

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1886.

NUMBER 1.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

"A Christian Nation."

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

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

An Unprofitable Alliance.

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

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

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

The American Sentinel.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But this can only be accomplished by an en-

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

The Mormon Question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE LETTER OF MR. BLAINE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

Proposed Union of Church and State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. J. W.

No Christianity by Law.

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

"A circular of the 'National Reform Association' has fallen into our hands, and calls for a brief notice. We assent to its 'fundamentals,' viz.: 'That Almighty God is the source of all

power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs.' We share in its regrets over the many 'persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our public schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to abolish the oath, prayer in our National and State Legislatures, days of fasting and thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion.' But we are not satisfied that it would be, on the whole, the best thing (even if it could be brought about with very little effort) to insert a clause in the United States Constitution, as an amendment, containing 'explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation.' We heartily desire 'to make this nation, consistently, and in the fullest sense, a Christian nation,' and all our labors are in that direction. But the nation will not be made such by any sort of an amendment to the Constitution; and when it has become such, there will be scarcely any need of such an amendment. If our spirit and conduct be Christian, any public declaration will not make the fact any more certain, will scarcely magnify it and will hardly make it more influential."

No Power but of God.

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

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

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

And it is also true—evidently true—that in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Macaulay on Gladstone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Parallel.

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

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

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

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

A Christian Nation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., JANUARY, 1886.

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

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

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

A "Non Sequitur."

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

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

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

The Never-Failing Result.

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

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

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

Too Plain to Be Denied.

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

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

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

A Good Confession.

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

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

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

Is It Blindness?

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

TERMS.

SINGLE COPY, per year 50 cents.
To foreign countries, single subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

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