Government, as well as one of the greatest causes of the Sabbath desecration throughout the whole commonwealth, and calling upon *the organization of all evangelical bodies in the United States* to combine in order to secure the entire abolition of whatever in the Post-office Department is a violation of the *Sabbath law.*"

And the National Reform Committee of the United Presbyterian General Assembly, also held in June, passed the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That the moderator and clerks be directed to append their signatures in behalf of the Assembly to the [National Reform] petition requesting Congress to pass a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no future contracts which shall include the carrying of the mails on the Lord's day."

Of course under the Constitution as it is, Congress can pass no such law, because the passing of all such laws, whether by Congress or by State Legislatures, is essentially religious legislation, and is prohibited by the Constitution. Therefore it is that the National Reform Association wants the Religious Amendment adopted, making the Constitution to recognize the Christian religion, and so give a basis for Sunday legislation.

Here then is the situation. The National Reform Association proposes a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Through such an Amendment there will be formed a union of Church and State. Under cover of the universal demand for Sunday laws, the question of the Constitutional Amendment can be made a question of national politics, and can be brought to a vote of the nation. When it is so brought to a vote, the National Reform Association can bring to the polls, in its support, the voters of "all evangelical churches," the voters of the Prohibition party, the voters of the Catholic Church, the voters of the Knights of Labor, and the workingmen generally, and with these the Socialists and all the rest of the non-religious rabble, and the whole thing sanctified by the sweet influences of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and so can carry it as sweepingly as inquisitorial Sunday laws are now carried in some of the State Legislatures.

We pretend not at all to say how soon this may be the grand question in national politics. It *can* be done very soon, but whether soon or late, we know, and so everyone else who will look at this thing exactly as it is, may know, that whenever the day comes that it is brought to a vote it will as surely carry as that day comes. That that day will come is as sure as that these facts exist. And when it does come, then there comes with it a union of Church and State, with its whole train of attendant evils in this Government. And in that day, liberty—whether civil or religious—will forever take her departure from this dear land, her last and happiest home on earth. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And *now* such vigilance is demanded as never before in the history of the nation. May God arouse the people to a sense of it.

A. T. J.

NATIONAL REFORM District Secretary J. M. Foster says:—

"The same cry that aroused the crusaders in the eleventh century to rescue the holy sepulcher from the hands of the infidel, will awake the hosts of Immanuel to rescue this land from the powers of the world, and incorporate it in the *City of God*."—*Christian Statesman*, June 2, 1887.

We have an idea that that is just about the straight truth in the matter as it will be when National Reform gets to its full tide of progress. Then, as like causes produce like effects, we may expect to see again enacted some of the fanatical scenes of the crusades. Says Waddington: "The crusaders exclaimed, 'It is the will of God!' and in that fancied behest, the fiercest brutalities which the world ever beheld sought—not palliation, but—honor and the crown of eternal reward."

The Question Met—and Evaded!

THE Religious Amendment party has utterly failed to vindicate itself under the indictment which we have brought against the movement. The SENTINEL has taken up the leading declaration of what they "propose" to do; it has analyzed it, and clearly pointed out its tendency, and its unavoidable results; it has examined the main points in their own reports of the speeches of their leading men; it has followed the *Statesman* in its editorials and in its correspondence; and while they have maintained an apparently studied silence in regard to our exposure of their errors and sophistries, they console themselves with asserting that our arguments do not "meet the question." We now propose to show that the question has been meandering in the hands of its friends, and can only be met by crossing its winding track.

A National Convention of the Amendmentists was held in Pittsburg in 1869. In the call for this convention are found the following words:—

"The National Association, which has been formed for the purpose of securing such an Amendment to the National Constitution as will remedy this great defect, indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation, invites," etc.

In the Cincinnati Convention in 1872, Dr. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and Recording Secretary of the National Association, delivered an address on "The Legal Effect and Practical Value of the Proposed Amendment," in which he attempted to guard the expression of the above "call" as follows:—

"It will furnish a legal basis for all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government. . . . It is all Christian laws, institutions, and usages *in our Government*. We do not propose to find a basis for the laws and institutions of the church, of Christian families, or of the closet, in the National Constitution; but for that great body of laws, institutions, and usages, *in our Government*, which are of Christian origin."

This disclaimer is worthless, for two reasons: 1. It is neutralized by other statements of the "Reformers," and of Doctor Stevenson himself, as we shall show. 2. There is no "great body of laws, institutions, and usages in our Government, which are of Christian origin." In fact, there is not a single law, institution or usage in our Government which is of Christian origin, as we shall presently notice.

In the second Pittsburg Convention, held in 1874, Hon. Felix R. Brunot, president both of the association and of the convention, announced the object of their movement as follows:—

"We propose '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 laws of the land."

President Brunot quoted the above words from their previously made declaration of principles. The limitation for which Mr. Stevenson made his plea was not inserted. We shall give reasons for believing that there was no intention to have it inserted.

Regarding this declaration of principles a letter of inquiry was addressed to the *Statesman*, asking if they meant what they said; if, inasmuch as baptism and the Lord's Supper are "Christian institutions," it was their intention to have these placed on a legal basis. But, instead of "touching the real question," they evaded it, and gave the following as the enumeration of the points at which they aimed:—

"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, moreover, are proper to the State, and cannot, in any candid mind, be confounded with baptism and the Lord's Supper."

No; these are not to be confounded with baptism and the Lord's Supper, because these latter are "Christian institutions," while those enumerated by the *Statesman* are not! Not one of the things mentioned by the *Statesman* is peculiar to Christianity. When the question was raised as to what would be the effect of the Religious Amendment on the Jew, an officer of the association replied: "We are not a Jewish, but a Christian nation; therefore our legislation must be conformed to the institution and spirit of Christianity." And yet it is a fact that the Jewish nation had every law, institution, and usage which the *Statesman* enumerated, which can be drawn from the Scriptures. Of late a conference of Jewish rabbis appointed a committee to draw up a petition to be presented to Congress, urging that body to pass a national marriage law. And yet our model Reformers tell us that marriage is a Christian institution. The truth is, that the origin of marriage is given in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the institution antedates Christianity. And so of the other points named.

But, we inquire, what effect did the inquiry have on the National Reformers? It led them to be yet more guarded in their platform, and it now reads thus:—

"The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government, to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government," etc., "and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government," etc.

We might safely challenge them to show that there are any "Christian features" in our Government—anything that is peculiar to Christianity. But the point we wish to notice now is, that this platform does not really express their designs. In the Pittsburg Convention Dr. Stevenson gave an address on "The Ends We Seek," before President Brunot took the chair and announced what they "propose" to do. Dr. S. said:—

"Through the immense largesses it receives from corrupt politicians, the Roman Catholic Church is, practically, the established church of the city of New York. These favors are granted under the guise of a seeming friendliness to religion. We propose to put the substance for the shadow, to drive out the counterfeit by the completer substitution of the true."

This language may seem much or little; we shall have to interpret it by other statements which more clearly reveal their designs. In this same address Mr. Stevenson said:—

"Our hopes, too, look beyond the mere maintenance of our Christian institutions as they are. We must do more than merely arrest the current which is bearing us away from God and religion. We must begin to make progress in the opposite direction. The success of our movement will be the introduction of a springing and germinant principle into the Constitution, which will yet redeem American politics from all unholy influences, and enable us to attain to a complete and consistent character as a Christian nation."

There is no mistaking this language. To expect to exclude "unholy influences" from American politics, and yet maintain the republic—allow the right of suffrage to the people—is the sheerest folly. The truth is that the success of their schemes will leave scarcely a vestige of the present features of our Government, which is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." And here we will let President Brunot put a quietus upon the idle assertions of recent writers in the *Statesman*. They present the Government of Israel as the one after which they wish to pattern, and declare that it was a republic, and that under it the people had larger liberty than we have in this Government. In President Brunot's address in the Pittsburg Convention, February 4, 1874, he said:—

"Up to the Christian era no nation permitted freedom of conscience in religion. The government of the Israelites was a theocracy. The laws came directly from God."

This is the truth; but to the same extent that these words are true, to that extent the words of the writers referred to are false.

Particular attention is called to the statement of Doctor Stevenson, that it is *not* their intention to merely maintain "the existing Christian features in our Government," whatever that expression may mean. The adoption of the proposed Religious Amendment would be the introduction of a "germinant principle into our Constitution;" it would be only the beginning of the complete subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power in the nation. Listen to another avowal from 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. . . . 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 the dangerous character of the syllogism, that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

We have found that these reformers often publicly claim much less than they mean, but their words are too significant and strong

to permit us to believe that they ever mean less than they claim. The conclusion which has "the dangerous character of the syllogism," and which *must* "come with invincible power," is the self-same conclusion which was involved in the Councils of the Catholic Church, and wrought out practically by the Inquisition.

We hope that American citizens do not need any argument to prove to them that the civil Government has no right to put "any restraint upon the conscience." Yet this is exactly what the National Reformers demand; they affirm that "the church" shall determine what restraints the Government shall put upon the consciences of religious minorities, of dissenters, as well as of the non-religious.

Now while we have taken up the various items of their platform; the published speeches made in their National Conventions; the editorials and correspondence of their papers; and the reports of their "district secretaries;" we have analyzed and shown the tendency of their utterances, their professed arguments; and we have carefully set forth the necessary and undeniable results of the success of their movement—they have not taken up and reviewed a single article of the *SENTINEL*; they have not met a single argument we have presented on the tendencies and results of their movement; they have not attempted to justify their absurd statements wherein they not only confound religion and morality, but religion and crime; and yet they have the effrontery to say that it is unnecessary for them to notice our arguments, because we do not meet the point! Some time since, when this assertion was reiterated, we invited them to frankly and plainly tell us what the point is; what is the question at issue; and if it is not found in their platform; in their published speeches; in their weekly organs, either as editorials or correspondence, to just indicate where we might find it, and we promised to notice it fully and at length, but all in vain. From their actions we might infer that they had joined a perpetual "mum social."

There are many intelligent and inquiring people carefully watching the progress of this controversy. And the number of such is fast increasing. And the self-styled Reformers may rest assured that, in the eyes of the real inquirer, accusations of ignorance of history, of the Bible, and of government, in which they have freely indulged, are poor substitutes for argument. We would be glad to know whether they ever intend to try to "meet the question," fairly and squarely on its merits.

J. H. W.

GOVERNMENTS have it not in their power to do their subjects the least service as to their religious beliefs and mode of worship. On the contrary, whenever the civil magistrate interposes his authority in matters of religion, otherwise than in keeping the peace amongst all religious parties, you may trace every step he has taken by the mischievous effects his interposition has produced.—*Burgh*.

A Little Comparison.

THE *Christian Statesman* of February 24 says:—

"The constant struggle for place and pelf and power in American politics, closely resembles the struggles for the throne in the last days of the Roman Empire, and every thoughtful student of history must be struck by the correspondence."

Very true; and the thoughtful student of history will be struck by another correspondence which the *Statesman* forgot to mention. In the last days of the Roman Empire many professed Christians, whose zeal outran their piety, thought that politics would be vastly improved if only the church were placed under State patronage, and were allowed a controlling voice in public affairs. Accordingly Constantine did for the church just what the National Reform Association is trying to accomplish in these days. What he did, and its consequences, is thus told by Eugene Lawrence:—

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the bishop of Rome emerged from the catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna, and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the religion which he professed.

"The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud. The bishop was elected by the clergy and populace of the city, and this was the only elective office at Rome. Long deprived of all the rights of freemen, and obliged to accept the senators and consuls nominated by the emperors, the Romans seemed once more to have gained a new liberty in their privilege of choosing their bishop. They exercised their right with a violence and a factious spirit that showed them to be unworthy of possessing it. On the election day the streets of Rome were often filled with bloodshed and riot. The rival factions assailed each other with blows and weapons. Churches were garrisoned, stormed, sacked, and burned; and the opposing candidates, at the head of their

respective parties, more than once asserted their spiritual claims by force of arms."

Much more might be given to the same effect. The struggle for place and power is not yet so openly shameless as it was in the days of Rome's decline; but once let the church, as a church, enter into politics, and the climax will be reached. The lesson which the thoughtful student of history will draw from this, is that men cannot be converted by the forms of religion, and that if the State is controlled by unprincipled men, a union of Church and State will simply result in the church's being controlled by the same wicked men. The unregenerated human nature that is in any man will make itself manifest whether he is in the church or out of it.

E. J. W.

"At It Again."

THIS is the title of a very appropriate cartoon inserted in *Puck* for November 18, 1885. It represents the Pope with the triple crown on his head and himself crawling through the ballot-box, to pull down that clause in the Constitution which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Just above the crawling Pope, suspended from the wall, are extracts from the Papal Encyclical.

1. "Every Catholic should rigidly adhere to the teachings of the Roman pontiffs, especially in the matter of modern liberty, which, already, under the semblance of honesty of purpose, leads to error and destruction."

2. "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs."

3. "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."

With this picture the motto of *Puck* is very appropriate—"What fools these mortals be."

In the coalition about to be formed between the Papists and the Protestants, this picture well represents the case. It is through the ballot-box that the National Reformers propose to amend the Constitution. And the National Reformers well understand that they can do nothing of the kind without the aid of the Roman Catholics. The Roman Church looks to the subjugation of all earthly Governments. This she has publicly stated many times, and, with a mixture of haughtiness and effrontery, she still urges forward her claims to political power, and to the right to dictate to politicians and statesmen and Governments what policy they shall pursue.

That she has done this in time past, none will deny; that kings and emperors have sat at the feet of the Pope and done his bidding, all history attests; but to a great extent this galling yoke was broken in the progress of liberty and Protestantism since the Reformation. But now Protestantism proposes to undo all her past good deeds, by making religion an element in our national Constitution; and this the proposed Amendment will in effect accomplish. They proclaim to the world their willingness and even their ardent

desire to cast this fire-brand of religious controversy into the arena of political strife, thus signifying to all that they wish to have a hand in once more inaugurating wars of extermination, similar to those of the Dark Ages, when Peter the Hermit preached extermination of the Turk, or such a war as the bigoted Philip of Spain confidently entered upon, when he built his huge ships and sent his Invincible Armada to frighten Queen Bess out of her Protestant ideas of allowing her little island to become a safe asylum for religious refugees from the Inquisitions and Bastiles of the continent.

The Sigismund of 1414, who violated his word with Huss and Jerome, and such monarchs as Philip II. of Spain, decided in religious controversy as to what church or what doctrines all should accept; and the Church of Rome is responsible in a large measure for the course pursued by kings and emperors and States of that age.

When a church uses its influence to corrupt the State, that moment the church becomes responsible to God for the blind, mistaken course any Government will enter upon in the administration of religious affairs; and once established, laws of this kind will not be relinquished by the State without a struggle. Such power once attained is a boon to legislators who stoop to any device to gain honor, wealth, or preferment; hence such power as the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposes to vest in civil rulers, has dangerous precedents.

Such power, the National Reformers affirm, was vested in the Hebrew State; and certainly all will admit it was evil when bad rulers administered it. So here, we cannot expect to elect good and holy men to the offices of Government; therefore, it will be with us as it was with Israel when Ahab reigned. Elijah will have to flee forty days' journey into the wilderness, and many Protestant amendmentists will bitterly rue the day they amended the Constitution; for the Government is already under Papal rule to some extent, and it will be wholly so when the Amendment is carried out. Then will Protestant bigots realize the part they have acted in helping the Pope to crawl through the ballot-box. Well does one artist say, "At it again;" in other words, "History is repeating itself."

JOSEPH CLARKE.

In a note on the annual meeting of the National Reform Association and its demand for national religion, the *Christian at Work* makes the suggestive remark that "it is noteworthy that nothing is said as to the deterioration of religious life in the family, nor is any allusion made as to the means for supplying that deficiency." That is true. Likewise there is nothing said of the deterioration of genuine godliness in the church. All the lack is in the hypothetical individual which they call the nation; that is the butt of all their complaints. They may plaster the national Constitution all over with Religious Amendments, but such methods will never plant practical religion in the family nor sup-

ply the lack of vital godliness in the church. They may plead that it is by increased godliness in the family and in the church that they expect to get the Religious Amendment to the Constitution. But it is not so. That association is making no effort to increase godliness in either the family or the church. Its methods and its aims are wholly political, not moral. And this movement being so largely indorsed by the churches is proof positive and confessed that those churches are powerless to do the work which God gave the church to do. Nor will a Constitutional Amendment supply the power. True, it will give the churches the power to force upon the ungodly their own form of godliness without the power, all which will only increase unto more ungodliness. And from all such people and their work the word of God commands to turn away. Look at 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

The State, the Church, and the School.

WE have received from the author, C. H. I. Schuette, A. M., a book entitled, "The State, the Church, and the School." It is quite a full and free discussion of each of these institutions in itself, and in its relation to the others. He first discusses "The State"—"Its Nature and Office," "Its Chief Arms," and "Its Sphere of Jurisdiction"—and he does it well. Next he treats of "The Church"—the rights of religion, the "Essence and Forms" of the Church, "Its Object and Its Methods," "Limits and Powers of Action"—and he does that well. Next he shows their "divinely ordered relation," and that too he does well. Next he discusses their "humanly ordered relation," which of course is their vital union. This he does, if anything, better than all. First he refutes, and splendidly, too, the arguments for their union, whether under the form of a particular church organization, or under the form of Christianity as a whole. Then he presents a series of excellent arguments directly against any such union. Next we have not the least valuable chapter of the whole book,—giving copies of the sections of the National Constitution, and of all the State constitutions that relate to religion. Then, last of all, he discusses "The School"—"Parental Duties," "What It Is and Should Be," "Its Relation to State and Church," and "The American School"—this likewise he does well.

At this our readers may wonder why we did not say at once that it is an excellent book, and so send forth our hearty commendation. Well, this we should have done had we found the book consistent with itself. To use a familiar and homely illustration: It is all very well when we see a cow give a large quantity of excellent milk, but it is not at all well to see her lift her foot and kick it all over. It is a pleasure to read a sound treatise on an interesting subject, but it is most painful, while reading such, to find your author suddenly turn a complete somersault and subvert every principle which he has established, and labored to illustrate. And this is precisely the predicament in which we found this

author when we reached section 15 of this book, pages 281-296.

After critically discussing the sound principles of Government and Religion, and their relation to each other, or rather their proper separation from each other, and after showing this proper separation as illustrated in the theory of our own Government, he finds, as anyone may find, certain practices, especially in our State governments and legislation, that are inconsistent with the sound principles which he has established. But instead of allowing them to be exactly what they are, "inconsistencies," and allowing them to stand condemned by his principles, as inconsistencies, he undertakes to justify them. And in his attempt to justify the inconsistencies he is compelled to use arguments that subvert every principle that would stand against a union of Church and State, and which subvert the very arguments which he himself uses against such union.

Of these "inconsistencies" he selects three, and names them thus:—

"The law of the observance of Sunday, the law punishing blasphemy, and the law creating chaplains to the Government—these are the specimen statutes now to be reviewed with a special reference to the question whether they are in full harmony with the principles of a perfect religious freedom and with a complete legal separation of State and Church."

Then of the law of Sunday observance he very properly argues as follows:—

"Were we to inquire, for example, why we have a Sunday by the law of the land in which we live, we venture to say that nine answers out of ten would point us to the decalogue. In other words, we would be told that whereas God has instituted the Sabbath, our Government, as a matter of course, must command its observance. Yet no answer made could be more fallacious, and, in its logical workings, more disastrous to our theory of Government. And here we do not refer to the question whether or not the divine law of the Sabbath is of universal application—a matter on which Christians themselves are divided—but to the utterly false political principle on which the answer is based, to wit: that whatever God has forbidden or bidden must also for that very reason be forbidden or bidden by the law of the land. On such grounds every biblical injunction and precept would have to be embodied, as an integral part thereof, in our legal code; and whither such a procedure would lead us, it is not difficult to foresee. The distinction between politics and religion, the State and the Church, would thus be completely wiped out, and there would ensue a condition of affairs more woful than the world has ever known. In our day, and in our land especially, because Church and State are separate, no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds."

Now Sunday is purely a religious thing, and laws for its observance must be based on purely religious grounds, for the thing itself exists upon no other grounds—it is wholly an affair of the church. In view of this quotation, therefore, the query very properly presents itself. How can our author justify civil laws for the observance of Sunday? He attempts it thus:—

"The true *rationale*, therefore, of laws such as have a religious significance, and as we have named above, must be sought elsewhere."

That is to say that the *rationale* of laws having a *religious* significance must be sought elsewhere than on *religious* grounds. How could things having a religious significance be found anywhere but on religious grounds even if they were sought? How can things having a religious significance grow out of any but religious grounds?

But the grounds upon which he seems to seek this "true *rationale*" are that the majority of the people demand it, and that is enough, whether their demand be well founded or not. Thus he argues:—

"Whether the religious belief which leads the great majority of the people to demand the legal sanction of Sunday be well founded or not, or whether their motives be pure or not—these are points on which it is not the business of the law and the law-makers to decide. The mere fact that the general body of the people wants a day of worship is enough to give a solid foundation to the law which respects the will so expressed."

How it would be possible to frame a proposition that would be more destructive of every principle of justice or of right we cannot imagine. Whether the demand be well founded or not, or whether the motives of those who make the demand be pure or not—these are points that cannot enter into the question at all! They are the majority, and the majority demand it, and even though it be an unjust demand, wickedly intended, "that is enough to give a solid foundation to the law"! According to this there never has been, and there never can be, in any place where the majority could or can make their demands to be heeded, any law that did not, or that would not, rest upon "a solid foundation." According to this even the crucifixion of the Saviour rested upon a solid foundation. For was there not "a great multitude" with the chief priests and the scribes and the elders, who demanded his crucifixion? To Pilate was this not the majority? Whether the demand was well founded or not or whether their motives were pure or not—these were not points on which it was the business of Pilate to decide. The mere fact that the great multitude wanted it, was enough to give a solid foundation to the act of Pilate, which respected the will so expressed. We submit that this is a valid argument under the proposition laid down by this author in support of Sunday laws. It is an infamous proposition, that is all.

And further, immediately following the words above quoted, he says:—

"Especially must the popular will be heeded in this matter, because of its religious nature, on the ground that religion is the source and strength of all true morality."

This, too, not five pages from where he wrote that "no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds." That is to say: "No civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds," but civil statutes must be enacted in favor of Sunday, "especially," "because of its religious nature"! If the inconsistency which he attempts to justify is any more glaring than that which appears in his justification, our Government must be in a pitiable condition.

We have not the space to notice his justification of laws against blasphemy. Suffice it to say that he disallows Blackstone's definition of blasphemy, in civil jurisprudence, and proposes one of his own that does not relieve the matter a particle, and he sustains it by argument that would justify criminal statutes against everybody who should choose to openly disagree with the religious belief of "the great mass of our people" (page 292). And as he himself condemns the appointment of chaplains by the Government, it is not necessary that we should notice that.

The truth is that in his section on "Inconsistencies" the author of "The State, the Church, and the School," has attempted to do what cannot be done. Webster defines "inconsistent," as "irreconcilable in conception or in fact." The things which our author mentions as inconsistencies, *are* inconsistencies. And his attempt to reconcile them is simply an effort to reconcile the irreconcilable.

Yet there is a way in which his credit for consistency as a writer may be regained and maintained, and by which the standing of his book may be assured. Let him blot out his attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable in these two places in section 15, let the "inconsistencies" stand as they are, and let them stand condemned as they are by the sound principles of the book throughout. With those parts blotted out, we verily believe that the book would stand as the best treatise in existence on the subject with which it deals; it would well deserve a place on the table of every household in the land; and we would gladly do our best to see that it had that place. But as it is, the book only condemns itself, as it ought to be condemned by every person who loves human right and religious liberty.

The book is issued by the Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. A. T. J.

National Reform Association.

THE above is the title of an organization that seeks a union of Church and State. Despite all their disclaimers, in their demands for changes in our Government are found embodied all those ideas that lead logically to a union of Church and State as fully as that which exists with the Mormons in Utah. The papers and the ministers of this association abound in arguments that point unmistakably to such union.

We had, during our colonial days, several examples of such union, the fruits of which we read in the hanging of Quakers, and the various civil disabilities imposed upon men whose faith was not in harmony with orthodox creeds. They could not act as jurors, could hold no office, were not allowed to testify, and had no vote. By the time our Constitution was framed, these disabilities had become so odious in the popular mind that it was determined that the separation between Church and State should be made complete, and that no religious tests should be allowed.

We often hear this omission imputed to Jefferson, who is reputed an infidel; but the

truth of history is, that the framers of that instrument were nearly all, if not quite all, believers in Christianity, and Jefferson was not in the convention, nor in this country when it was made. From the days of Constantine to that time no case could be cited in which the union of Church and State had not proven pernicious to both. Dr. Crosby has put the matter well when he says: "The moment you put religion in the hands of the Government you do what Constantine did, and will bring about the dark ruin of the tenth century." Conversely, when you put the Government under church control, the history of the Roman church in its wars and persecutions, the Inquisition of Torquemada, the fires of Smithfield, and the bloody records of witchcraft and hanging of Quakers is prophetic of what will follow. These unions have never purified politics, always have degraded religion.

We know it is claimed that the age of persecution is passed. 'Tis not so. We see around us constantly reminders that human nature is always the same—and as long as we have bigots in religion we will have the spirit of persecution that would employ fire and fagot if it dared. How often do we hear it claimed that only members of church are fit for public stations. All pains and penalties and disabilities imposed for lack of belief in dogmatic theology, whether it be by the State or by the Church, is against the genius and spirit of American institutions; and he who advocates it is disloyal to that freedom of conscience which every truly good citizen claims for himself and freely accords to others.

Man's religion is a matter wholly between the Creator and the creature; and homage is voluntary, belonging to a realm over which no human authority extends. Neither State nor Church can coerce men into piety, or subjugate individual reason. "Each soul, as to its faith, its thoughts, and affections, and the obligations which bind it to God, is as free from the rightful control of human authority as it could be if no such authority existed. This is what is meant by religious freedom; not from God's authority, but man's authority; so that each one is left to follow the dictates of his own conscience." All the rightful duty of Government in matters of religion, is to protect.

We have written these things because of the efforts being made by the National Reformers to change our Constitution, under which men enjoy full liberty of conscience, and have prospered more than another people, and because we fear Pharisees more than publicans and harlots. Better lot it be—let well enough alone, and take no steps in the direction of the conditions in the time of Constantine, Louis XIV. of France, the Commonwealth rule in England, or the Puritans in Massachusetts.—*Eaton (Ohio) Register.*

THE church has no need, no call, no business whatever, to turn farmer, tradesman, speculator, politician, distributor of prizes, comedian, cook and caterer, or anything of the kind, no matter how excellent the opportunities and how golden the prospects may appear.—*Sel.*

The Promoter of Sin.

THE author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" truly says: "All happy obedience must arise from affection, exercised toward the object obeyed. Obedience which arises from affection blesses the spirit which yields it, if the conscience approve of the object obeyed, while, on the contrary, no being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love. To obey a parent, or to obey God, from interested motives would be sin. The devil might be obeyed for the same reason. All enlightened minds agree to what the Bible confirms, and what reason can clearly perceive without argument, that love for God is essential to every act of religious duty. To tender obedience or homage to God, while we had no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature."

Than this we know of no paragraph in all literature that more clearly reveals the essential wickedness of all enforced conformity to religious duties, and therefore the wicked cruelty of all State interference in religious things. "No being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love." Therefore for Governments to compel men to conform to duty toward God while bearing in their hearts no love for him, is only to compel men to sin, because, saith the Scriptures, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." While for the State to offer inducements to men that would lead them to conform to religious duties from interested motives would also be sin. "To tender obedience or homage to God while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature." Now such is precisely what the National Reform scheme proposes to do to the people of this nation. The National Reformers propose to compel men to tender obedience and homage to God; while they have no love for him in their hearts. Therefore the direct result of the triumph of National Reform principles will be to compel men to dishonor their Maker and do violence to their own natures, and thus vastly to increase the ratio of sin in the nation and hasten its destruction.

Sentinel Tracts.

THE Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., has just issued some new tracts treating upon the subjects discussed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL which they will send, post-paid, at the rate of one cent for each eight pages. The following are the names of the tracts:—

Religious Liberty, 8 pages; National Reform is Church and State, 16 pp.; The Republic of Israel, 8 pp.; Purity of National Religion, 8 pp.; What Think Ye of Christ? 8 pp.; Religious Legislation, 8 pp.; The American Papacy, 8 pp.; National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, 16 pp.; Bold and Base Avowal, 16 pp.; National Reform Movement an Absurdity, 16 pp.; The Salem Witchcraft, 8 pp.; National Reform Constitution and the American Hierarchy, 24 pages.

One copy of each of the above excellent tracts will be put up in a neat package which will be sent post-paid to any address for 15 cents. Or eight packages for \$1.00. They can be obtained from any S. D. A. City Mission, State T. and M. Secretary, or Pacific Press Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

OUR GENERAL AGENTS.

Alabama and Mississippi—Elder C. W. Olds, 520 Sixteenth Street North, Birmingham, Ala.
Australia—Echo Publishing House, North Fitzroy, Victoria.
British Guiana—George Amsterdam, Georgetown, British Guiana, S. A.
Canada Tract Society—R. S. Owen, South Stukely, P. Q.
Colorado Tract Society—167 Clement St., Denver, Col.
Connecticut—S. L. Edwards, Middletown, Conn.
Dakota Tract Society—Vilas, Miner Co., Dakota.
Delaware and Maryland—D. C. Babcock, Frederica, Del.
District of Columbia—International Tract Society, 1881 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
England—The Present Truth, 72 Heneage St., Grimsby, Eng.
Florida Tract Society—Box 232, Jacksonville, Fla.
Georgia—Charles F. Curtis, 229 South Pryor St., Atlanta, Ga.
Hawaiian Islands—International Tract So., Honolulu, H. I.
Illinois Tract Society—3652 Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Indiana Tract Society—32 Cherry St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Iowa Tract Society—603 East Twelfth St., Des Moines, Iowa.
Kansas Tract Society— or of Fifth St. and Western Avenue, Topeka, Kan.
Kentucky Tract Society—Elsie Scott, Cecilian, Hardin Co., Ky.
Louisiana Tract Society—321 Second St., New Orleans, La.
Maine Tract Society—No. 1 Johnson St., Bangor, Me.
Michigan Tract Society—Hattie House, Sec., *Review and Herald* Office, Battle Creek, Mich.
Minnesota Tract Society—236 Lake Street E., Minneapolis, Minn.
Missouri Tract Society—2339 Chestnut St., St. Louis, Mo.
Nebraska Tract Society—1505 E. St., Lincoln, Neb.
New England—N. E. Tract Society, South Lancaster, Mass.
New York Tract Society—Box 113, Rome, N. Y.
New Zealand—International Tract Society, Turner St., off Upper Queen St., Auckland, N. Z.
North Pacific—N. P. Tract Society, Box 18, East Portland, Or.
Norway—*Sundhedsblad*, Christiania, Norway.
Nova Scotia—Elder I. E. Kimball, No. 69 North Park St., Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Ohio Tract Society—178 Warren St., Toledo, Ohio.
Pennsylvania Tract Society—5 Madison St., Wellsville, N. Y.
Switzerland—Imprimerie Polyglotte, 48 Weilerweg, Basel, Switzerland.
Tennessee Tract Society—Springville, Henry Co., Tenn.
Texas Tract Society—Mrs. Leo Gregory, Sec., Denton, Texas.
Upper Columbia—U. C. Tract Society, Mrs. L. A. Fero, Sec., Walla Walla, W. T.
Vancouver Island—Bernard Robb, Victoria, B. C.
Vermont—Lizzie A. Stone, South Lancaster, Mass.
Virginia—Jillie D. Woods, Quicksburgh, Va.
Wisconsin Tract Society—1209 Jenifer St., Madison, Wis.

THE SABBATH QUESTION

IS THE

LEADING SUBJECT OF THE DAY.

THE GREAT DEMAND OF THE HOUR, FROM THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS, IN SOCIAL CIRCLES AND IN LEGISLATIVE HALLS, IS

That the Sabbath be more strictly observed. To assist the intelligent-minded of our land to have correct views of this important question, a book has been prepared which thoroughly discusses the Sabbath institution in every conceivable phase. Such is the valuable work entitled

"History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week."

By ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

This great and exhaustive work is the result of ten years' hard labor and historical research. The book contains 548 12mo pages, and is printed in clear type, on good paper, and is well bound. Price, post-paid, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

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, Health and 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. Three months, trial subscription, for 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," ETC., ETC.

THIS is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a *Historical, Political, and Religious Standpoint.*

The Sunday Question, Modern Spiritualism, and National Reform

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE MARVEL OF NATIONS is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1887.

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

THE Bible says, "If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him; but if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him." But the National Reform doctrine is that whether one man sin against another, or whether he sin against the Lord, the judge shall judge him anyhow. The fact of the matter is that nothing can be truer than that National Reform is directly opposed to the Bible.

"DISTRICT SECRETARY" REV. M. A. GUALT says he is "proud to belong to a denomination which appropriates \$10,000 of its funds for political agitation each year." We do not doubt it in the least. But, Mr. Gault, "Pride goeth before destruction," for "Everyone that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord; though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." To the American people we say, When these proud political agitators come to you, remember that "Blessed is that man that maketh the Lord his trust, and respecteth not the proud."

IN the Cleveland National Reform Convention, 1883, the Rev. Frederick Merrick, D. D., said:—

"Given any form of government, and human nature what it is, and the temptations of office what they are, and corruption is inevitable."

Of course it is. And yet with human nature exactly as it is, and the temptations of office precisely what they are, these men actually teach that a National Reform form of government will bring the millennium. But even though the thing could last a thousand years it would only be a millennium of corruption worse corrupted. There is no danger however of there ever being a millennium of National Reform. It would be literally impossible for human society to bear for any considerable length of time the weight of corruption that would be heaped upon it by such a form of government.

THE National Reform Association proposes a Constitutional recognition of Christianity as the national religion, and to provide the church "funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field." The following words from Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, are true and most appropriate just now:—

"State recognition and State support lead inevitably to pride, bigotry, and intolerance. And this may easily pass into a divine-right consciousness that shall use the stake, the rack, the torture, to vindicate the arrogant claim, and bring protesting heretics to their

senses. Happily we are rid of all this. Let us thank God for it, and keep it so. Let us pray that that bitterest and bloodiest of all wars, a religious war, be spared us. Let us say instantly and firmly to any grasping hierarchy coveting State recognition and aiming at exclusive privilege, 'Hands off! No public money for sectarian use.' Let us keep Church and State clear of each other. It has been our glory and our peace thus far."

THE National Reformers tell us that they do not want their Constitutional Amendment until they can get it by a free vote of the people. They do not want Christian institutions and customs enforced by civil laws, until it is the will of the people that they should be so enforced. Very well, that looks mild enough, and people certainly ought not to complain of the results of laws which they themselves enact. But let us examine the case a little more closely.

What do they mean by the will of the people? Do they mean *all* the people of this land? If so, what necessity will there be for placing Christian laws and usages "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land"? If *all* the people accept Christianity of their own free will, what need of laws enforcing Christianity? At any rate, if that is just what they want, they could save time by saying nothing about laws at present. Let them exert all their energies to get men converted as soon as possible, and then when all are converted, they can introduce their scheme of a legal recognition of Christianity.

But it is not at all probable that any National Reformer would claim that they expect to get every person in favor of their scheme before they put it through. They do not expect that *all* the people will ever voluntarily accept their theories. What they mean by having the Amendment a free expression of the will of the people, is that they want a clear, working majority. In other words, they don't want the Amendment until they can have a large enough majority in favor of it to *compel* dissenters to accept it, "under all civil pains."

Unbearable Usurpation.

THUS says Prof. O. N. Stoddard, of Wooster University, Ohio, and a leading National Reformer:—

"The State must begin the cultivation of morals at the cradle's side, and continue till mature manhood and womanhood have completed the lesson."

That is to say that the State must step between the parent and the child even at the cradle side, and at the very first begin to instill into the mind of the child doctrines which the parent abhors because he knows in his heart they are false. What can the parent do? If he protests then he is separated entirely from his child, as one whose influence is contaminating and dangerous to the interests and the authority of the State.

Do not think that this statement of Professor Stoddard's is a slip of the pen, or exceptional among National Reformers. It is straight out National Reform doctrine. In

their Cincinnati Convention, 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo said:—

"But why not divide this work, and leave the moral and religious part of the education of the citizen to the parent and priest? Because you cannot hold the parent or the priest to any public responsibility to educate the child into that practical form of religion and morality essential to good citizenship in a republican State."

So therefore under National Reform rule the State must supplant the parent. And under such rule we shall be inducted into the times of Louis XIV., when parents were robbed of their children, because "The will of the king is that there be no more than one religion in this kingdom; it is for the glory of God and the well being of the State." Or the times of the Covenanter rule in Scotland, when "the preacher reprehended the husband, governed the wife, chastised the children, and insulted over the servants in the houses of the greatest men."

If there was ever a more wicked scheme devised outside of the Papal Church than is set forth in this National Reform iniquity, we know not where in all history it can be found. And to realize that such a wicked thing is today supported in its aspirations by the moral influence of "all evangelical churches" and by the active influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is astounding.

A GENTLEMAN in Indiana, who is both a lawyer and the editor of a paper, sends us a letter, from which we take the following extract:—

"I have just finished reading the May number of the SENTINEL. I like it very much. It seems to oppose the National Reform nonsense as a Christian should, and not as an infidel would. I dislike the so-called reform, because I think it dishonors my Saviour, not because I don't believe in him. Whatever dishonors Christ, brings misery to men. I like your arguments, and wish you great success. Many ministers in my church are carried away with this heresy, and are injuring their usefulness. My church is the United Presbyterian; it is near of kin to the Covenanters."

Our friend has the right idea of National Reform, and he has hit exactly upon the secret of the SENTINEL's opposition to it. May there be many like him, not only among the United Presbyterians, but among the Covenanters themselves. No one who truly desires to honor the Lord Jesus, will wish to see his religion degraded to the level of politics, nor to have national acknowledgment of Christ secured by the help of the votes of selfish and worldly 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 subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 1887.

NUMBER 8.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } - - - - - EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

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

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

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

Convicted on Their Own Testimony.

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

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

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

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

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The church was now secure. She had

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Superficial Criticisms.

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

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

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

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

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

While we cannot draw a parallel between

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

Speaking of our positions, he says:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL REFORMERS CONDEMNED BY WEBSTER.

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

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

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

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

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

Webster also says:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

Civil or Religious, Which?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thus says Mr. Crafts:—

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

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

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

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

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

A. T. J.

Church and State.

EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT FOR THEIR ALLIANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"In what way?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Evils of National Religion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sunday Prohibition.

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

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

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

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

BIBLE-READINGS.

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

By ELD. E. J. WAGGONER.

THESE Readings were prepared especially for the use of 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:—

	No. Ques.		No. Ques.
Daniel 2	63	The Law of God, No. 4	32
Daniel 7	63	" " " 5	31
Daniel 8	60	Ephesians 2:15	26
Daniel 9	64	Romans 6:14	23
The Sanctuary	170	Romans 10:4	17
The Law of God, No. 1	80	Galatians 3:13	19
" " 2	81	Romans 3:20	10
" " 3	23	Tithing	99

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

	No. Ques.		No. Ques.
The Sabbath, No. 1	51	2 Corinthians 5:8	18
" " 2	49	Luke 23:39-43	16
" " 3	42	1 Peter 3:18-20	10
Colossians 2:14-17	19	Luke 16:19-31	37
Psalms 118:24	13	Living Souls	14
Penalty of Transgression	10	Nature of Man	18
Sanctification	43	Punishment of the Wicked	70
Second Coming of Christ	64	Work of the Spirit, No. 1	47
The Resurrection	59	" " 2	51
Immortality	18	Church Membership	61
Philippians 1:23	5	Missionary Labor	52

Price for the Two, 50 Cents. Address: PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN

DURING THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE SABBATH QUESTION

IS THE LEADING SUBJECT OF THE DAY.

THE GREAT DEMAND OF THE HOUR, FROM THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS, IN SOCIAL CIRCLES AND IN LEGISLATIVE HALLS, IS

That the Sabbath be more strictly observed. To assist the intelligent-minded of our land to have correct views of this important question, a book has been prepared which thoroughly discusses the Sabbath institution in every conceivable phase. Such is the valuable work entitled

"History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week."

By ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

This great and exhaustive work is the result of ten years' hard labor and historical research. The book contains 548 12mo pages, and is printed in clear type, on good paper, and is well bound. Price, post-paid, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE,

HEALDSBURG, CAL.

A MODEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, ESTABLISHED IN 1882.

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

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

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

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

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

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

W. C. GRAINGER, Healdsburg, Cal.

THE MINISTRATION OF ANGELS.

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 1887.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We do not say that its hopes are well

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

Religion and Politics.

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

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

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

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

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Bound to Succeed.

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

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

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

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

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

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 9.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

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

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

A Principle to Be Remembered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W!

A "Virtual Theocracy" Promised.

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

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

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

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

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

E. J. W.

Sunday Laws and Liberty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Rabbi proposed "a compromise be-

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

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

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

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

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

Again:—

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

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

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

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

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

"In California this oligarchy of foreign

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. T. J.

Church and State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A REFORMER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the same article we read:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some Facts about National Reform.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore the sum of all this matter is—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As to a Religious War.

A CORRESPONDENT asks the following questions:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLAIN FACTS FOR OLD AND YOUNG

—EMBRACING—

NATURAL HISTORY AND HYGIENE OF ORGANIC LIFE.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

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

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED,

CONTAINING OVER 600 OCTAVO PAGES.

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

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

Sex in Living Forms—Reproduction—Sexual Hygiene—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, Oakland, Cal. General Agents for the West.

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS.

BY J. M. HUTCHINGS.

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

MARVELOUS GRANDEUR KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

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

BEAUTIFUL FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH.

BY J. W. MORTON.

FORMER MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO HAWAII.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MODERN SPIRITUALISM

ITS NATURE AND TENDENCY.

By ELDER J. H. WAGGONER.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

BIBLE SANCTIFICATION:

A CONTRAST OF TRUE AND FALSE THEORIES.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE.

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

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

By U. SMITH.

AUTHOR OF "SMITH'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES," ETC., ETC.

THIS is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a *Historical, Political, and Religious Standpoint*.

The *Sunday Question*, *Modern Spiritualism*, and *National Reform*

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE MARVEL OF NATIONS is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

By ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.

THIS WORK CONTAINS A MINE OF INFORMATION.

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

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1887.

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

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

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

Puritan "Rights."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, too, they are opposed to compelling

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

Not a Godless Nation?—Why Not?

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

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

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

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1887.

NUMBER 10.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL.

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } - - - - - EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

Prussia at the Pope's Feet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Throne of David.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Christian Liberty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not "A Daniel Come to Judgment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Church and State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The "Christian Cynosure" Again.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Again the *Cynosure* editor avows:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. T. J.

National Reform and Woman's Christian Temperance Union Assembly.

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

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

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

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

The Rev. M. A. Gault's "Talk on Bible Politics" given at 4 o'clock, in a hall called Bradley Temple, was mainly an effort to prove a similarity between the Jewish State and our Government, and to show that some of our principal laws are nothing but adaptations and modifications of laws given by Moses. The speaker held strongly that the moral law, the decalogue, is still binding upon mankind, and should be enforced upon the people by the State. And, in fact, these statements were repeated time and again by other speakers, so that if we had not known just the object of this movement, we might have thought ourselves in the midst of a people that wished to magnify the law and of such honorable, a people that especially treasure the commandments of God and the 3^d of Jesus. And here we apprehend will upon the secret of their success. A direct appeal to the moral law, the ten commandments, has still a deciding influence upon the minds of a great many professed Christians who do not see that the enforcement of moral precepts is beyond the power of civil governments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS.

BY J. M. HUTCHINGS.

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

MARVELOUS GRANDEUR KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

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

BEAUTIFUL FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

DIPHTHERIA:

ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

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

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

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1887.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AN exchange says:—

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

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

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

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

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 11.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL.

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } - - - - - EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

A Sound Opinion.

We don't suppose that one reader in ten in this country has the least idea of the progress National Reform is making in the United States. These National Reformers propose amending the Constitution of the United States so as to make this a “Christian Government.” The Prohibitionists of nearly every State in the Union have in some way committed themselves to this reform. Many ministers in nearly every denomination are working earnestly for it. It is a kind of religion that is well adapted to the gushing, unstable, and illiterate religion of the time. Professors who are strangers to the spirituality of Christianity, very naturally call to their aid the civil law. They must have power in their religion, and not having the power of the Spirit, being ignorant of it, they readily accept the aid of the strong arm of the law. The masses of the people have never thought of the question and are indifferent about it. If a vote is taken on the question before the people investigate it, it will carry, for the people generally think it makes no difference, and many would vote for it just to please professed Christians. But it is the greatest heresy of the world.—*Rushville (Ind.) Jacksonian.*

THE New York *Observer* complains that “Sunday newspapers have done more than all other influences combined to destroy the popular reverence for the Sabbath.” And then almost in the same breath *naively* states that “during the summer season thousands of nominal Christians will find the Sunday newspaper where they will fail to find a place of worship or the hour of prayer.” Therefore abolish the Sunday newspaper without delay. By all means take away at once all opportunity for these very excellent nominal Christians to do wrong, so that they may all become real strong, vigorous Christians (?) by doing right because they have no chance to do otherwise. The Sunday newspaper may be a very wicked thing, but how much more wicked it is than the professed Christian who would rather read it than to go to worship or to prayer, perhaps the *Observer* can decide. We can't.

A Monstrous Bid.

WE have several times shown the declared purpose of the National Reform Association to “gladly join hands” with the Catholic Church, and to co-operate with the Roman Catholics in any way that they may choose, in carrying to success the National Reform scheme. But, although the National Reformers have for several years thus held themselves in readiness, they have not till now made any distinct official advances to gain the Papal co-operation. Now, however, they have decided on a course that can scarcely fail to win the so much, and so long, coveted assistance of the Papacy. This was the outcome, and the only immediately practical one, of the Saratoga National Reform meeting, August 15-17.

The main question there discussed was the question of religion in the public schools, under the heading of “Secularism in Education.” Mr. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and Corresponding Secretary of the National Reform Association, opened the discussion.

“The speaker argued against the secular programme: 1. That it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics or conciliate them to our school system. Their special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious worship and instruction from the schools only gives color to the charge.”

So, then, the public-school system of the United States must be revolutionized because “it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics.” That the Roman Catholics may be conciliated, and “their special outcry” stopped, “religious worship” and religious “instruction” must be forced into the public schools. As, therefore, the movement is, first of all, specially to satisfy the Roman Catholics, it would logically follow that the “religious worship and instruction” that would be conducted and given in the public schools, under the National Reform regime, would be such as should specially satisfy the Roman Catholics. And for once in its history the course of the National Reform Association is strictly logical; for in the course of the discussion, Rev. S. V. Leech, D. D., of Saratoga, who has been for seven years chaplain of the New York Senate, asked the Corresponding Secretary to state how National Reformers would answer this argument:—

“If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay version [the Catholic Bible] in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?”

“The Corresponding Secretary” answered,—
“WE WOULDN'T OBJECT.”

The National Reformers “wouldn't object!” They “wouldn't object” to a majority of Roman Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands of the children of Protestants and other non-Catholics, in the public schools! They “wouldn't object” to twenty Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands, and the Catholic worship upon the minds, of the children of nineteen non-Catholics in the public schools!

Therefore, let it forever be borne in mind that the aim of the National Reformers is, by amendment of the National Constitution, to put it into the power of the Roman Catholics, wherever they may be in the majority, to force the Roman Catholic “worship and instruction” into the minds of the children of non-Catholics, in the public schools. And let it also forever be borne in mind, that the Rev. Herrick Johnson, D. D., of Chicago, was chairman of the meeting in which this wicked thing, this religious tyranny, was proposed and indorsed; and that Joseph Cook, of Boston, took an active part in the same conference.

Then, as though realizing the effect of his unqualified answer, the Corresponding Secretary attempted to guard his answer, and to deaden its effect, by saying:—

“We would be glad to see Roman Catholics putting the Bible, in any version, into the hands of their children.”

“Into the hands of their children,” so should we. But that was not the question, Mr. Stevenson, nor is that point involved in the question. The question was *not*, Shall the Roman Catholic put the Douay version into the hands of his children? But it *was*, Shall he put that Catholic version into the hands of my children? You said the National Reformers “wouldn't object” to it. But I do most decidedly object. There was no such question asked as, Shall the majority of Roman Catholics put the Catholic Bible or any other Bible, “into the hands of their children”? But the question *was*, Shall the Roman Catholics, when in the majority, put the Catholic Bible into the hands of our children? You said the National Reformers would not object to it. But, Mr. Stevenson, we do most decidedly object to their doing so; and we object to your National Reform scheme of putting it into their power to do so. Your “glozing” argument, Mr. Stevenson, is entirely foreign to the question; yet it is valuable in that it shows how readily, and how perfectly, the National Reformers adapt themselves to the

crafty ways of the Jesuitical system whose alliance they so deeply crave. Yet, although we should be as glad as anybody to see the Roman Catholics putting the Bible into the hands of *their* children, even then we most decidedly object to their doing it in the public schools and at public expense.

But the Corresponding Secretary goes on:—

"This is not a question of versions, but of the right of the word of God to a place at all in the public schools. Prof. Tayler Lewis once wrote two valuable articles on the theme, 'The One Bible,' in which he maintained that no body of Catholic scholars, in the face of the scholarly world, would deny that King James's version is a real version of the Holy Scriptures, while Protestant scholarship cheerfully admits the same of the Douay Bible. There are not a half a dozen passages in it which even seem to inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine. It is a Latinized version rather than Anglo-Saxon, far less plain than ours, but it is a version."

Exactly what Mr. Stevenson means by the phrase "distinctively Roman doctrine" we cannot say, because the popular Protestantism of the day is making so many compromises with Romanism that it is difficult to tell just what is distinctively Roman doctrine. But we here quote one verse from the Douay version, and ask the non-Catholic people of this country whether this is not enough distinctively Roman in doctrine to distinctively condemn the National Reformers in their proposal to give the Catholics power to teach such stuff in the public schools of this Nation. We quote Hebrews 11:21, which in the Douay version reads thus:—

"By faith Jacob dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod."

To *adore*, is "to worship with profound reverence; to pay divine honors to; to honor as a god."—*Webster*. Therefore the Douay version distinctly inculcates the doctrine that Jacob worshiped with profound reverence the top of his rod; that he paid divine honors to, that he honored as a god, the top of his rod. And this is the version of the Bible which the National Reformers "wouldn't object" to have a majority of Catholics by law to put into the hands of the children of a minority of non-Catholics. This is the doctrine which the National Reformers propose, by constitutional amendment, to empower a majority of Roman Catholics in any school district of the United States, to teach to the children of non-Catholics. Therefore, if National Reform succeeds, what is to hinder the Roman Catholic majority from teaching your children and mine to adore the top of the priest's rod, in the public schools? For what is the Bible to be taught for in the public schools if it is not to be obeyed in the public schools? And if the Catholic Bible is to be taught in the public schools where the Catholics are a majority, then is not the Catholic Bible to be obeyed in such schools? As the National Reformers propose to have "religious *worship*" as well as religious instruction in the public schools; as they propose to have Catholic worship and instruction in the Catholic Bible in the schools where Catholics are in the majority; and as the Catholic Bible says that Jacob

"adored the top of his rod," "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith"—then why should not the children in those schools adore the top of the priest's rod, "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom," whose vicegerent on earth the Pope is, and also "as an instance and argument of *their* faith"? Who can prevent it, when once the Roman Catholics are empowered by constitutional amendment to do so?

How long shall it be before the American people will awake to the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement?

Whether, according to Mr. Stevenson's idea, this passage is one of the less than half a dozen passages which inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine, we know not, but we do know that it inculcates distinctively *idolatrious* doctrine. But even then that is not the primary question involved here. Whether there be in the Douay version a half dozen such passages, or one such passage, or none at all, the principle is the same. And it is the *principle* upon which we stand. That principle is that the Catholic majority has just as much right to force the Catholic Bible, and the Catholic instruction, and the Catholic worship, upon the non-Catholic minority in the public schools as the Protestant majority has to force the Protestant Bible and the Protestant instruction, and the Protestant worship, upon the non-Protestant minority in the public schools. And that is but to say that there is no right at all on either side of the question, nor in the question anywhere. And this only illustrates the principle that neither the Bible, nor religious instruction, nor religious worship, can of right have any place in the public schools of the United States Government, or of any other civil government on earth. We have cited the above passage from the Douay version, and made the argument upon it, only to make more clearly apparent the justice of the principle, and not because we think that the Catholics have any less right in the matter than Protestants have.

But is there any prospect of the National Reformers succeeding in this project? There is decidedly a favorable prospect of it, and therein lies the danger. It must always be borne in mind that the phrase National Reform Association embraces all the "evangelical" churches, the Prohibition Party, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Now all this force, allied with the Catholic Church, and increasing its strength by the support of the professional politicians whom it can influence, can carry their issue at the polls as soon as they can bring the matter to a vote. The only question that remains an open one is, Can they gain the alliance of the Catholic Church? With a few more such bids as this one made by the Saratoga meeting, we are sure they can, even if they do not by this one. To set forth the matter a little more fully, let us size up the proportions of the bid that was made at Saratoga.

First, they said in substance that the Douay version and King James's version of the Script-

ures are the one Bible; that the Catholic Bible is just as nearly the true word of God as is the Protestant Bible; and that the great question is not one of versions, but of the right to this word of God to a place in the public schools, while the question of versions is a secondary matter, to be decided after the main question has been decided.

Secondly, they declared that wherever the Catholics are in the majority, they may put the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools.

Now let us suppose that the Catholic Church accepts the bid, what would be the result? By this alliance the National Reform Party can carry a constitutional amendment, declaring that the Bible shall forever have a place in the instruction of the public schools of this Nation. Thus that question will be fixed, and whether the Bible and its instruction shall be in the schools, would be no more a matter of controversy. The only question then remaining will be, What Bible? And by the main question already decided, this question will be reduced to very narrow limits. It will be only a question between Catholics and Protestants. Because so far as the non-religionists are concerned, the question is already decided that the Bible shall be in the schools; and to the man who cares nothing particularly about the Bible or its instruction, it will make not a particle of difference what Bible is in the schools; and this indifference will be justified and emphasized by the National Reform Protestant concession, already made, that there is no difference. Therefore the question of, What Bible? being solely one between Catholics and Protestants, what would be the result? Here are some figures from the census of 1880.

In	Catholics.	Protestants of all classes.
California,	216,000.	52,621.
Louisiana,	280,000.	100,223.
Massachusetts,	500,000.	253,397.
Wisconsin,	306,000.	189,844.
Minnesota,	139,500.	118,627.
New York,	1,210,000.	771,171.
Connecticut,	175,000.	131,450.
Rhode Island,	96,000.	37,150.
Colorado,	28,000.	14,992.
Nevada,	5,000.	2,117.
Washington Ter.,	12,000.	6,023.
Montana,	16,450.	1,896.
Arizona,	42,000.	141.
New Mexico,	121,000.	290.

Therefore, if the Catholic Church should accept the Saratoga National Reform bid for her alliance, and the question of the Bible and religious instruction in the public schools were decided to-morrow, or next year, or at any other time, the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, could be established in all the public schools of these ten States and four Territories.

Nor did the Saratoga meeting stop with this. Read the following from the official record of the proceedings:—

"REV. DR. PRICE, of Tennessee: 'I wish to ask the Secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *consensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools as they do in Massachusetts?'

"THE SECRETARY: 'I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.'

"DR. PRICE: 'I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference, to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible.'

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

We believe it is not only possible but probable, for very opportunely with this action of the National Reformers at Saratoga, there came from the Pope to the Catholic prelates assembled at Baltimore to discuss the plans of the new Catholic University at the capital of the Nation, the following:—

"The unlimited license of thought and writing, to which erroneous notions concerning both divine and human things have given rise, not only in Europe but also in your country, has been the root and source of unbridled opinions, while, on the other hand, with religion banished to a great extent from the schools, wicked men strive by craft and fallacious wisdom to extinguish the light of faith in the minds of the young, and to enkindle there the flames of irreligion. Wherefore it is necessary that youth be nourished more carefully with sound doctrine, and that these young men especially, who are being educated for the church, should be fully armed to fit them for the task of defending the Catholic truth. We therefore most gladly welcome and heartily approve your project for the erection of a university, moved as you are by a desire to promote the welfare of all and the interests of your illustrious republic."

Now when the National Reform Association, to gain the religio-political alliance of Rome, goes as "requested" to these Roman Catholic authorities, carrying in its hands the concession that the Catholic Bible is as nearly the word of God as is the Protestant Bible, that they are virtually all one; and also carrying in its hands the public schools of ten States and four Territories of this Union, to be delivered over bodily to the religious rule of Rome—*will the Romish Church accept the bid?* We fear she will. But whether she will or not, we call it a MONSTROUS BID. And if she does not, we are sure the National Reformers will increase the bid, and will keep on increasing it till she does accept it.

And what are you going to do about it?

A. T. J.

THE National Reform Association will have to look out for itself; we have received a paper printed at Buffalo, N. Y., entitled the *National Reformer*, the organ of what it proposes to call the "National Reform Party." Its platform is not exactly that of the original simon-pure National Reform party. It seems to be kind of half-and-half; in some things it seems to incline toward the original, but it declares that "the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed," and this is political atheism in the eyes of the regular National Reformers. It may be that the regular National Reform Association will swing this new party into its train, as it has the "evangelical" churches, the W. C. T. U.,

Prohibition, and as it proposes to do with the Workingmen, the Catholics, and everything else. We rather expect that it will. It will have to do something, or else there will be a serious clash of voices and aims, with both parties running under the same name. However, as "District Secretary" M. A. Gault is an adept in dealing with "clashing voices," we have no doubt that he can bring this matter out all straight. We hope he will try, for the SENTINEL expects to have something to say about the regular, original National Reformers, and we don't want to be misunderstood.

What Was the Point?

IN the *Christian Statesman's* report of the Ohio Prohibition Convention we find the following item:—

"John B. Finch brought down the house when, with allusion to Governor Foraker's prompt invocation of the power of the courts a fortnight ago to forbid the return of the rebel flags, he inquired why the Governor, when it was first proposed in the Ohio General Assembly two years ago to repeal the Sabbath law, did not instantly telegraph to the bishops of the M. E. Church to serve out an injunction, etc. The audience saw the point, and cheered till they were tired, and then renewed the applause, with fluttering handkerchiefs, high lifted fans, and straw hats in profusion."

Just exactly what the point was which the audience saw in this and cheered so lustily, we cannot imagine. Is it possible that Mr. John B. Finch meant that Governor Foraker *should* have telegraphed to the bishops of the M. E. Church to serve an injunction against the repeal of the Sabbath law? and is that the "point" that the audience saw and cheered till they were tired? Did Mr. Finch mean to convey the idea that the bishops of the M. E. Church have, or ought to have, power to serve injunctions upon the civil authorities of the State of Ohio? and is that the "point" which was applauded with handkerchiefs, fans, and straw hats, in such vociferous profusion? Or, above all, did he mean to imply that either the body of bishops of the M. E. Church, or any other earthly power, has, or ought to have, the right to serve an injunction upon the legislative power of the State of Ohio? and is that the "point" (?) over which the convention went so wild? If it is, the idea is certainly wild enough in itself to justify even the wild demonstrations so admirably described in the report.

There is, however, that about the affair which serves to perfectly illustrate the real point which we are now emphasizing in the SENTINEL, that all legislation enforcing the observance of the Sabbath is essentially religious legislation. Else why should it be thought the proper thing for a governor to do to call upon a board of bishops to serve an injunction against any legislation adverse to its compulsory observance? The point is that Sunday laws cannot be separated from religious legislation. Perhaps that is the point that the convention saw in Mr. Finch's speech, and which they so heartily cheered. Church and State ideas are becoming very popular now in Prohibition conventions.

The Bible in the Public Schools.

IN the June number of the SENTINEL there was an article in which the following sentence occurred: "To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public school seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous." To this statement a good friend of the SENTINEL took exception, thinking that it argued a lack of appreciation of the Bible. Although our private explanation of the matter was satisfactory to him, we propose to consider the subject somewhat in detail, for the benefit of others who may think that loyalty to the word of God demands that its study be maintained in the public schools.

In the first place we will say that we yield to none in reverence for the Bible. We believe it to be the inspired word of God, and that it is "true from the beginning." As an educator it is invaluable. We believe that if the Bible is rightly studied, a man can get a better education from it alone than from any other book that was ever printed. He would have a better disciplined mind and would be better fitted for society and business, than he could be by studying any other book ever written. Take all the eulogies of the Bible that have ever been written or spoken, and it may still be said that "the half has not been told." And still we hold that it is a great mistake for Christians to insist upon the Bible being used as a text-book in the public schools. Our reasons are these:—

The Bible is not an ordinary text-book. It is not a book to be studied as an arithmetic, beginning at the first page and mastering it point by point until the end is reached. It is not a book of logic, nor a book of science, although it is logical, and is scientifically exact, and is the basis of all true science. But it is primarily and solely a book of morals. It is true that there is no other book in the world the study of which will so admirably discipline the mind as will the Bible; and it is for this reason that many think the Bible should be used as a text-book in the public schools. But such ones forget that the disciplinary effects of the Bible are not obtained when it is studied for that purpose alone, as people study geometry or read the orations of Cicero, but that the discipline of mind from the study of the Bible comes only when it is studied with a view of carrying out its precepts in the daily life.

Proof of this is found in the following texts: Ps. 111:10: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." Deut. 4:5, 6: "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. *Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.*" The Bible is like no other book that was ever written. Its language is

simple and may be understood by the common people, yet it withholds its treasures from the most learned if they do not study it with reverent hearts. The one who studies it with no thought of its value as an educator of the mind, but solely to know what is the will of God, will find his mind expanded so that he can better comprehend affairs of every-day life; while the one who attempts to study it in the same manner and with the same spirit as he would study some secular author, will not derive any material benefit.

The sum of all this is, that the Bible is a book whose sole object is to teach men the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. Now what is the public school? It is an institution of the State; it is supported by the State, and all those connected with the public-school system are in the employ of the civil government. They are, if you please, officers of the State. Therefore if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it will be simply the State teaching religion. The State will have to determine what views of the Bible shall be taught; for, let it be remembered, the Bible is not like mathematics, which is a fixed science, and concerning which there cannot possibly be a difference of opinion; but it affords opportunity for much variety of opinion. This is not because the Bible is so obscure that people cannot see alike, but because God has ordained that man shall be a free agent in matters of morals. And here is where the danger comes in, for if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it must be taught in accordance with some system, and whatever theories may be taught, somebody's conscience is sure to be outraged.

For example, there are many sincere Christians who believe that immersion is the only true baptism, while others conscientiously hold that sprinkling is baptism, and that infants should receive the ordinance. Most people believe that man has the principle of immortality by nature, while many believe that immortality is given only to those who believe in Christ, and they hold that any contrary teaching robs Christ of his chief glory. One person believes in the perpetuity and universal obligation of the ten commandments, while another believes that they were only for the Jews, and are now abolished. One man is a Unitarian and his neighbor is a Trinitarian, and so on. It is not within our province to say which of these views are right and which are wrong. It is sufficient that each one believes his own view to be the correct one, and does not wish to have his children taught a contrary view; neither does he wish to have the money which he pays as taxes to support the school, used in propagating doctrines which he holds to be vital errors.

So we say that Christians themselves should not merely refrain from insisting that the Bible be used in the public schools, but should rather insist that it be kept out. There is indeed danger in having it placed there, for when that is done somebody's religious convictions are sure to be trampled upon. It is of the very essence of Church and State union to have the Bible taught in the public schools,

for that would be nothing else but the State teaching religion; and the standard of the religion taught would be the opinions of the majority. Let each professed Christian who thinks that it is little less than sacrilege to say that the Bible ought not to be taught in the public schools, consider the matter seriously. He will find that what he wants and expects is that *his views* of the Bible shall be taught. But he has no warrant that this will be the case. It will not be the case unless he chances to be among the majority, and in that case he is helping to outrage the conscience of some other man. The simple fact is this: If the State adopts the Bible as a textbook in its schools, then it must decide how it shall be taught, or, in other words, must fix a standard of religion.

But suppose that all Christians were agreed concerning the principal points of Bible doctrines; they are not the ones who are to be considered. The public schools are for the public, and among the people there will be many who do not accept the Bible at all. What shall be done in their case? Here is the answer that Pastor Joshua Denovan gives in an article on, "The Bible in the Public Schools," which appeared in the *Faithful Witness*, of Toronto, Canada:—

"Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of man, in Britain and the United States, can't be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all."

And again, speaking of the consciences of such men, he says: "Such consciences are peculiar—abnormally unique—and their owners must suffer for conscience' sake."

The *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, contains a reprint of the article in which these words occur, and the editor called special attention to it as a "masterly article." Such sentiments are in keeping with National Reform ideas of the gospel, but they are as different from the gospel of Jesus Christ as night is from day. The gospel knows nothing of compulsion; "*Whosoever will*, let him come," is its gracious call. The use of force in connection with matters of religion was conceived and is fostered only by the prince of darkness, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." An infidel is a man, and, as such, he is entitled to the same rights and privileges in a human ("belonging to man or mankind") government that his Christian neighbor is, who is only a man. He may be and should be invited and urged to accept the Bible as the revealed will of his Creator, but so long as it would be wrong to compel a Christian to help support schools which should teach views of the Bible which he cannot conscientiously adopt, so long will it be wrong to compel unbelievers to support schools for the teaching of religion.

How, then, can the youth of Christian parents receive the Biblical instruction which their parents desire them to have? Let their parents instruct them at home, as is their duty. To the parent, and to the parent alone, has

God intrusted the moral and religious instruction of children. The divine command is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6:5-7.

If any number of parents who are of the same faith wish to send their children to a school where they can study the Bible to better advantage than they can at home, they may combine and form a denominational school, which is independent of State patronage, and to the support of which none need contribute except those who believe in the principles taught. Such schools are on the same footing as the various religious denominations themselves. The religious instruction is private, because it is supported by the private, voluntary contributions of those who favor the views taught by any given denomination; it is public only in the sense that anybody who wishes is privileged to come. This is all that anybody should desire; whatsoever is more than this, cometh of evil. E. J. W.

A PREACHER ON SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

THE following ringing words from the Rev. Bird Wilkins, pastor of Bethesda Baptist Church, Chicago, are of a sort that is too seldom heard nowadays. If the whole Protestant Church should take this position, she would have no need to seek political aid to make her power felt.

It is no advantage to the religion of Christ or his church that laws are being enacted at our State capital, looking to a strict observance of Sunday as a holy day. That is what it means. It is church legislation. Whenever and wherever the church has entered the halls of legislation, she has left her power outside. She, upon entering the political arena, lays aside her robes of victory. She may have a majority, and thus carry her point, but I tell you it is contrary to the genius of the gospel of Christ. He did not leave us the political sword with which to set up his kingdom in the hearts and lives of men.

I tell you, the United States herself will lose her robes of honor whenever she puts religion into her statute-books. Whenever Jesus is to appeal to Blackstone, then will Jesus become a politician; then will come to pass the attempt to force men to bear the mark of the beast. I am not ready to see the church scrambling amidst the political corruptions of the day to have laws passed for the preservation of her holy days. Whenever I think the religion of love given by Jesus needs the arm of the State to support it or protect it I will renounce it. Whenever I believe the Baptist Church covets secular power to save her holy days, I will be Baptist no more. It is a declaration of weakness on

our part to ask such legislation, and suicidal to rejoice over it. Say it is not religious intolerance if you choose, but I know it is, and you know it is.

To indorse these Sunday laws as a church is to indorse or to approve one of the festivals of the ancient sun-god, and an edict of a Pope of Rome. And how our Protestant divines, and Baptist ministers, especially such men as Dr. P. S. Henson, of this city, and Dr. Fulton, of Brooklyn,—I say, how these brethren can defend a law that attempts to consecrate a day which is made holy by the decree of a heathen idolater, I do not understand, nor can they explain it. I do not oppose these Sunday laws, however, on account of their origin, but because I do not want to see the church creeds put into our law books. No, not a single line of any creed do I want to see there. And I think the larger number of candid-minded people in this country, upon sober second thought, will follow the example of California in this matter, should such laws be enacted here, and repeal them.—*Selected.*

Religious Exercises in State Schools.

IN May, 1885, the Secretary of State at Washington officially rebuked the Austrian Government for declining to receive our appointed minister because his wife was a Jewess. In the letter of censure he says: "Religious liberty is the chief corner-stone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter, and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws."

This is the boast of America. Moreover, religious liberty is her own contribution to the science of government. For, until ours were formed, there had never been a government in Christendom which was not a crude alloy of the gold of Christianity with the iron of civil power. The reformers did not reform the adulterous union of Church and State. There is not a creed or a confession of faith framed by them that does not give to the civil magistrate coercive authority in religion. The proclamation of religious liberty attracted to America the exiles of every land.

Yet the dissenters who sought freedom here would hardly permit dissent. William Penn established "free soil for Christianity" only. Lord Baltimore tolerated only theists, and allowed only Christians in office. The charter of Roger Williams proposed to propagate Christianity, and under it Jews were denied citizenship. Still, it is the glory of Rhode Island that, for a century and a half before the Federal Constitution, she maintained a system of religious liberty which was, of all that the world had ever seen, the nearest to perfection.

The sovereign Convention of Virginia framed and adopted unanimously, June 12, 1776, the famous Bill of Rights. This enactment, far surpassing *Magna Charta*, laid the foundation of all American government, both State and Federal. Sections 15 and 16 read as follows:—

"No free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by

a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

"Religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and it is the duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other."

Mr. Jefferson, as one of the committee to revise the laws of Virginia, wrote the "Act to Establish Religious Freedom," which was passed December 16, 1785. From the original text of the long and grand preamble we quote a few select clauses:—

"Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain, by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; 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 of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, but to extend its influence by reason alone; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagations of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of liberty; that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction:

"We, the General Assembly, do enact, 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 we do declare that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right."

The Constitution of the United States, as originally adopted in September, 1787, contained no guarantee of religious liberty. The only reference to the subject was in Section 3, Article 6, in these words: "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." But the First Amendment, which was proposed by Virginia and adopted because of her insistence, explicitly declares: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And so the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner. Thus perfected, the Federal Constitution was ratified by all the then existing States, and to-day every State, old and new, has a similar provision in its own organic law. So it is that "religious liberty is the chief corner-stone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter, and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws."

It is very evident, in the light of these well-known facts, that any religious exercise whatever in a State school is a violation of religious liberty; for it is essentially of the nature of a religious establishment, consisting of religious observance ordained by civil law, and conducted by a ministry whose pay is furnished by general taxation. Religious instruction is necessarily sectarian; for, though the law may not prescribe the doctrine, yet if it prescribe or even permit a teaching, it gives its sanction to what is taught, and thereby maintains a certain, yet very uncertain, form of doctrine. It is impossible for any instructor in religious matters to teach what will be approved by all; his teaching will inevitably be colored by his own adopted views. Thus, in many of our State schools we have a sectarian establishment, and citizens are taxed to sustain religious observances which in conscience they disapprove.

The sort of horizontal reduction enacted in some States, that the Bible be read without comment, is a concession that is a confession. Shall the Pedobaptist be forbidden to enlarge on household baptism? That were hard. But what is the Bible? Does it exclude the Apocrypha? The Romanist says, No. Does it include the New Testament? The Jew says, No. The concession stops short of justice.

But, says some shallow casuist, education with us is not compulsory; the objector need not patronize the public schools. It is sufficient to reply that the question is not concerning patronage, but concerning taxation. Yet observe; by ordering the school so that the objector cannot in conscience patronize it, you rob him of the share in free education to which his tax entitles him. Equally shallow is the proposition to make the religious exercises elective. Then, indeed, the objector, availing himself of the other courses alone, may get all that he wants, for himself or his children, free and untainted. But the crying fact remains; the spot that will not out. He is taxed to maintain a teaching for others which he believes to be false and injurious.

We, the great majority, enact; they, the small minority, must submit. And so, the tax. We, the wise and powerful majority, are orthodox, no doubt; they, the foolish and weak minority, are guilty of shocking heresy, no doubt. Then why not also the rack? To the chivalric and the just, the feeble are sacred. And therefore our fathers proclaimed religious liberty, made it organic law, imbedded it in State and Federal Constitutions. What is a Constitution but an ægis of the minority to shield them from the tyranny of the majority? Only within its provisions may the majority rightly overrule. Nevertheless, we, the boastful heirs of a freedom which proclaims that there shall be no religious observance established by law, go about, and establish a religious observance by law.

Oh! that some Hampden would arise in this far nobler cause, and resist, even to imprisonment, an impious impost, and bring the Supreme Court to pronounce upon the constitutionality of a law imposing a tax in support of

religious teaching. Were the law to give its sanction to the teaching of "the priestly power of the keys," or even of "the new theology," and lay a tax in support of it, I fancy there would beat once on hand a host of Hampdens. Then, indeed, we should see very clearly that "the opinions of men are not the object of civil government," and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical."—*Judge Noah K. Davis, in Forum, February, 1887.*

The National Reform Head.

At the Lakeside National Reform Convention, the following question was asked:—

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

The question was answered by both Dr. McAllister and "Secretary" Coleman. Dr. McAllister's answer we shall notice at another time. Mr. Coleman's answer was this:—

"It is true our movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body."

It is so seldom that we find a National Reform expression with which we can agree heartily, unreservedly, and without any if's or but's, that we hasten to give to this statement our unqualified indorsement. We perfectly agree with it. It is true. It is as full of truth as an egg is full of meat. The National Reform movement in the past, and from its very beginning, has had a great deal more head than body. We not only perfectly agree with Mr. Coleman's statement, and give it our unqualified indorsement, but we feel disposed just now, for the sake of the cause, to emphasize the fact somewhat by giving some proofs in its support.

It is well known that the National Reform Association has had for years, and has now, a string of vice-presidents numbering about one hundred and twenty—this year they number one hundred and twenty-two. Those who have ever seen the list know that, with but two exceptions, it is made up of titled names to the fullest extent that titles can be obtained; such as Rev.; Rev. D. D.; and Rev. D. D. LL.D.: Right Rev. D. D.: and Right Rev. D. D. LL.D.: Rev. Bishop; Rev. D. D. Bishop; and Right Rev. D. D. Bishop: Rev. Professor; and Rev. D. D. Professor: Rev. President; and Rev. D. D. President: President D. D.; President D. D. LL.D.; President Ph. D. LL.D.; and President W. C. T. U.: Hon.; Hon. Ex-Governor; and His Excellency Governor: Col.; Brev't Brig.-Gen.; etc., etc., *ad nauseam*.

All this is generally known, but it is not generally known that *nobody knows whether the one-half of these people are in favor of National Reform or not.* The National Reformers themselves do not know whether all the men whose names they publish as vice-presidents, are in favor of National Reform or not. No, there are some of them of whom they do not know whether they have been dead or alive for the last five years. We know that they are not all citizens of the United States, and that they do not all even live in the United States. We

know that they are not all in favor of National Reform.

We know that in the very latest published list of their vice-presidents they have the name of a man who is a bishop of the Church of England *in Canada*, and has been for five years. Yet all these years the National Reformers have run his name as a vice-president of their association, calling for an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and still do so! Of this we have the written evidence. Will the National Reform gentlemen please tell us what a Canadian bishop can have to do with amending the Constitution of the United States?

We know that they have run for five years or more the names of men as vice-presidents representing certain States, while those men have not lived in those States at all in all that time. Of this also we have the written evidence.

We know that in their latest published list they have the name of one man at least who is openly opposed to the whole National Reform movement. We are not at liberty to print the gentleman's name (he is a clergyman to whose name the title of "D. D." is annexed), but we may insert some of his words on this point; it throws some light upon the National Reform method of getting so many and such distinguished names in their list of vice-presidents. He says: "I was placed there [among these vice-presidents] evidently as a mere *figure-head*, never having done, or been asked to do, anything to further its objects. Some months ago I was written to, and asked if I had any objections to my name being retained on the list, and if I did not answer *silence* would be taken for *consent*. From sheer indifference I did not answer."

And that is how this gentleman's name remains on the list of vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. How it got there in the first place he does not know. But they got his name and made him a Vice-president, and then asked him whether his name might be "retained" and "silence" would give "consent." Out of "sheer indifference" he kept "silence," and so he is still a vice-president of the National Reform Association. If he had been dead it would have been all the same, because then there would have been "silence," and silence would have given "consent," and so, even though dead, he would yet have been a vice-president, in good standing no doubt, of the National Reform Association.

Indeed, just such a thing as this was stated in the Pittsburg Convention last May. One of the secretaries said they ought to revise their list of vice-presidents, because a number of names that had been on the list for several years were of men who were dead, and he thought those names ought to be dropped. As long as it is only the *name* that is used, anyhow, we see no use in dropping the name just because they find out that the *man* is dead. The *name* of the Right Rev. John Smith, D. D., LL.D., Ph. D., President of a Female Institute in a place where

there is no such institution, is of just as weighty importance after he is dead as before. And as the influence of his name is all that is asked of a vice-president of the National Reform Association, the name can be used just as well after he is dead as when he is alive. As our correspondent further says, "As it seems that *names* and not *active co-workers* is all that is cared for . . . this holding on to men, dead or alive, is doubtless true of others in the list.

And that is how so large and influential a list of vice-presidents of the National Reform Association is kept up. And these facts, for they are facts, serve to illustrate and to emphasize Mr. Coleman's statement that the National Reform "movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body." Yes, indeed, a great deal more. But we are perfectly assured that it will not be always thus. With the immense bids that the National Reformers are making for the alliance of Rome, we are fully persuaded that they will yet gain the active, abiding efforts of Rome exerted in behalf of a national religion here. Then their movement, so far as *they* are concerned, will change ends, and in the proportion will have "a great deal" more *tail* than body—unless indeed they then become incorporated into, and a part of, the great body of Rome itself.

That Mr. "Secretary" Coleman's statement may state the exact truth a little more exactly, we propose an amendment so that the statement shall read as follows:—

"It is true our [National Reform] movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body, and the head itself has been a great deal more *figure-head* than anything else."

That is the exact truth in the case according to the facts. We have more to say on this but haven't space just now. A. T. J.

What about Persecution?

AMONG the questions asked at the Lakeside National Reform Convention, was the following:—

"Will not the National Reform movement result in persecution against those who in some points believe differently from the majority, even as the recognition of Christianity by the Roman power, resulted in grievous persecutions against true Christians?"

This is a question in which many people are deeply interested, and we would call special attention to Dr. McAllister's answer:—

"Now notice the fallacy here. The recognition of the Roman Catholic religion by the State made that State a persecuting power. Why? Because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. If true Christianity is a persecuting religion, then the acknowledgment of our principles by the State will make the State a persecutor. But if the true Christian religion is a religion of liberty, a religion that regards the rights of all, then the acknowledgment of these principles by the State will make the State the guardian of the rights of all men. False religion will be persecuted, and the State will be the persecutor. True religion never persecutes."

We may well say of Dr. McAllister's answer, "Now notice the fallacy here." And notice also the cool air of superiority with which he

pats himself and his fellow-reformers on the back. "Our movement will not result in persecution, because true religion never persecutes, and of course we wouldn't handle anything but the genuine article." Well, we will not now dispute the genuineness of their religion, but we are *sure* that they will not persecute so long as they have not the power, and there is no telling what the best of men may do when suddenly elevated to power to which they are not accustomed, and which is not theirs by right.

Let it be remembered that the possession of great power by any man, or by any organized body of men, is always dangerous. Mr. McAllister says that the recognition of the Roman Catholic Church by the State made that State a persecuting power, because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. Wonderful! But if the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion, why did it not persecute before it was lifted to the throne of the world? Oh, because it did not have the power! Exactly; and if it had never received the power, the world would never have found out that it was a persecuting religion, would it? Certainly not. Then it was not the *nature* of the Catholic religion that made it a persecutor, but it was the *power* that was given to it.

And let it be also remembered that the Roman Catholic religion was simply a perversion of the purest form of religion that was ever exhibited to the world,—that taught by Christ and his apostles. Some of the same churches that were founded by the apostles themselves, became the worst instigators of persecution. What was it that brought about this change? Nothing else than their seeking for power, and for the aid and friendship of the State. Says the apostle James, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." No matter how pure the religion may be which any body of men possesses, it is sure to be corrupted when they seek alliance with civil power.

It was not because the Popes of Rome were the worst men that ever lived, that they persecuted. It was simply because *their* religion was made a part of the State, and disobedience to that religion thus became disloyalty to the State, and therefore there was no alternative but to punish the offender. But when the State punishes a man for a crime against it, which crime is only a matter of conscience, then such punishment becomes persecution. The following words from Buckle's "History of Civilization in England" are very true, and we recommend them to the serious thought of National Reformers and of all others:—

"Protestants, generally, are too apt to suppose that there is something in their creed which protects them against those hurtful extravagances which have been, and, to a certain extent, still are practiced in the Catholic Church. Never was a greater mistake. There is but one protection against the tyranny of any class, and that is to give that class very little power. Whatever the pretensions of any body of men may be, however smooth their language, and however plausible their claims,

they are sure to abuse power if much of it is conferred upon them. The entire history of the world affords no instance to the contrary. In Catholic countries, France alone excepted, the clergy have more authority than in Protestant countries. Therefore, in Catholic countries they do more harm than in Protestant countries, and their peculiar views are developed with greater freedom. The difference depends, not on the nature of the creed, but on the power of the class. This is very apparent in Scotland, where the clergy, being supreme, did, Protestants though they were, imitate the ascetic, unsocial, and the cruel doctrines which in the Catholic Church gave rise to convents, fastings, scourgings, and all other appliances of an uncouth and ungenial superstition."

It was not because the people of Arkansas are worse than the people of Kansas, nor because the religion professed by the citizens of Arkansas is of a worse type than that professed by the people of Kansas, that the former State a year ago persecuted citizens even to the death, and the latter did nothing of the kind. It was simply because there was a law in Arkansas which made it a crime for the few to worship God in a different manner from what the majority did; and Kansas had no such law. Any other State in the Union, having a law like the Arkansas Sunday law, would do just as she did.

It is true that true Christianity never will persecute; but it is also true that true Christianity is never found in alliance with civil power. People often make the mistake of confounding true Christianity with the profession thereof. But true Christianity is known by fruits, and not by profession merely. A man is not necessarily a Christian because he professes the Christian religion. Even though his creed may be a perfect one, and he may hold to no doctrinal error, he may lack the vivifying influence of the Spirit of God, which alone can make the true Christian. Lacking this, his profession of the purest form of doctrine will avail him nothing. But this Spirit is never found in an alliance with civil authority. See James 4:4, already quoted.

Lastly, in the very answer in which Dr. McAllister disclaimed any intention on the part of National Reformers to persecute, he admitted that persecution would come. Said he: "False religion will be persecuted." Well, when did any people ever persecute those whom they thought were professing the true religion? The Papal persecutions were all directed against "heretics." The Catholics never professed to persecute the holders of the true religion; they would indignantly resent any such accusation. But the trouble was, *they* arrogated to themselves the power to decide who were heretics, and what was the true religion. If they had allowed the poor Huguenots and Waldenses a voice in the matter, the decision would have been different. But no; the Catholics were in the majority, and had the power, and *that* made them infallible. So the National Reformers, when once they get the power, will virtually declare themselves the infallible judges of true and false religion; and woe to the un-

fortunate few who profess what they decree to be the "false religion," because it differs from theirs. Who is willing to help the National Reformers into power, after hearing their own statement of their intentions? No beings but glorified saints or angels, with Christ himself as leader, could be trusted with all power, both civil and religious; and without any disrespect to National Reformers, we say that they are a long ways from being either saints or angels.

Yes, Mr. McAllister, we see the fallacy, and we think that other people can, unless they are National Reformers. E. J. W.

"IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS"

Has been out but a short time, but it has already attained a large sale, and has come to the front as the finest book for agents to handle which has ever been published on this coast. It is a book which sells to all classes of readers. As a work of art it surpasses anything of the kind which has ever before been attempted. The beautiful full-page "artotypes" present the Yo Semite in all its grandeur, and bring out the scenery in a more life-like manner than it could be produced in any other way. The Yo Semite Valley is now the leading attraction for tourists, and it is visited every year by thousands. It is one of the wonders of the world, and this work written by a man who has lived so long amidst these scenes is one which all will be eager to possess.

This new book is not only the most authentic and finest historical description of the Yo Semite which has ever been written, but it is a complete and reliable guide to the valley and Big Tree Groves. It gives every route to these places of interest, and is the only work which, without bias or preference for any particular route, gives truthful information in regard to all the ways by which one can reach the Yo Semite.

This unrivaled work of nearly 600 pages, with 160 illustrations, of which 50 are full page, and 28 are elegant artotypes, will be furnished to subscribers at the following low prices:—

Fine English Cloth, embossed in jet and gold,	\$3 75
Fine English Cloth, embossed in jet and gold, gold edges, 4 50	
Full Sheep, library style, marbled edges,	5 00
Half Morocco, gold edges,	6 00
Full Turkey Morocco, gold edges,	7 00

If a copy of the book is desired, drop a line to the publishers, and an agent will call and show you the work, or if there is no agent in your place, the publishers will send you a copy, prepaid, at the above prices. Address, Pacific Press Publishing House, Twelfth and Castro Streets, Oakland, Cal.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH.

BY J. W. MORTON.

FORMER MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO HAYTI.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS.

ASSORTED PACKAGE NO. 6. PRICE, 25c.

THE Plan of Redemption—The Sufferings of Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—Scripture References—The Spirit of Prophecy—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The End of the Wicked—The Two Thrones. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

A TRACT of 24 pages, which fully answers this question, and shows how Sunday displaced the Bible Sabbath. Extracts given from Catholic writers. Price, 3 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1887.

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

THE proceedings of the Saratoga Convention, to which reference is made in the leading article of this paper, are printed in full in the *Christian Statesman*, September 1, 1887.

THE article in this paper in which John B. Finch is mentioned, was in type more than a month before Mr. Finch's death. His death, however, does not affect the matter, as the principle is the same; and it is with *principles* and not persons that the SENTINEL deals.

LET it be graven as with an iron pen, upon the minds of the American people, that Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and the National Reform Association as a whole, are in favor of putting the Roman Catholic Bible into the public schools of the United States, whenever the Roman Catholics are in the majority.

THERE are few clergymen of the United States who are more prominently before the people than Dr. Josiah Strong, author of "Our Country," and now secretary of the Evangelical Alliance. Recently in Boston, before a company of ministers and prominent laymen, he "represented that it was of the utmost importance that the masses be made to know that the gospel, and not the ballot, is the panacea for social problems." National Reformers and others please make a note of this.

THE School Board of Pittsburg, Pa., have made a Catholic priest, Father McTighe, principal of one of the public schools of the city, and have appointed two nuns as teachers in the same school. Now if only that priest and those nuns will establish the Catholic Bible, and Catholic worship, and Catholic instruction, in that school, we may expect that the hearts of the National Reformers will sing for very joy. For this is a long stride toward the point at which the National Reformers are aiming, and this is the very thing which the National Reform Association is commissioned by the Saratoga resolution to secure "if possible," by an alliance with the Romish Church.

THE Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Mirror*, writing under date of July 12, says:—

"Monsignor Ruffo and his companions were well received in England, as you know from the reports of the English press. Mgr. Ruffo is convinced that the time is not distant when an amicable arrangement will be made between the English Government and the Papacy and official representatives accredited from both. The queen was especially kind to the Papal envoy, and assured him

that she remembered with great pleasure the visit made by the present Pope to Windsor [before he became Pope] after completing his mission in Belgium."

We have no doubt at all that the convictions of Mgr. Ruffo are well founded.

THAN Right Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone there is no Protestant who is better acquainted with the ways of Romanism; and of it he says:—

"Ultramontanism has been very busy in making controversial war upon other people with singularly little restraint of language; and has far too little of the truth told to itself. Hence it has lost the habit, almost the idea, of equal laws in discussion. Of that system, as a system, I must say that its influence is adverse to freedom in the State, the family, and the individual; that when it is weak it is too often crafty, and when strong tyrannical."

And yet the National Reformers "regret to say" that up to August 17, 1887, no decided attempt had been made to secure the active co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church in subjecting this Government to the religious power! As such an alliance could be wished for only by the crafty or the tyrannical, the openly expressed "regret" of the National Reformers that it has not been secured reveals at once the nature of the National Reform movement.

Religious Intolerance.

A SHORT time ago we gave an account of a Catholic procession in France, at which a man was beaten nearly to death for not taking off his hat as the procession went by. It will be remembered that that was given by the *Christian at Work* as proof that France is not a godless nation. In the same paper, August 18, we have an account of another such procession, this time in Spain, as follows:—

"The Spanish republic under Prim sought to establish religious toleration; and it was so successful that when the revolution came, and Alfonso ascended the throne, he had to accept the fact as a fundamental law. But the new law is not always respected, as the following shows. As the reader doubtless knows, in cases of administering the rite of extreme unction to the dying, it is customary in Spain to go in procession through the streets, the priest carrying aloft the 'custodia,' and an acolyte ringing a hand-bell, at the sound of which all passers-by are expected to kneel until the procession passes. Since the establishment of religious liberty in 1868 it is no longer obligatory on all to conform to this custom, and consequently many, from conscientious scruples, refrain from doing so, although, if possible, they endeavor to get out of the way, so as not to give needless offense. But the other day a poor woman—a member of the Protestant community—was passing through one of the streets of the town, and on turning a corner came into contact with 'the procession of the host.' Not prepared to kneel, and unwilling to appear disrespectful, she stepped aside into a doorway to let the procession pass; but the priest rushed after her, dragged her out, and with great violence endeavored to force her on her knees. Not succeeding in this, he handed her over to two policemen, and charged her before the Judge of First Instance with insulting the 'established religion.' The judge took the priest's declaration [in writing], absolutely refusing to hear the poor woman, and ordered her off

to prison to await her trial. Heaven knows when this 'trial' may come on, and so this poor wife and mother is excluded from her home for an indefinite period. It is gratifying to know, however, that the matter having come to the knowledge of influential parties in London, counsel has been secured and funds raised for the purpose of seeing that the poor woman receives justice."

France and Spain are two of the European countries in which the *Christian Statesman* and National Reform "cordially and gladly recognize the fact that the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism," and which "in a world's conference for the promotion of National Christianity could be represented only by Roman Catholics."

NEARLY every Protestant paper in the country, whether religious or secular, has confessed it to have been the duty of Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome when he was commanded by the Pope to do so, to answer for his opinions that were already condemned. The truth is, that if he had gone to Rome, he could, and no doubt would, have been kept there forever, and that too in a dungeon, just as likely as not, unless he should have recanted. And even had he recanted he would never have been allowed to return to free America. The chances are ten to one that had Dr. McGlynn gone to Rome he would never have been directly heard of more. The *Christian Advocate* (N. Y.) has come nearer to the truth in the matter than any other paper we have seen. It says:—

"Once in Rome he could have been kept there indefinitely. He could be assigned to duty in any part of the world; could be cut loose from his life-work, and removed from all his associations and centers of influence, and be compelled to begin a new career under a ban."

But Dr. McGlynn knows Rome's methods too well to be caught in the toils of the Romish Inquisition, and he still breathes the free air of yet free America. But how long America shall remain free from Rome's pernicious power is a question. With the National Reform party and its allies endeavoring to create a constitutional basis for religious legislation in national affairs, and bidding for Rome's influence to help secure it; and with the press of the country siding with Rome in a controversy involving the right of free thought and free speech of an American citizen, the prospect is not very reassuring.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 12.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

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

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

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

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

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

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

An Examination of Principles.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. J. W.

The Christian Statesman Speaks.

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

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

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

Again the *Statesman* says:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Again says the *Statesman*:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then, the *Statesman* asks—

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

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

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

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

A. T. J.

Christianity Means Honesty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Busybodies.

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

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

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

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

Tampering with the Constitution.

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

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

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

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

Rome's Work.

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

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

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

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

False Reform.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Christianity under Our Constitution.

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

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

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

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

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

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

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

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS.

BY J. M. HUTCHINGS.

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

MARVELOUS GRANDEUR KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

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

BEAUTIFUL FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES.

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

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

"IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

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

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE.

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER, 1887.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We are afraid that it is too true.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.



Adventist Pioneer Library

For more information, visit:

www.APLib.org

or write to:

apl@netbox.com