

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1888.

NUMBER 4.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

"AND he said unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's."

THE New York *Independent* notes and comments as follows:—

"The present worthless school system,' is what the *Freeman's Journal* calls our scheme of public education. If the Roman Catholics insist on destroying this system, they will have to destroy the Nation to succeed."

Oh, no, they will not! All they will have to do to succeed is to wait a little while till the National Reform Association shall have gained the support and the influence of a few more Protestant leaders, and then to accept the persistently proffered alliance of the Association, and the work will be done; the system will then soon and easily be destroyed. But then, having succeeded, the Nation will soon be destroyed. The *Independent* is right as to results; it had only misplaced the items. They will not have to destroy the Nation to succeed in destroying our public-school system. But having succeeded in destroying our public-school system, the destruction of the Nation will soon follow.

MR. "SAM" SMALL has acquired a national reputation, and a very extensive influence, as a religious worker. Against this in itself, or in its legitimate exercise, we have not a word to say. But when he essays to use his influence in the line of things set forth in the following proposition, then we most decidedly object. Says Mr. Small:—

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

And that will be but the Papacy over again. From the way things are now going we have no doubt that Mr. Small as well as the rest of us will see that day come. And when it does come it will be the most woful day the Nation will have ever seen; and the utter ruin of the whole national fabric will then be but a question of a little while.

Morality and Civil Government.

THE *Independent*, of St. Helena Cal., criticises a statement of the SENTINEL as follows:—

"Says the AMERICAN SENTINEL: 'Morality is a matter which, from its original nature and object, lies entirely beyond the reach and control of the State proper.' Then we are to understand that all police regulations, looking to the moral welfare of the community are wrong and illegal. Unfortunately for our fair California, that sentiment has prevailed too long."

The statement of the SENTINEL is strictly true. Let us enlighten our critic. *Morality*, as defined by Webster, is "The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule; . . . the conformity of an act to the divine law." The true moral standard is the law of God—the ten commandments. The keeping of the ten commandments is morality; the breaking of any one of them is immorality. The keeping of the ten commandments is righteousness; the breaking of any one of them is sin.

This true moral standard takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman is adultery; and these things are immoral. Morality or immorality lies in the heart; it pertains to the thoughts and intents of the heart; and with it the State can have nothing at all to do. The civil government has nothing to do with hatred, nor with covetousness, nor with impure thinking; yet all these things are immoral. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees; he may keep this up all his days, and the State will not touch him, nor has it any right to touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be, yet the State cannot punish him. And this demonstrates our proposition, that "with immorality the State can have nothing at all to do."

But only let that man's hatred lead him to attempt to do an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him. Only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him. Only let his impure mind lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet bear in mind, the State does not punish him even then for his *immorality*, but for his *incivility*. The State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is *uncivil*. It cannot punish immorality; it *must* punish incivility.

This distinction is shown in the very term by which we designate State or national government. It is called civil government; no person ever thinks of calling it *moral* government. The Government of God is the only moral Government. God is the only moral Governor. The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governments of men are *civil* governments, not moral. Governors of men are *civil* governors, not moral governors. The laws of States and nations are *civil* laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government it pertains to punish *incivility*, not immorality. Thus again it is demonstrated, that with immorality civil governments can never of right have anything to do.

On the other hand, as God is the only moral Governor; as his is the only moral Government; as his law is the only moral law; and as it pertains to him alone to punish immorality; so likewise the promotion of morality pertains to him alone. Morality is conformity to the law of God; it is obedience to God. But obedience to God, must spring from the heart in sincerity and truth. This it must do, or it is not obedience; for, as we have proved by the word of God, the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. But "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." By transgression all men have made themselves immoral. "Therefore by the deeds of the law [by obedience] shall no flesh be justified [accounted righteous or made moral] in his sight." Rom. 3: 20. As all men have, by transgression of the law of God, made themselves immoral, therefore no man can, by obedience to the law, become moral; because it is that very law which declares him to be immoral. The demands, therefore, of the moral law, must be satisfied, before he can ever be accepted as moral by either the law or its Author. But the demands of the moral law can never be satisfied by an immoral person, and this is just what every person has made himself by transgression. Therefore it is certain that men can never become moral by the moral law.

From this it is equally certain that if ever men shall be made moral, it must be by the Author and Source of all morality. And this is just the provision which God has made. For, "now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which

is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned [made themselves immoral] and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:21-23. It is by the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ's sake; and we receive it by faith in him who is both the Author and Finisher of faith. Then by the Spirit of God the moral law is written anew in the heart and in the mind, sanctifying the soul unto obedience—unto morality. Thus, and thus alone, can men ever attain to morality; and that morality is the morality of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ; and there is no other in this world. Therefore, as morality springs from God, and is planted in the heart by the Spirit of God, through faith in the Son of God, it is demonstrated by proofs of Holy Writ itself, that to God alone pertains the promotion of morality.

God, then, being the sole promoter of morality, through what instrumentality does he work to promote morality in the world? What body has he made the conservator of morality in the world? The church or the civil power, which?—The church and the church alone. It is "the church of the Living God." It is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It was to the church that he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" "and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It is by the church, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, that the gospel is "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." There is no obedience but the obedience of faith; there is no morality but the morality of faith. Therefore it is proved that to the church, and not to the State, is committed the conservation of morality in the world. This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality. The State can't teach morality. It has not the credentials for it. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ are both essential to the teaching of morality, and neither of these is committed to the State, but both to the church.

But, though this work be committed to the church, even then there is not committed to the church the prerogative either to reward morality or to punish immorality. She beseeches, she entreats, she persuades men to be reconciled to God; she trains them in the principles and the practices of morality. It is hers by moral means or spiritual censures to preserve the purity and discipline of her membership. But hers it is not either to reward morality or to punish immorality. This pertains to God alone, because whether it be morality or immorality, it springs from the secret counsels of the heart; and as God alone knows the heart, he alone can measure either the merit or the guilt involved in any question of morals.

By this it is demonstrated that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality in any way. Whoever attempts it, usurps the prerogative of God. The In-

quisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality. Because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The Papacy, asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequence. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would wring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the Inquisition was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition, for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

By all these evidences is established the plain, common-sense principle that to civil government pertains only that which the term itself implies—that which is *civil*. The purpose of civil government is civil and not moral. Its function is to preserve order in society, and to cause all its subjects to rest in assured safety by guarding them against all incivility. Morality belongs to God; civility belongs to the State. Morality must be rendered to God; civility, to the State. "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

A. T. J.

The Baptists and National Reform.

MORE than once we have noticed, in the reports of the lecturers of the National Reformers, that they were opposed by Baptist ministers. This we should expect from our knowledge of Baptist principles. And sometimes they report that Baptist ministers heartily indorse their movement. This we should expect only where the Baptist ministers are regardless of the foundation principles of their faith; or where they have never inquired into the real object and intention of National Reform.

It is a truth that national religion, call it Church and State, or Religion and State, or what you will, cannot flourish where church membership is made to depend on conversion and personal piety. And no church can maintain the vitality and spirituality of religion, where national religion exists. The professed Reformers understand this to be so, however much they may plead for the necessity of national religion for the sake of upholding the church. Before they expect us to coincide with their movement, they ought to be able to point us to a single instance where national religion has preserved the spirituality of Christianity, and the purity of the church. The experiment has been made often enough, under very varied circumstances; but always with the same result. Religion has become a mere formality, whenever the State became its patron.

The following paragraph I copy from a National Reform paper. The editor gave his indorsement of the article in the strongest terms:—

"Little ones are as much under the covenant as their fathers. They are an essential element in the Nation, and are to be taught, and by their presence to teach others, that the obligation to serve the Lord does not originate in personal engagement. Antipedobaptists are all opposed to national Christianity. They have sufficient perspicacity to see that from the claims of a national bond, children cannot be exempted; and the absurdity of excluding such as are under bond, from the church, because they are incapable of a personal consent to the ecclesiastical covenant, would be too glaring."

People with more consistency than the National Reformers possess, who fully believed the above sentiment, would never ask, or at least expect, Baptists of any class to join in their crusade for national religion, with its necessary accompaniment of national and unconverted church membership. It certainly takes a great deal of what is modernly called "cheek," for the self-styled Reformers to accuse the Baptists of being recreant to their principles in refusing to aid them in their efforts to establish national religion, with such an avowal as the above before the world.

We will notice a few points which present themselves in the above declaration.

1. These little ones who are born under the national system of religion, are members of the church. And such they must continue to be, without regard to the characters they form when they grow up, as long as they are citizens, or belong to the Nation. For, it would be absurd to exclude from the church those who are "under national bond," the "ecclesiastical covenant" being a national covenant. This leads naturally and unavoidably to an unconverted church membership. And this has been the result whenever national religion has been established.

2. This declaration shows the fallacy of the claim of the National Reformers, that their object is not to establish a national church, but national religion without a church. According to their own avowal, they who are under national bond, or under a national ecclesiastical covenant, are necessarily church members. They say that to suppose the contrary is absurd. But the fact that they are necessarily church-members does not necessarily make them Christians, or religious. In their system church membership comes before religion. They are church-members by virtue of the national covenant under which they are born, without any regard to "personal engagement." The national covenant may make them church-members, but it cannot make them Christians, or religious. It may deceive them, and settle them down in a false hope, by leading them to believe they are Christians by virtue of their church membership, which is by virtue of the national bond or covenant under which they were born. It may enable them to successfully practice hypocrisy for social or political reasons, but it never will have a tendency to arouse their religious convictions; or to lead them to trust in

"personal engagement" alone as the foundation of their religious hope, as it really is. All history attests that national religion has never had such a tendency, in a single instance. It has no such tendency to-day, even in this age of Bible privileges.

The system is radically wrong, and can be advocated only by those who have not studied its principles, or those who have a favorite church hobby to ride, and who are so self-complacent that they think they are doing God service by compelling uniformity to their particular belief.

That their object is Church and State, or a national established church, is clearly evident from their uniform teachings, notwithstanding their persistent denials. And we are compelled to believe that their denials are not made in perfect sincerity. We cannot give them credit for such a large degree of blindness or ignorance that they cannot understand the obvious intent of their oft-repeated declarations. Thus, in the same article from which we have quoted, bearing the strong indorsement of the editor, are found the following words:—

It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances, and laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its constitution and object."

The avowed object is not that the State should acknowledge religion, and regulate its administration in harmony therewith, but it should, by statutory arrangement, confess the divine origin and organization of the church, and regulate its administration in conformity with the constitution and object, not merely of religion, but of the church. And this is not Church and State! oh, no. How we do wonder at the blindness of those who cannot see a plain distinction between Church and State and church and religion in such an arrangement as this! Alas for the church that is led by such leaders as the National Reformers; and alas for the nation when it is made subservient to such a church as they represent.

Ask anybody to point to the beginning of Church and State, and they will turn to Constantine the Great as the author of the system; the system which proved so disastrous to the purity of the church, and to the cause of vital Christianity. But our model Reformers do not want such a system as he established. No, they do not; for with such a system their ambition would never be satisfied. We will point out the difference between his system and that for which they ask.

Constantine established the church after the model of the empire, making the church and the empire as nearly identical as was possible, and retain the supremacy of the civil power. But the supremacy of the civil power was maintained during his reign, and for several centuries after his time. The church became the creature and servant of the empire; and

the church rulers were willing to accord to the emperor the general supervision of the church, for the sake of the advantages which they derived, and the honor conferred upon the church, by the alliance. But our Reformers will not abide any such arrangement. They demand that the church shall be the controlling power, and the State exist to serve the interest of the church. The State must acknowledge the authority of the church, and the Government must be administered in conformity with the constitution of the church. Constantine made the church subservient to the State; but these modern Reformers intend to make the State altogether subservient to the church. And yet they have the effrontery to deny that they seek any arrangement that can be called a union of Church and State. We wonder that they deny their object, while their statements of the object are published in their periodicals, and circulated broadcast through the land. But our wonder is still greater that people give ready credence to their pretenses, and shut their eyes to those many avowals of their intention to have the State administered in subserviency to their church system.

Shall the sad history of the church repeat itself in the United States? In a future article we shall point out the change that came over the administration of the Government when the supremacy of the State was lost, and the church occupied the position that our Reformers want it to occupy in Protestant America. It really appears to us that nothing but personal ambition could lead men to be so blind as to the results of their efforts, as these seem to be.

J. H. W.

"Connecting Links Between Church and State."

IN the *Homiletic Review* for December, 1887, Philip Schaff, D. D., LL.D., has an article on "The Connecting Links Between Church and State," and says that there are three of these links, namely, Marriage, Sunday, and the Public School. That is, these are the three links which form the union of Church and State in the United States. From the adoption of the Constitution until lately, it has ever been the just pride of this Nation, that in its form of government, Church and State were wholly separate; and that with religion the State had nothing to do, but left that matter just where it rightly belongs, as solely pertaining to the individual's personal relations between himself and God. Within the last few years, however, there has been a notable change of view in regard to this subject, in both its phases, especially on the part of prominent theologians and would-be church-leaders.

One class of these insist that the propagation of religious opinions is an essential prerogative of civil government, and therefore they with "undying enthusiasm" are determined to have the National Constitution and laws so altered as to make their views effective. Of this class the leaders of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are the representa-

tives. The other class insist that in this Government there is already a union of Church and State. Of these Dr. Schaff is the principal one, and this article in the *Homiletic Review* is his statement of the case. It would be an easy task to show the causes of this change of base on the part of the Church and State religionists, but we shall not enter upon that at this time. We want to notice Dr. Schaff's "Links."

He starts out with this proposition:—

"A total separation of Church and State is an impossibility; unless we cease to be a Christian people."

He offers not a particle of proof in support of this statement, while proof is the very thing that is most needed. He assumes that the people of the United States are Christians, while not one in ten of them are Christians. The Doctor ought to have offered some proof; assumptions are *not* proof. But granting his assumption that this is a Christian people, and this a Christian Nation, his proposition is yet defective, because he says that, that being so, "A total separation of Church and State is an impossibility." However, to call this defective is not enough—it is totally wrong. For the precept of Christ *does* make a total separation of Church and State. The word of Christ is, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." There is no question at all that by the term "Cæsar" the Saviour means the State—the civil government. Here duty lies in two directions—to God and to the State. To each is to be rendered that which is his—to God that which is God's, to the State that which is the State's. Now the church of Christ is God's; that which is rendered to the church is rendered to God, because it is "the church of the living God." The church is not Cæsar's, it is God's. That which pertains to the church does not and cannot pertain to the State; that which is to be rendered to the church is not to be, and cannot be, rendered to the State; because the church is God's, and that which is God's must be rendered to him and not to the State. Therefore it is demonstrated that in these words the Lord Jesus has totally, and forever, separated the church from the State. And therefore Doctor Schaff's proposition is contrary to the word of Christ.

Doctor Schaff counts marriage as one of the connecting links that unite Church and State. But this is impossible without making marriage a sacrament of the church and confining it to that, as the Papacy has assumed the power to do, and so to count all marriages as only concubinage which are not solemnized by the church. But this it is impossible to do, because marriage *belongs to the race*. It no more belongs to Christians than to pagans. It is an original institution, and knows no distinctions. It belongs equally to atheists, infidels, Jews, heathen, and Christians—all alike, and to one class no more than to another. And as the institution belongs to all classes that can be found in civil government; and *as it relates to man in his relations to his fellow-men*; its regulation is properly within the province

of civil government. As a matter of fact, marriage is no more a "connecting link" between Church and State, than is life, or property, or character.

But when the Doctor comes to the discussion of his second "connecting link," the Sunday, he makes a good deal worse mixture than he does with his first. We quote the whole paragraph:—

"The Christian Sabbath, or weekly day of rest, is likewise protected by legislation, and justly so, because it has a civil as well as a religious side; it is necessary and profitable for the body as well as for the soul; it is of special benefit to the laboring classes, and guards them against the tyranny of capital. The Sabbath antedates the Mosaic legislation, and is, like the family, founded in the original constitution of man, for whose temporal and spiritual benefit it was instituted by the God of creation."

This paragraph is as full of error as an egg is full of meat. We have not space to fully set forth all the errors that it contains, but we shall call attention to some. The most prominent token of error that it bears is, that it contradicts itself. He first calls it "the Christian Sabbath," and then says that it is "founded in the original constitution of man." But Christianity is not an original institution. How, then, can the Sabbath be "founded in the original constitution of man," and be at the same time the "Christian Sabbath"? It cannot be; it is a moral impossibility. Christian institutions are peculiar to the system of redemption through Christ; but the Sabbath antedates the system of redemption. The Sabbath was instituted before man had sinned, before he needed to be redeemed. It would have been kept by man had he never sinned; but had he never sinned, there never would have been any Christianity, nor any Christian institutions. Consequently it is impossible for the Sabbath to be the "Christian" Sabbath. It is utterly a misnomer to call it the Christian Sabbath. The only names the Author of the Sabbath has ever given it are "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day."

Let these titles, which alone the Author of the Sabbath has given to that institution, be put alongside of his own words in relation to what men owe to civil government, and see how the matter stands. He calls it "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day." He says, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." The Sabbath is the Lord's. It is the Lord's day. Therefore it is to be rendered to the Lord. The Sabbath pertains not to Cæsar. It is not Cæsar's in any sense. It is the Lord's. Therefore, the Sabbath being the Lord's and not Cæsar's, it is proved by the words of Christ that the civil government has nothing at all to do with it. This annihilates at once the Doctor's idea that the Sabbath "has a civil as well as a religious side." The word of God says that the Sabbath is the Lord's, and Christ distinctly separates that which is the Lord's, from that which is Cæsar's: therefore when Dr. Schaff or anybody else attempts to pass off the Sabbath as both civil and religious, as pertaining

both to God and to Cæsar, he confounds that which Christ has clearly distinguished, and virtually charges Christ with loose thinking.

The commandment of God does not say, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *civily*; it does say, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *holy*." The Sabbath is wholly a religious institution; man's observance of it pertains wholly to the Lord. Therefore when the State undertakes to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, it thereby demands that to Cæsar shall be rendered that which is God's; and in that it usurps the place of God. That which is the Lord's we are to render to him direct, without any of the meddling mediumship of Cæsar. When we have rendered to Cæsar that which is his, we have rendered to him all his due, and when he has so received his due, he has no right to demand any more. And it is none of his business how men render to God that which is God's, or whether they render it at all or not.

All this is written in regard to the State and the Sabbath of the Lord. It is Sunday, however, that Dr. Schaff presents as the second connecting link which forms the union of Church and State in our country. And indeed this much of his article is true. Sunday is the link which connects Church and State, whenever the State has anything to do with it in the way of legislation. We ourselves showed in the SENTINEL of last month, that Sunday was the link that united Church and State in the fourth century, and that in the same way Sunday is now being used as the link by which Church and State will be united in fact in the United States. But whereas the Sabbath of the Lord belongs to God, though not to Cæsar, the Sunday Sabbath belongs neither to God nor to Cæsar. There is no command of God for it. It is wholly an institution of the church. The church instituted the practice of Sunday observance; the first Sunday law that ever was issued—that by Constantine—was at the request of the church, and was expressly to favor the church; and that has been the only purpose of Sunday legislation from that time to this. And that is why it is that Sunday is in truth the "connecting link" that forms the union between the Church and the State. But the more permanently that link is severed amongst all people, the better it is for both Church and State. There has never yet been a union of Church and State, that has not tended only the more to corrupt both. And it never can be otherwise. The church of Christ is espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ," and she cannot join herself to any other, without forsaking her Lord and making herself an adulteress.

Let no one blame us for saying that there is no command of God for keeping Sunday, and that it is an institution of the church. We make the statements just as we find them, and we find them made by what is certainly high authority. The American Tract Society issues a \$500 prize-essay on the subject, which says of the "Christian Sabbath," that there is "complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command" "or definite

rules for its observance are concerned." And the American Sunday School Union issues a \$1,000 prize-essay on the same subject, which says: "Up to the time of Christ's death there had been no change in the day." And "so far as the record shows they [the apostles] did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week." And this \$500 essay also fixes upon Sunday as a sacred day only by "a consensus of the Christian church." Now according to the word of Christ, which we are here discussing, men owe duty in but two directions—to God and to Cæsar. But Sunday observance belongs to neither of these, but to "the church." Therefore as Sunday observance belongs neither to God nor to civil government, there is no power in existence that can of right command it; and there is no obligation resting upon any soul to observe it.

Dr. Schaff's third "connecting link," the Public School, we must defer till our next.

A. T. J.

National Reform Ideas of Right.

THE following extract is National Reform doctrine in its purest form, from the pen of one of its best representatives:—

"A Christian people, adopting and administering a government that we would call Christian, might legislate about religion as well as about morals or education or temperance. To do so would not unite Church with State. Illustrations will be in place here. A Christian people might enact that any man who would blaspheme or curse God should be punished. If all the people of the United States were Christians, and they should be, they would do right in passing a law, Congressional or State or municipal, that no one, even a foreigner, pagan, or otherwise, should be permitted to erect a pagan temple and set up and worship idols therein. This would be a lawful, civil act, and would not unite Church and State."

This is a fair specimen of National Reform logic. Let us analyze it. "If all the people of the United States were Christians," they would have a right to pass a law prohibiting the erection of pagan temples, and the worshiping of idols. Upon this we would note the following three points:—

1. If all the people of the United States were Christians, such a law would not be necessary, for Christians do not erect heathen temples, nor do they worship idols. If they were all Christians, we cannot see why any such laws could be called for, unless the Christians were of the class who believe that they ought to do a certain thing, but haven't enough conscience in the matter to do it without being compelled. We have heard people say, "I believe Sunday ought to be kept, and if there was a law compelling everybody to keep it, I would keep it." Such ones are on a par with those who want a law forbidding Sunday railroad travel, so that they will not be tempted to patronize the railroads on Sunday, or to get up Sunday excursions to camp-meetings.

2. But we will not find very much fault with our friend's statement. Although it

would seem like a bit of foolishness for a lot of people who are already Christians to get together and pass a law forbidding any one of them to erect a heathen temple, we would have no objection to their amusing themselves in that way if they wanted to. And right here we will say that if the National Reformers will wait until the people of the United States are all Christians, not in name simply, but in fact, before they press their measures, we will join with them. But even in that case we would not admit that they would have any right to say what should be done by those who might not be Christians, or, to prohibit anybody from giving up his Christianity, and adopting any other form of worship. In the case supposed, the people of the country would form one large church, and might, just as any church now may, pass laws regulating their conduct as church-members; and whenever anyone did not wish to abide by those laws, he would simply lose his church membership, but not his citizenship. Anything intended to affect those not Christians, and not church-members, would be religious legislation, and would unite Church and State. The facts, in short, are these: Any organization has a right to make laws regulating the actions of members of that society, so long as they remain members, and no longer. The Odd Fellows have rules for their order, which must be observed by everyone who wishes to retain his membership in that order. But if the State should pass a law requiring every citizen to observe those rules, then we would say that Odd Fellowship and State were united. So also with the church.

3. "If all the people of the United States were Christians, . . . they would do right in passing a law . . . that no one . . . should be permitted to erect a pagan temple, and set up and worship idols therein." This statement is a virtual admission that they would not do right in passing such a law, if all were not Christians. And that is exactly the case. Nobody has a right to say what, or how, or when, anybody else shall worship. To say that if all the people of the United States were Christians, they would do right in passing a law that not even a pagan should erect a heathen temple, is simply nonsense; for if there were a single pagan here the people would not all be Christians. But we affirm that if all the people of the United States were Christians, with only one exception, they would not have the slightest right to say what that one should or should not worship.

Here, as before, we wish to emphasize the fact that if all were Christians, they would have a right to pass laws against idolatry, which should affect themselves as Christians, and none others. But they would have no right to say that nobody should come to this country, unless he believed just as they did. Here again is shown the inconsistency of National Reformers. They raise a great hue and cry against the injustice of limiting Chinese immigration, yet they hold to views that would not only exclude the greater portion of

foreign immigration, but would expatriate many who are loyal citizens. This is bigotry of the worse kind. It virtually says, "Every thing that we do is right, no matter how wrong it may be in others." We affirm the absolute right of every man to live wherever he pleases on this earth, and to believe what he pleases.

But many who would assent to this, might hesitate to say that the Government has no right to prohibit blasphemy. The third commandment is the touch-stone. If civil governments have a right to enforce the moral law, then they must prohibit blasphemy; if they have the right and power to prohibit blasphemy, then they have the right and the power to legislate on any other matters of morality and religion. In short, the whole matter of the right of the State to legislate on matters of religion, must stand or fall with the right to legislate against blasphemy. We think the following propositions will demonstrate that the State has no right to inflict any penalty, for violation of the third commandment.

1. If a man has a right, so far as men and human governments are concerned, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, he has an equal right not to worship him at all. That religion is to be a matter of free choice with every individual, is evident from the gospel call, "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." If whosoever will, may come, then whosoever will not, may stay away. Man's free agency is everywhere recognized in the Bible. To be sure, certain penalties are announced as sure to be visited upon those who do not accept the gospel; but these penalties are visited, not for refusal to accept the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they would have been freed by accepting the gospel, but which, since they do not come to Christ, remain upon them. The truth is, that every man is just as free to reject the gospel as he is to accept it. So far as men are concerned, he has as much right to believe nothing as he has to believe in God and the Bible.

2. If no man has a right to compel another to worship God, then men have no right to compel such an one to show reverence for God; for reverence is worship. The man who reverences God, worships him; and the man who does not reverence and worship God, violates the third commandment, even though he does not openly blaspheme.

3. If it be claimed that refraining from taking God's name in vain is not an act of worship, and does not indicate reverence for him, then the same thing must be true with reference to heathen gods. And then if the heathen were in a majority in this country, or if we were in a heathen country, they would have a right to compel us to refrain from speaking against their gods. For,

4. Blasphemy is not simply the use of profane oaths, but speaking against God. Last year a man was convicted of blasphemy, in New Jersey, yet there was no evidence that he had sworn. The only thing for which he

was convicted, was for speaking most disrespectfully of God, the Bible, and religion. When our missionaries go to foreign lands, they blaspheme the gods of the heathen. Paul was at Ephesus, he declared that "they be no gods which are made with hands." Now if the National Reform idea that the majority ought to rule in matters of religion, be true, then Paul ought not to have said anything against those heathen gods.

5. The ten commandments comprise the sum of all morality. The perfect keeping of them is perfect religion. To conscientiously and truly refrain from taking God's name in vain; that is, to reverence the name of God, is an act of religion. Therefore, if obedience to the third commandment may be enforced by the State, then the State may enforce religion upon all. The germ of all religious legislation lies in the enactment of laws against blasphemy.

But it may be said that our God is the true God, and that the Christian religion is the true religion, and that therefore people ought to worship our God, and adhere to our religion; that the gods of the heathen are no gods at all, and that we alone have a right to enforce laws concerning religion. Then we set ourselves up as the only ones who have the right of choice in matters of religion. And then the question might well be asked by the heathen, Who gave you a right to choose your religion and ours too? Have we not equal rights with you?

Let our National Reform friends turn their whole attention to making men Christians, in accordance with gospel methods. When they have done that, so that this is in fact a Christian Nation, and all the people without exception, are Christians, and of one mind, then it will be time enough to talk about making laws prescribing the forms of religion.

E. J. W.

Mr. Gault Speaks.

IN the SENTINEL of December, 1887, in answer to the CHRISTIAN STATESMAN'S inquiry, we wrote this:—

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

With this Mr. M. A. Gault makes his voice to clash after this sort:—

"There are two difficulties about the SENTINEL'S theory of government, one is its readers don't understand it, and the other is it don't understand itself. If it would only reason a moment it might discover that in our Government Cæsar represents the people, and among the things we must render to Cæsar is one day's rest in seven, and the security of the family relation, the security of life, liberty and property."

The great trouble with Mr. Gault is that he measures other people's understanding by his own; and because he doesn't understand a thing, he at once decides that nobody else

does. The gentleman greatly mistakes; the readers of the SENTINEL do understand it, and the SENTINEL thoroughly understands itself. As for Mr. Gault the SENTINEL can only repeat to him the answer that Dr. Johnson once gave to one who said that he "didn't understand:" "I give you *reasons*, sir; I cannot give you an *understanding*, sir."

Then he informs us that if we should reason a moment we might discover that "among the things we must render to Cæsar is one day's rest in seven." Well, let us reason a moment. Christ commanded: "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Now how did Cæsar ever come into possession of one day's rest in seven? The truth is he never came into possession of such a thing at all. The word of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God." The Sabbath is God's. He called it "*My* holy day." It is "*the Lord's* day." And the Lord has never resigned to Cæsar the possession of this day. Now as we are to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's, and as the Sabbath is wholly the Lord's, therefore there never can be any obligation upon any soul to render to Cæsar any such thing as the Sabbath or one day's rest in seven. Cæsar has no proprietorship whatever in the Sabbath, and he has no right to any. And whenever he attempts to assert any such thing, he obtrudes himself upon the rights and prerogatives of God; puts himself in the place of God; and demands the obedience which is due to God alone. And *that* is the principle of all Sabbath laws, and of Sunday laws, enforced by the civil power. And the SENTINEL is going to tell the people so.

Religious Bigotry in Spain.

THE land of the Inquisition, of somber cathedrals and bloody bull-rings, is more intensely Roman Catholic than Italy, and owing to its comparative isolation is less influenced by modern ideas of progress. Under the reign of Queen Isabel II., Matamoras, Carasco, and their friends, converted Bible-readers at Malaga, were thrown into prison and condemned to the galleys for professing Protestantism and assembling for religious devotion; in consequence of a strong protest of an international deputation of the Evangelical Alliance, the sentence of penal servitude was changed into exile (1863). The misgovernment and immorality of the queen resulted in her expulsion from the throne (1868), and in a succession of civil wars.

The Constitution of 1869 declares, in Art. XXI, the Catholic Apostolic Roman Religion to be the religion of the State, and imposes upon the Nation the obligation of maintaining its worship and its ministers. This is old Spanish. The second clause grants, for the first time, toleration to non-Catholics in these words: "No person shall be molested in the territory of Spain for his religious opinions, nor for the exercise of his particular religious worship, saving the respect due to Christian morality." Very good as far as it goes. But

during the reaction under Alfonso XII., the Constitution was modified June 30, 1876, and the concession of toleration virtually nullified by the addition: "Nevertheless, no other ceremonies, nor manifestations in public will be permitted than those of the religion of State." Thus the Constitution of 1876 restricts the liberty of non-Catholic worship to private houses. No church or chapel looking like a house of God, no tower, no bell, no procession, no public announcement is suffered by law, and Protestant preachers and evangelists depend altogether upon the tender mercies of the local magistrate, priests and people. Notwithstanding, the Protestants continue to labor, under these disadvantages, in about fifty humble places of worship in Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, San Sebastian and other cities where more liberality prevails than in ignorant and bigoted country districts. At the census of 1877 it was found that sixty per cent. of the population could not read.

On the other hand the Spanish Government has greatly diminished the material resources of the State Church. By two decrees of the Cortes, passed July 23, 1835, and March 9, 1836, all monastic establishments were suppressed, and their property confiscated for the benefit of the Nation.

Portugal knows and tolerates no other religion besides the Roman Catholic, except among foreign residents, who may worship privately in their houses, but not in a church. —*Dr. Philip Schaff, in Independent.*

Aims of the National Reform Association.

"My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36.

THE Jews expected the Messiah to establish a kingdom and enforce his teachings by laws and penalties of a worldly nature; and when they drew from him the confession that he was the Christ, and still disappointed their expectations, they brought him before Pilate with the charge of treason against the Roman Government. When Pilate asked him concerning it, he confessed, in the language of the text, and added, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." Evidently, *this* truth. Pilate was convinced that Christ's kingdom was of a nature that would not interfere with human governments, and said to the Jews, "I find no fault in him at all." He could not have said this, had he understood that his kingdom was of a worldly nature, secured and maintained by political strife and physical force.

When the soldiers went to take Jesus, Peter expected he would resort to force to deliver himself, and drew his sword to that end. But Jesus said, "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" Matt. 26:52-54.

He thus taught his disciples that turning to human power to advance his cause, was turning from him who said, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord." Jer. 17:5.

Neither Christ nor his apostles ever appealed to such power or authority to propagate their doctrines, or ever sought redress from that source. Christ said to his disciples, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Matt. 20:25-27. There were to be no lords nor subordinates among them, but all were to be on equality under him.

True religion is voluntary. Enforced religion is a mockery. Paul says, "Though we walk *in* the flesh, we do not war *after* the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." 2 Cor. 10:3, 4. In Eph. 6:11, 12, he says, "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against *flesh and blood*," hence no need of carnal weapons. The only weapon furnished in the Christian armory is "the sword of the Spirit," "the word of God." This is the only one used, or authorized to be used, by Christ and his apostles, in propagating or defending Christianity. The cause would doubtless have been far in advance of what it is to-day, if no appeal had ever been made to human force for its promotion, but had it been treated as entirely above worldly wisdom, power, or policy.

By what method and spirit do the National Reformers propose to accomplish their end? They shall speak for themselves. I give them credit for being conscientious. Saul of Tarsus was also conscientious in trying to propagate his faith by legal and forcible means, and overthrow what he thought opposed it. And, like him, the National Reform Association are evidently doing what is "*contrary to Jesus of Nazareth.*"

Rev. M. A. Gault says, in the *Christian Statesman*:—

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

Suppose the Pope of Rome should be the one to interpret what the moral law enjoins, would Mr. Gault be satisfied? But, of course, the National Reform Association expect to have that prerogative.—*Perhaps.*—Well, let us see what they intend to do. In their Article V, declaring reasons for amending the United States Constitution so as to make it a standard and guaranty of morality, Mr. Gault says:—

"We need it to correct our most unfortunate attitude under the first amendment, which restrains Congress from prohibiting the free ex-

ercise of any false religion, such as Mormonism, Oneidism, pagan idolatry, etc."

This "etc." of course includes any religious beliefs and practices which they deem erroneous. The first amendment referred to reads thus: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Freedom to worship God according to one's own judgment and conscience, they think, should not be tolerated, except as their judgment and conscience dictate to be proper. This change, they teach, is to be accomplished peaceably, if all acquiesce, and otherwise by force.

Mr. Gault says:—

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

What anarchist makes bloodier threats than this? It smacks strongly of the spirit of Roman Catholicism. "Cardinal Manning insists that it is a sin, and even an 'insanity' to hold that men have an inalienable right to liberty of conscience and of worship; or to deny that Rome has the right to repress, by force, all religious observances save her own, or to teach that Protestants in a Catholic country should be allowed the exercise of their religion."—*Grattan Guinness, in Christian Herald and Signs of our Times.*

Rev. W. J. Coleman at Lake Side, O., last August said:—

"There ought to be a mighty army ready to pour out treasure and blood, if need be, to vindicate the authority of Christ. The Bible should be adopted as a standard to decide questions of political life, to decide between right and wrong. The idea of a divine law and a divine Christ should be forced into politics. There is now no religion in the Constitution of the United States. Our aim is to bring this Nation to Christ, and to place it under the divine law. Our fundamental principles are, Christ is king of the Nation, and the Bible is the rule of action."

At the same convention Dr. McAllister said:

"Those who oppose this work now will discover, when the religious amendment is made to the Constitution, that if they do not see fit to fall in with the majority, they must abide the consequences, or seek some more congenial clime."

The Roman Catholics will doubtless indorse this sentiment with the understanding that they shall be the ones to interpret, and the National Reform Association have already appealed to them to join with them in bringing this about. In an editorial of the *Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884, is the following:—

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

Yes, even to shedding the blood of their Protestant brethren, who conscientiously differ with them in such measures. Here is an appeal, virtually, to the Pope in Rome to aid them in changing the Constitution and government of the United States.

The following from the encyclical letter of

Pope Leo XIII. (A. D. 1885) shows that the Roman Catholics are striving for the same power as are the National Reformers:—

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible into the administration of civil affairs, must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of States and legislation to be moulded to the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose, for an instant, from view the above principles. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart and soul and mind in defense of the church and Christian wisdom."

Compare this with a speech of Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., LL.D., Vice-president of the National Reform Association, in which he denounces Seventh-day Baptists as atheists. Speaking of atheists, deists and Jews, he said:—

"The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are joined with other members of the class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what particular day of the week should be observed as holy. These all are, for the occasion, so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be treated, as for this question, as one party. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

What else does this mean, than that those who oppose this measure, however sincere and godly, are no more to be tolerated than the worst thing out of hell? Does this language breathe the love and charity exhibited and taught by Christ? "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:9. "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" Luke 23:31. —*Rev. N. Wardner, D. D.*

BIBLE-READINGS.

IN TWO NUMBERS EMBRACING A PORTION OF THE BIBLE COURSE AT HEALDSBURG COLLEGE. BY ELD. E. J. WAGGONER.

THESE Readings were prepared especially for the use of colporters and those who intend to conduct Bible-readings in missionary fields, and they present a connected chain of argument upon the fundamental doctrines of Present Truth.

NUMBER ONE contains 57 pages, embracing sixteen readings, as follows:—


Daniel 2.....	No. Ques. 95	The Law of God, No. 4.....	No. Ques. 32
Daniel 7.....	93	Luke 23:39-43.....	31
Daniel 8.....	60	Ephesians 2:15.....	26
Daniel 9.....	94	Romans 6:14.....	23
The Sanctuary.....	179	Romans 10:4.....	17
The Law of God, No. 1.....	30	Galatians 3:13.....	19
" " " 2.....	81	Romans 3:20.....	10
" " " 3.....	28	Tithing.....	99

NUMBER TWO contains 46 pages, embracing twenty-two readings, as follows:—

The Sabbath, No. 1.....	No. Ques. 51	2 Corinthians 5:8.....	No. Ques. 18
" " " 2.....	49	Luke 23:39-43.....	16
" " " 3.....	42	1 Peter 3:18-20.....	10
Colossians 2:14-17.....	19	Luke 16:19-31.....	37
Psalms 118:24.....	13	Living Souls.....	14
Penalty of Transgression.....	10	Nature of Man.....	13
Sanctification.....	43	Punishment of the Wicked.....	70
Second Coming of Christ.....	64	Work of the Spirit, No. 1.....	47
The Resurrection.....	59	" " " 2.....	51
Immortality.....	18	Church Membership.....	61
Philippians 1:23.....	5	Missionary Labor.....	52

Price for the Two, 50 Cents. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

SCHOOL OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY,



OPENS MARCH 15, 1885

The undersigned have organized, and will open on the above date, a School of Domestic Economy, to be continued for twenty-five weeks. The following Subjects will be taught, both theoretically and practically:—

SCIENTIFIC COOKERY, TABLE SERVICE, HYGIENE OF DIET, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING, DRESSMAKING, LAUNDRY WORK, ECONOMICAL HOUSEKEEPING, DOMESTIC HYGIENE (including Sanitary care of house and premises, tests for impure water, purification of water, disinfection, etc.), INDIVIDUAL HYGIENE, and KEEPING OF FAMILY ACCOUNTS. In fact, every subject pertaining to the economical and hygienic care of a home.

TERMS: Tuition, \$25.00. Board and Tuition, \$100.00.

A number of suitable persons who can furnish good recommendations, will be given an opportunity to meet their expenses wholly in work, and if thoroughly capable can earn moderate wages during the course.

This is an Opportunity which no Young Woman who wishes to Become a

Good Housekeeper can afford to miss.

For circulars and further particulars apply at once to **SANITARIUM SCHOOL OF ECONOMY, Battle Creek, Michigan.**

TEMPERANCE PACKAGES.

We have put up in neat packages, with printed wrappers, three different assortments of our health and temperance works, which we will furnish, post-paid, at the prices named.

TEN CENT PACKAGE.

This package contains 100 pages in twenty-five tracts, as follows:—

The Code of Health—How to Live a Century—Pure Air—How to Ventilate a House—A Back Yard Examined—Inventory of a Cellar—What's in the Well—Cayenne and Its Congeners—A Live Hog Examined—A Peep into a Packing House—The Contents of a Tea-Pot—Tea Tasters—Tea Drinking and Nervousness—Tea Topers—Tea and Tippling—Tobacco Poisoning—A Relic of Barbarism—Tobacco Blindness—Science vs. Tobacco-Using—The Smoke Nuisance—The Rum Family—A Drunkard's Stomach—Gin Livers—A Rum Blossom—Alcoholism.

Of the twenty-five tracts, ten are devoted to general hygiene, five to the subject of temperance, five to alcoholic drinks, and five to tea and coffee. Twelve packages, post-paid, for \$1.00.

FORTY CENT PACKAGE.

The second package, costing forty cents, post-paid, contains the following tracts and pamphlets:—

True Temperance—Alcohol, What Is It?—Our Nation's Curse—Cause and Cure of Intemperance—Effects of Intemperance—The Drunkard's Arguments Answered—Alcoholic Medication—Alcoholic Poison—Tobacco Poisoning—Tobacco-Using a Cause of Disease—Tobacco-Using a Relic of Barbarism—Evil Effects of Tea and Coffee—Ten Arguments on Tea and Coffee—Pork, the Dangers of Its Use—Diphtheria, its Causes, Prevention, and Proper Treatment. By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. This book should be in every household.

ONE DOLLAR PACKAGE.

The third package, costing \$1.00, post-paid, contains in addition to the forty cent package the following pamphlets:—

Proper Diet for Man, price 15c.—The Uses of Water, price 25c.—Dyspepsia, Its Cause and Cure, price 25c.

The object of Arranging these Packages is to get them in a convenient form for sale and for selection.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

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

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

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1888.

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

In his revival services in Kansas City, last January, "Sam" Jones said one day:—

"One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote."

True enough, but would we not have more un-Christian voters too? If not, why not? Not all of the women in the United States are Christians, by any means. The truth is, that there are a great many more women in the United States who are not Christians, than there are who are Christians. And although it is true that to give women the ballot, will give more Christian voters, it is equally true that there will be more un-Christian voters also, and in the end the matter would not be helped at all. History does not present women-politicians in any better light than it does men-politicians.

In a sermon at Kansas City, January 22, "Sam" Small, in speaking of our country said:—

"From Maine and Massachusetts, to Georgia, all along the coast, the characters of the settlements gave it as one of their objects to glorify God, and forward his kingdom. . . . Then the heresy of hell took hold of a handful of people, and they made a Constitution, and left God entirely out of it."

We had thought to make some comments on this, but to brand as "the heresy of hell," the action of George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and the other noble makers of the United States Constitution, is sufficient of itself to render infamous the whole complaint which the speaker makes against the Constitution. Mr. Small is an evangelist and a great revivalist; now here is a conundrum: If the religion which he inculcates is compatible with such defamation as the above, then how much better off would this Nation be, if such religion should become National? We give it up.

THE Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marion County, Missouri, in convention assembled at Palmyra, in that State, "resolved" that,—

"We believe the very same condemnation and punishment should be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law."

So do we, and more than that, we know that it will be, for the Author of the moral law has said that "there is no respect of persons with God." What could have led these excellent Christian women to think that the same condemnation and punishment might not be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law, when the word of God is so plain on the subject? Do they

suppose the Lord is going to prove recreant, and that it is therefore necessary for them to remind him of his duty? We suspect, however, that they have fallen into the dangerous error of believing that it is within the province of civil government to punish violation of the moral law, and they are contemplating the taking of God's work into their own hands.

In the February SENTINEL, it will be remembered that we asked Mr. W. T. McConnell "to show any commandment of God for keeping Sunday." We do not intend for a moment to convey the idea that we would not be opposed to civil laws enforcing its observance, even though it were commanded by the law of God. This was simply an *argumentum ad hominem*. We would be just as much opposed to civil laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, or any other day, even though it were commanded by the law of God, as we are as it is. Our opposition to Sunday laws is from *principle* and not from *partisanship*. The principle is that the civil power has no right to enforce the observance of any religious institution, of any kind whatever; nor to enforce any duty as a *commandment of God*. Yet, as against this principle, the Sunday institution is doubly weak: First it is wholly an ecclesiastical institution, and secondly, there is no commandment of God for it. And as the National Reformers propose to enforce the keeping of Sunday as a commandment of God, of course it is perfectly in order for us to call for the commandment, while at the same time we would oppose civil laws enforcing it, even though there were a commandment of God for it.

Not a Christian Nation.

It would be difficult to use language in a looser way than by calling this "a Christian Nation." In all the Nation there is not a single town, nor a village even, in which the people are all Christians. A single family in which all are Christians is seldom found; and individual Christians are not abundant. We do not say these things to find fault; we are simply stating the facts in the case, as every person knows who looks at things as they are. Let any person anywhere in the land honestly ask himself the question, and honestly answer it, How many of my immediate neighbors and acquaintances actually show in the works of a godly life that they are real, consistent Christians? In the face of facts as they are, the answer only can be, Very few. How many are really separate from the world, and conformed to the will of Christ?

Take even the churches themselves, and everybody knows, and the churches themselves confess, that many of their members will not bear the test of the precepts of Christ. Many of them love the opera or the circus more than they love the prayer-meetings; and the excursion more than the services of the church; and the newspaper more than the sermon; and pleasure more than God; and the world more than Christ. Then, while it is thus with the church, where is the sense

of calling the Nation, Christian? and while the church is so nearly half full of worldlings, what is the use of talking about this being a Christian Nation? The trouble is that they put upon the term "Christian" a construction so loose that there is scarcely any discernible distinction between many of those who bear it and those who don't, and then spread the term over the whole mass, and thus they have a "Christian" Nation. But so long as the term "Christian" means what the word of God means—so long as it means strict conformity to the precepts of Christ—just so long it will be that this is not, and cannot be, a Christian Nation, except by each individual's becoming a Christian by an abiding, working faith in Christ.

A Wicked Question.

A CERTAIN "W. J. C." wrote to the *Interior* lately, from Gravel Hill, North Carolina, as follows:—

"DEAR INTERIOR: I would like very much to have your views upon the legality of allowing heathen temples to be erected in this country, as I see they have such things in some places, and hear of no efforts being put forth to prevent them. Is our Constitution so flexible that it can be made to bend to suit every shade of invention of the devil? There is a vast difference between religious worship and idolatry. I do not think the Lord is well pleased with it, and are we not encouraging it by allowing it, and becoming therefore a party to the crime? Ought not the attention of the Government to be called to it, with a view to its suppression?"

And some people seem to think the spirit of the Inquisition is dead! Mr. "W. J. C." ought to be told that however flexible our Constitution may be it cannot yet be bent to suit that worst of all the "inventions of the devil,"—religious persecution, and the despotism of religious bigotry which is so hard for "W. J. C." and his kind even now to restrain. We are glad to see that the *Interior* has the right view of the matter. It answers the question thus:—

"Undoubtedly every man in this country has a constitutional right to worship God, or any god, or no god, as he pleases; so long as he does so in an orderly way. Freedom of worship cannot be legally denied."

It is not every religious paper in the land that sees the matter so clearly.

THE reign of Constantine bears witness that the State which seeks to advance Christianity by the worldly means at its command, may be the occasion of more injury to this holy cause than the earthly power which opposes it with whatever virulence.—*Neander*.

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
Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - 50c.
In clubs of five or more copies, per year, each, - - - 30c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 2s.
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.