

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1886.

NUMBER 3.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

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

An Important Truth.

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

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

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

The Truth in the Case.

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

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

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

Policy of the New Government Outlined.

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

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

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

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

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

That is exactly what was done by Constan-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

Morality and Religion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

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

Church and State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. T. J.

The Chinese Question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. H. W.

Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. J. W.

“What Does It Amount To?”

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

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

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

"Monmouth, Ill.

STARK, JR."

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

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

A Significant Fact Acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Macaulay on Gladstone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., MARCH, 1886.

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

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

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

Both True and Good.

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

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

Notices of the Sentinel.

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

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

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

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

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

Well, that is discouraging!

Religion in Politics.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

TERMS.

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

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.