

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 1886.

NUMBER 8.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

OAKLAND, CAL.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

LEGAL CHRISTIANITY is a solecism, a contradiction of terms. When Christianity asks the aid of government beyond mere *impartial protection*, it disowns itself. Its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated the better it is for both.—*Supreme Court of Ohio.*

A STATE church cannot well avoid fostering hypocrisy and worldliness; and mere intellectual advantages, without reference to character, are apt to push men into positions for which mere intellectual qualifications are insufficient. Where appointments and advancement are dependent upon secular authorities, influences will be brought to bear upon the clerical profession which tend toward the decay, rather than the awakening, of spiritual life.—*H. H. Boyeson, in Congregationalist.*

THE Catholic *Monitor*, of San Francisco, in an article relating how Catholics were persecuted by the Orangemen, after their organization in Ulster in the last century, says:—

“And this happened under the flag of Protestant England, a little over a century ago; yet the Catholic Church is held up to the world as the *only* ecclesiastical power that ever persecuted for conscience' sake!”

Not so; we would not so single out the Catholic Church as the sole persecutor. Any ecclesiastical power, be it Protestant, Catholic, or Pagan, if joined with civil power, will persecute dissenters. It cannot be otherwise. The Catholic Church has been the greatest persecutor known in history, because it enjoyed the longest period of union with, and supremacy over, the civil power. If it had never been able to use the secular power, its persecutions would never have been heard of. The Catholic Church from the time of Constantine until the sixteenth century is the model after which the Religious Amendmentists in the United States are working; and if they shall gain their purpose, Protestant America will, from the very nature of the case, persecute dissenters as vigorously as did Catholic France or Episcopal England.

## The Kingdom of Christ.

IN our remarks upon the idea of the “National Reformers” concerning the “Republic of Israel,” we denied their assertion that the seventy elders of Israel were a Congress, or a legislative body. We should go further, and deny that they were constituted a *body* in any sense whatever. They were inferior judges or justices, each acting separately from the others. They were no more a Congress than are the justices of the peace in any of our States. They never deliberated or acted in an associated capacity. To call them a Congress, and Israel a Republic, is an abuse of history and of language. But we know not to what these professed Reformers will not resort to make plausible their pretenses, and thus to compass their ends.

And they err as greatly in their views of the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ as they do in regard to the history of the government of Israel. Christianity was established as a national system; its redeemed will be “of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues” (Rev. 7 : 9), but no nation in the aggregate will ever be saved. Even Israel, a nation ruled directly by the Lord under inspired leaders and teachers, never developed a generation of sincere believers. In establishing the gospel, James said that God “did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name.” Acts 15 : 14. It was necessary to have a separate people, with its priesthood and genealogies, both to represent in types the work of Christ, and to identify him as the seed of Abraham and the son of David, in fulfillment of the promises and the prophecies. But that necessity no longer exists, and therefore Christ “hath broken down the middle wall of partition” (Eph. 2 : 14), putting no difference between Jews and Gentiles (Acts 15 : 9), ordaining that “in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” Acts 10 : 35. The gospel of Christ is a gospel of faith—of personal piety. And the work of faith is a work of preparation for admittance to the kingdom of Christ; as Peter says “to them that have obtained like precious faith with us,” that if they add to their faith the Christian graces, they shall never fall, “for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” See 2 Peter 1 : 1–11. It is a denial of every principle of the gospel to talk of “Christ coming into his kingdom in the United States” by means of a popular vote or a Constitutional Amendment.

But so the amendmentists talk, and for this they profess to be looking.

They seem to entirely misapprehend the present position and work of the Saviour, and the nature of the authority which he now possesses by the gift of the Father. It is a fact plainly taught in the Scriptures that the Father, at different times, confers authority of an entirely different nature upon his Son. Christ himself makes an announcement of this fact when he speaks of his occupying *two thrones* at different times, and for different objects. We refer to Rev. 3 : 21, where Jesus testifies thus to John: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in *his throne*.” The differences of these thrones, and of the objects of Christ's occupying them, we will notice.

Of the Father's throne we say:—

1. It is the throne of the dominion of the whole universe. “God, the Judge of all,” sits upon it, and before it must come the actions of all the subjects of the Creator, and from it must go forth the decisions which concern the eternal destinies of his creatures.

2. That throne is in Heaven above. It is not, and never was, upon this earth.

3. Upon that throne Christ sits as a priest—a mediator or intercessor for our race. In this he fulfills the type of Melchisedec, who was “king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God.” Heb. 8 : 1 says: “We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the Heavens.” See Paul's argument in chapters 5 to 9. Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, because his priesthood is on a throne—the throne of his Father in Heaven. In this it differs from the priesthood of Aaron. And only in this sense is he a king at the present time—a priest-king. All his present rule and authority is in harmony with his office and character of a mediator or advocate. It is not the authority of an executive, or of one who punishes sinners. His authority in that respect is in the future.

4. His occupancy of that throne is limited in regard to time; his priestly kingdom he will deliver up; his advocacy or work of mediation will end. 1 Cor. 15 : 24–28.

5. We have no genealogy of Melchisedec, and, accordingly, Christ has no predecessor or successor in his priesthood. He sprang from a tribe which could have no priesthood in Israel, and he alone is priest on the throne of his Father.

6. While sitting upon the throne of his

Father in Heaven, he is expecting and waiting for a gift of power and authority of another nature. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. "After he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. 10:12, 13. His Father puts his enemies under his feet, but not till his priestly reign on the throne of Heaven ends. 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Of his own throne we may say:—

1. It is the throne—not of his Father in Heaven, but—of his father David. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." Luke 1:32. "God had sworn with an oath to him [David], that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Acts 2:30.

2. The throne of David was not in Heaven. The first dominion or rule over Israel as a nation, was from Heaven, because their government was originally a theocracy. But the throne of David was in every respect distinct from the throne of universal power whereon Christ now sits.

3. It is counted Christ's own throne, because he was born heir to it, and his genealogy from David had to be preserved in order that his claim to it might be recognized.

4. His reign upon this throne will never end. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:32, 33.

5. Jehovah promised to establish the throne and seed of David forever. "Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." Ps. 89:3, 4, 27. The Revision says: "The highest of the kings of the earth." Therefore it was prophesied of Christ, David's son, that, when the kingdom is given to him, "all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Dan. 7:14.

6. David had no priesthood, and his son and heir can have no priesthood on his throne. As has been proved, the priesthood of Christ is on the throne of his Father in Heaven. Hence his reign upon the throne of David is not a priestly reign. When he is given power over the nations, according to the promise of the Father, the fulfillment of which he has yet in expectation, he will no longer be a mediator, or Saviour of sinners.

The points of difference between the *two reigns* of Christ, and of the *two thrones* upon which he reigns, are plainly brought to view in the Scriptures. It is only by confounding the circumstances of the two reigns, and misapplying the Scriptures in reference thereto, that the "National Reformers" make their positions appear somewhat plausible.

It must be remembered that "*his enemies* are put under his feet." When the nations are subdued under him, they are his enemies still. And what will he do with them when they are given to him? The second psalm answers this question: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou

shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." And with this agree all the prophecies. Thus in Dan. 2, the kingdom of Christ is represented—not as converting the nations and incorporating them into itself, but—as breaking in pieces and destroying them. They are not brought into subjection to a mild sway of gospel grace; for there is no gospel grace offered to sinners after Christ ends his priesthood and receives his power over the nations. The kingdoms of earth will be dashed in pieces, broken, destroyed; they become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, driven away by the wind, so that "no place is found for them." To represent all this as the conversion of the nations, and their adopting the gospel of the kingdom as their "national religion" is to greatly pervert the Scriptures. It is crying "peace and safety" when destruction is impending. 1 Thess. 5:1-3.

Rev. 11:15-18 is most explicit in the same direction. The seven trumpets of this book cover this whole dispensation; the last three are called "woe trumpets" (see Rev. 8:13), because woes are upon the earth during their sounding. This dispensation closes with woes upon the nations, because "in the last days" the wicked "wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3.

We have not space in this number for a comment on Rev. 11:15-18, but will briefly notice a few of the points introduced. It is under the sounding of the seventh angel that the kingdoms of this world are given to Christ, and that his everlasting reign commences. This is yet future; for his priestly reign on the throne of his Father is not yet ended. And it is not only said that the kingdoms become Christ's, but "of *our Lord* and of *his Christ*." And thanks are ascribed to the great God, the Father, because he has taken his power to himself; which, of course, refers to the kingdoms of this world. Hitherto they have been under the sway of Satan; God deposes the great usurper, who took by stratagem the dominion given to Adam (compare Gen. 1:26 and Luke 4:5-7), and gives it to "his Christ," the second Adam, who, in turn, gives it to his people, the saints. Verse 18 tells us the condition of the nations when they were given to Christ: "And the nations were angry." The disposition of the just God toward the angry nations is also shown: "And thy wrath is come." The time is further pointed out; these things take place under the seventh trumpet, and the wrath of God is come, "and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth."

Jesus said the saints will be rewarded at the resurrection of the just. Luke 14:14. The resurrection of the just takes place when Christ himself returns to the earth. 1 Thess. 4:15-17. At the coming of Christ, the saints inherit, or enter into and possess, the kingdom. Matt. 25:31-34. And they cannot inherit it before the resurrection; for Paul says "that flesh and blood [man in a mortal state] cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption

inherit incorruption." 1 Cor. 15:50. Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, which cannot be inherited by dying people; they must first be immortalized by the resurrection or a translation. God hath "chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." James 2:5. They who are rich in faith, and love God, are now *heirs* of the kingdom, and they will *inherit* it when Jesus comes and redeems them from the bondage of corruption. See Rom. 8:23 and 2 Cor. 5:4.

At a future time we may notice more at length the prophecies of the setting up of the kingdom, and of the closing scenes of this dispensation. We trust that even this brief view will suffice to show the errors of the "National Reformers" in their application of the prophecies. They propose to set up the kingdom by a majority vote; but God will in his wrath destroy the majority and give the kingdom to a "little flock." Luke 12:32. J. H. W.

### The Golden Opportunity of National Reform.

THERE is a glorious field open and white already to the harvest of National Reform. There is a tree whose fruit is so lusciously ripe for National Reform, that the tree needs but to be shaken for the fruit to fall into the mouth of the National Reform eater; and we urgently call the attention of the *Christian Statesman* to it, and through it the attention of all the National Reformers.

Rev. J. H. Pettee, of Okayama, Japan, reports in the May number of the *Missionary Herald* that Japan is so amazingly eager to become a Christian nation, that there is danger that she will adopt "some low, loose type of Christianity," and that "in a mere formal way." He says there is danger that she may adopt the Roman Catholic, or the Russo-Greek form of Christianity, because "Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, or other Protestant denominations will not, or cannot offer her a short road to" her longed-for goal—the name and place of a Christian nation. Now the National Reform Party furnishes just the short cut to the place of a Christian nation, which Japan in her heathen blindness is groping about to find. The National Reform Party, we believe, owns the right of way to this road which now Japan so long has sought, and mourned because she found it not. How can the National Reformers sit still, and lend no helping hand to poor, pleading Japan? We do not wish to interfere in any way with the internal workings of that Party, but if we might be allowed the privilege of making a suggestion, we would recommend that Rev. E. B. Graham and Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., be sent at once as National Reform missionaries to conduct Japan along the National-Reform short-cut to the place where she may stand before the world a Christian nation. Here is an opportunity for them to fairly rival St. Francis Xavier or Gregory Thaumaturgus.

We would advise them that, for the success of their particular movement in this case, delay is dangerous; for Mr. Pettee reports that "the most progressive secular paper in the sunrise

kingdom" has already "openly advocated baptizing the emperor and a few of the nobles, that Japan may be considered a Christian nation." It declares, "Christian blue is the fashionable color, and not Buddhist brown; therefore let us put on a blue coat." So if the National Reform Party would have the glory of starting Japan in the race of Christian nations, it is essential that its missionaries be sent speedily.

Let not our readers suppose for an instant that Mr. Pettee asks for any such thing as the National Reform movement would supply, or that he would indorse it. He has too much respect for Christianity for that. He rightly gives this subject the title of "A New Peril in Japan;" and declares in words of solid truth, "The last thing a true Christian desires to see in Japan is, Christianity proclaimed the State religion." So say we, in Japan or in any other country; least of all in our own. But that is exactly what the National Reform Party proposes to establish in this country, and aims to create here the identical condition of affairs as that into which Japan is about to plunge. And were its purpose accomplished, that would be the darkest day that Christianity has ever seen in America.

A. T. J.

### Will "National Reformers" Persecute?

In the "National Reform" Convention held in Pittsburgh, in February, 1874, Dr. A. A. Hodge made a speech in favor of the proposed amendment, in the course of which he uttered the following words:—

"If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, in the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship; and while they may be restrained from some self-indulgence, they can be constrained to no violation of their convictions.

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose that precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences."

From this deliverance we draw the following necessary conclusions:—

The idea intended to be conveyed is that "we," the "National Reformers," are all good; "we" would not persecute anybody; but if the unbelieving minority should prevail, "we," the innocent and helpless majority, would be at their mercy. As a piece of sentimental cant, the utterance was a success; as common sense and truth, it was a failure, for minorities have never yet persecuted majorities, and the very idea of such a thing is absurd. No matter how violent a man may be, the man who has twice the power that he has is in no danger. What Dr. Hodge calls the "unbelieving minority," now occupies, according to the "National Reformers," the very ground for which they are striving. The "Reformers" claim that they want to Christianize this Government; then it must be that this "unbelieving minority" now holds the ground. And yet we have not heard of any persecution being raised against the "Christian majority." As a matter of fact, no

people have ever suffered persecution for conscience' sake, except from the hands of those who professed some form of religion.

These "National Reformers" do not agree among themselves. Dr. Hodge says that, if their project carries, infidels will be just where they have always been. But Mr. Coleman says that the success of their movement will "disfranchise every logically consistent infidel." We believe Mr. Coleman's statements, because (1) from the very nature of the case the "Reformers," if successful, must disfranchise those who dissent from their positions, and because (2) Dr. Hodge's own statement provides not only for the disfranchisement of infidels, but for the persecution of those Christians who may not agree with the majority. Note carefully the following:—

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose that precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences."

With the last clause we agree. When there is a conflict between the law of God and the law of men, the law of God must have the preference. "But," say the "National Reformers," "we propose to make the law of God the law of the land, and then there can be no persecution, because the law of men will coincide with that of God." The fallacy in this proposition lies in the assumption that they, if successful, will make the perfect law of God the law of the land, or that, if they should do so, all who revere God's law would agree with their understanding of it. They count on there being no dissenters except infidels, forgetting or ignoring the fact that there are conscientious differences of opinions even among Christians.

It is a fact that among professed Christians there is not perfect unanimity of opinion concerning the law of God. On this point the Christian world may be divided into the following classes:—

1. Those who hold that the law of God is binding upon all men.

2. Those who hold that the law was abolished at the cross, and that it now has no claims upon anybody.

The first class may be still further divided as follows:—

1. Those who hold that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday.

2. Those who believe that the fourth commandment now enjoins the observance of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

As all of those who reject the authority of God's law are agreed that Sunday is the proper rest day for mankind, it follows that the only practical controversy over the law of God is concerning the application of the fourth commandment; the great majority of professed Christians (including the National Reformers), construe it as enjoining the Sunday rest, while a small minority are positive in their conscientious conviction that it requires them to keep Saturday. Now even allowing that the majority are actually right, and that their interpre-

tation of the law of God is correct, the fact remains that a minority do not admit their interpretation. Those in the minority are conscientious in their belief that the law which the majority sustain is opposed to the law of God; and when the law of men conflicts with the law of God, Christians have no alternative but to obey the latter, and disobey the former; they must follow their convictions, and, as Dr. Hodge says, "take the consequences." That these "consequences" would be punishment for violating the law of the land, is a necessary and obvious conclusion. Dr. Hodge says in the same speech from which we have quoted:—

"The Christian minister receives the word of God as his law in the church, and interprets it for himself. The Christian magistrate receives the same word as his rule in the State, so far as it casts light upon human duties and relations involved in the functions of government, and the magistrate interprets it for himself."

Those who violate the laws, as interpreted by the magistrates, are always punished by the magistrates. It may be that the accused one has obeyed the law, according to *his own* view of it, but that does not shield him from punishment; in the eyes of the magistrate, he is a criminal. But punishment for following one's own convictions concerning the law of God, is persecution for conscience' sake. Therefore we say that if the Amendmentists succeed in carrying out their plans, there will be religious persecution just as surely as there will be conscientious Christians who dissent from their views. He who cannot see this is blind indeed. Indeed, the only ground on which they pretend that they will not persecute is that infidels have no convictions, and that all but infidels will agree with them. We are not prepared to admit that infidels have no convictions; but we are prepared to say that there are Christians who do not accept "National Reform" doctrine, and who have convictions.

E. J. W.

### The Danger Real.

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that there is in this country a large and influential party whose avowed object is to "secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States" as will allow Congress to do what the first article of amendments to the Constitution now forbids it to do, many persons imagine that religious liberty is in no danger. But it is in danger; and many are blindly giving assent to a project which, if successful, will bind, not only the acts, but also the consciences of all who are not in harmony with the views of these religious-political schemers.

The avowed object of this association is thus set forth in article II of its constitution:—

"The object of this society shall be to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Of course this may mean a great deal; or, like other party platforms, it may mean very little; and it is decidedly objectionable, or measurably unobjectionable, to the degree that it is made to mean all or less than is really ex-

pressed in it. However, we will allow its authors to explain its meaning. We may not find perfect harmony of sentiment in all the utterances of the National Reform Party; but the preponderance of testimony shows clearly that the amendment which they propose is designed to be practical as well as ornamental. In their Convention at Cleveland, Ohio, among other resolutions they adopted the following:—

“Resolved, That we re-affirm that this religious amendment, instead of infringing on any individual's right of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of Church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens.”

That sounds well; and is admirably adapted to the purpose for which it was framed; namely, to disarm opposition and lead people to suppose that that which they propose is simply a paper reform (?). Just what they do really propose is shown by the following bit of Christian (?) sentiment expressed by Professor C. A. Blanchard in the Pittsburgh convention in 1874:—

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

Of course the unavoidable inference is that Congress must make laws to punish for false religion, just as it makes laws to punish for false money, etc. And not only was this sentiment uttered in a National Reform Convention, but it was applauded by the members of that convention. But how such an amendment could possibly “form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens,” is not apparent to the average mind. And no wonder; for it is evident that were Congress to do anything of the kind it would restrict the religious liberty of all who should be in any respect outside of the religion thus established by law. For instance, the *Christian Statesman* once said of certain Congressmen who traveled on Sunday on their way to Washington:—

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

That is to say, give us the proposed amendment, and the man who travels on Sunday cannot hold office! He may be a Jew or a Seventh-day Baptist who conscientiously keeps the seventh day according to the strict letter of the fourth commandment;—may he not then set off for the national capital on Sunday?—No, indeed; for by act of Congress Sunday has been declared to be the Sabbath; and so the man who has rested on the seventh day, according to the commandment, as he verily believes, must also rest the first day according to act of Congress! And thus he is restrained both as to his outward actions and as to his conscience.

But suppose that he does travel on Sunday?—Oh! he cannot hold office. And more than that he cannot vote! In short, he will be disfranchised! At least that is the way Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the principal exponents of this

new plan of providing “the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens,” puts it. In the *Statesman* of November 1, 1883, Mr. Coleman, in reply to a question, said:—

“The classes who would object [to the amendment] are . . . Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it, if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would *disfranchise* every logically consistent infidel.”

There can be no mistaking this language. For all practical purposes all who object to the amendment are to be considered as Jews and infidels and atheists, and they are all to be disfranchised! And what for? Oh, forsooth the Jew keeps his store open on Sunday; and the infidels and atheists—well, being infidels and atheists, and this being a Christian nation, they of course can have no political rights anyway! They may be all well enough as neighbors, and tax payers, but then they can't vote; for don't you see that by act of Congress this has been made a Christian nation!

But it may be urged that Jews, infidels, and atheists are disfranchised because they will not do that which the amended Constitution requires; namely, recognize Christ as the ruler of the nation; also that being Jews, infidels, and atheists they are necessarily immoral persons, and therefore should have no voice in a government whose fundamental code is the moral law. But how about the Seventh-day Baptist? He fully recognizes Christ and the moral law, in fact, he is quite a stickler for the law. What, then, will be the attitude of the National Reform Government to one who differs from it only in that he, in all good conscience, keeps the day anciently observed by the people of God? Let Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Illinois, answer. After speaking of atheists, deists, and Jews, he says:—

“The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy. These all are, for the occasion, and as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. *They must be counted together.*”

Such an utterance needs no comment. This is not the sentiment of Him who said, “My kingdom is not of this world;” but it savors of the Dark Ages, and has about it the scent of the musty dungeons of the Inquisition. But history repeats itself; and why may it not do so in this as well as in other things? This Reform (?) Association is rapidly growing in numbers and influence. Their speakers are constantly in the field; and they are rapidly enlisting the sympathy and the co-operation of almost the entire ministry of our land. They are themselves ministers, and they go from place to place, visiting clergymen and securing the use of their churches in which to hold meetings.

They appeal to church people in behalf of religion; to moralists, in behalf of morality; to the temperance people, in behalf of temperance; and to laboring people in be-

half of a day of rest for workingmen. Railroad accidents are by them held up as evidence of the displeasure of God toward the railway companies for running their trains on Sunday. Cyclones and floods are represented as the judgments of God upon the Nation for its wickedness in refusing to make the decalogue (as expounded by the National Reform Party) the fundamental law of the land! In short, they appeal to any and every motive to compass their ends—and all for what? That they may multiply tenfold the number of hypocrites; that our churches may be defiled by political corruption; that religious bigotry and intolerance may spring up and flourish in our land, and that they may, like Saul of Tarsus before his conversion, enter into every house, and, haling men and women, commit to prison all who do not believe and practice as they, the National Reform Party, dictate.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

#### National Reformed Presbyterianism.

At its recent session at Rochester, New York, the Reformed Presbyterian Synod adopted a memorial to Congress, urging upon that body the necessity of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, advocated by the National Reform Party. The memorial “is to be signed by all adult members of the church both male and female, and laid before the National Legislature.” We have not space to print the memorial entire; suffice it to say that it presents the usual National Reform complaints about the present Constitution having in it “no acknowledgment of God nor of the moral laws of his Government;” that this “encourages the false doctrine that civil government has no moral nor religious duties to perform;” that the refusal of this nation to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as king, and to accept his law, “involves the Nation in unspeakable guilt and exposes us to the chastising and destroying judgments of God,” etc., etc., and closes with these words:—

“That we who present this petition are unable, for these reasons, to accept the Constitution as a right fundamental law for the nation, and are, therefore, debarred on conscientious grounds from participation in the Government. We can neither take office under it ourselves, nor by voting for others, lay this Constitution upon them as the rule of their official conduct.

“We pray you, therefore, to propose such an amendment to the National Constitution as shall suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority in national affairs, and so place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”

It will be seen at once that this is a regular National Reform document. Indeed, the National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics. The first step that was ever taken, the first paper that was ever presented in behalf of the National Reform movement, was by a Reformed Presbyterian, Mr. John Alexander, of Philadelphia. The leading, active workers in National Reform, called District Secretaries, are, with two exceptions, Reformed Presbyterians. Rev. W. J. Coleman, Rev. M. A. Gault, Rev. R. C.

Wylie, Rev. J. M. Foster, and Rev. N. M. Johnston, with Rev. D. McAllister and Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editors of the *Christian Statesman*, are all Reformed Presbyterians. The other two District Secretaries, Rev. J. H. Leiper and Rev. Wm. Weir, are professedly United Presbyterians, but in advocating the National Reform they clearly violate the United Presbyterian creed, and stand as avowed Reformed Presbyterians. All the arguments for National Reform are Reformed Presbyterian arguments; all the principles are Reformed Presbyterian principles. We repeat, therefore, that the National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics.

That this is the truth will be plainly apparent to any one who is acquainted with the two bodies; and the more closely the subject is studied, the more evident this truth will appear. We have room here for only a few points in proof. A catechism of the distinctive features of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, by William L. Roberts, D. D., in presenting the supposed claims of Christ as king in the civil affairs of nations, and the duties of nations to acknowledge him as civil ruler, declares this to be "a peculiar principle of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the grand doctrine of their Testimony." And "their Testimony" condemns as an error, the statement, "That there is any creature or institution which is not subject to Christ, for the good of his church."

In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, Rev. J. R. W. Sloane says of the Reformed Presbyterians:—

"The more special and distinctive principle of this Church, the one in which she differs from all others, is her practical protest against the secular character of the United States Constitution. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and that civil government is a divine ordinance, and one of the 'all things' put under him as the mediatorial ruler of the universe, and that to him the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse close incorporation with any government which does not in some form recognize those principles, and give them effective expression in its legislation. On examination of the United States Constitution, that remarkable document is found to contain no recognition of God as the source of all legitimate civil authority, nor of his law as supreme above all human laws, nor of his Son as governor among the nations. . . . The Constitution does not recognize the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, Christian morality, *Christian qualifications for civil officials*, and gives no legal basis for any Christian feature in the administration of Government. . . . They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice."

The report on National Reform in the late Synod referred to above, says:—

"It is ours to hold up the ideals of God which have originated the National Reform cause."

In the *Reformed Presbyterian* for January, 1870, James Wallace says:—

"The proposed Amendment of the Federal Constitution is an acknowledgment by the Government, that God is the author and source of all authority and power in civil government; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that his revealed will contained in the Bible is the supreme law of nations.

Now the Association for National Reform proposes to have *these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church* adopted into the Constitution of the United States, and *annulling any parts of that Constitution* that may be inconsistent with these principles."

Again he says:—

"The principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work. National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the nation."

It is, therefore, as clear as a sunbeam that the National Reform movement is an effort to put into the Constitution of the United States and make practical there, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and that the National Reform Party is doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. And when the United Presbyterian Church, the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Prohibitionists, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, or any other church, party, or union, lends its support to the National Reform Party, it is but doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,—it is simply aiding to make of practical application in the civil affairs of this Nation, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

According to these principles, what is the duty of the State? Rev. J. M. Foster tells us:—

"The duties which the reigning mediator requires of nations," are (1) A constitutional recognition of himself as king of nations. . . . (2) A constitutional recognition of their duty as the divinely appointed keeper of the moral law. . . . (3) A constitutional provision of moral and religious qualifications for their officers. . . . (4) An acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national covenanting with him. . . . (5) An acknowledgment and performance of the Nation's duty to guard and protect the Church—*by suppressing all public violation of the moral law; by maintaining a system of public schools, indoctrinating their youth in morality and virtue; by exempting church property from taxation; and "by providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field."*—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1884.*

Now take even the phenomenal definition given by the National Reform Party itself, as to what constitutes a union of Church and State, *i. e.*, "the selection of one church, *the endowment of such a church*, the appointment of its officers, and *the oversight of its doctrines*," and if this Reformed Presbyterian National Reform scheme does not sufficiently meet the definition, then nothing can; and if such would not be a union of Church and State, then there has never been any such union in this world.

And yet, knowing that the principles of National Reform are the peculiar principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; knowing that the distinctive point of their attack—the secular character of the Constitution—is the distinctive principle of that church, "the one in which she differs from all others;" knowing that the success of the National Reform movement will be but to make practical, in the affairs of this Government, these principles which are peculiar to the Reformed Presbyterian Church—knowing all this, Dr. McAllister, T. P. Stevenson, W. J. Coleman, M. A. Gault, R. C. Wylie, J. M. Foster, and all their Reformed Presbyterians

and National Reform associates, in National Convention assembled, will stand before the intelligent people of this Nation, and "affirm" and "re-affirm" that this movement does not tend, "in the least degree," toward a union of Church and State!

A. T. J.

### Government not Paternal.

It is a part of the argument of the Religious Amendment Party that government is paternal and should therefore be the great conservator of religion. This is, and has been, ever the claim of those who, like the National Reform Party, advocate the unity of religion and the State. In Macaulay's Essays,—"*Gladstone on Church and State*," and "*Southey's Colloquies*,"—there is a forcible presentation of the logic of this question. The following selection we present as being particularly appropriate to the National Reform Party; and that it may appear to the best advantage we insert the title of that party in place of the persons whom Lord Macaulay named:—

"The duties of government would be paternal, if a Government were necessarily as much superior in wisdom to a people as the most foolish father, for a time, is to the most intelligent child, and if a Government loved a people as fathers generally love their children. But there is no reason to believe that a Government will have either the paternal warmth of affection or the paternal superiority of intellect. The National Reform Party might as well say that the duties of the shoemaker are paternal, and that it is a usurpation in any man not of the craft to say that his shoes are bad and to insist on having better. The division of labor would be no blessing if those by whom a thing is done were to pay no attention to the opinion of those for whom it is done. The shoemaker, in the *Relapse*, tells Lord Foppington that his lordship is mistaken in supposing that his shoe pinches. "It does not pinch; it cannot pinch; I know my business; I never made a better shoe." This is the way in which the National Reformers would have a Government treat a people who usurp the privilege of thinking. Nay, the shoemaker of Vanbrugh has the advantage in the comparison. He contented himself with regulating his customer's shoes, about which he had peculiar means of information, and did not presume to dictate about the coat and hat. But these Reformers would have the rulers of a country prescribe opinions to the people, not only about politics, but about matters concerning which a Government has no peculiar sources of information, and concerning which any man in the streets may know as much and think as justly as the king, namely, religion and morals.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. A Government can interfere in discussion only by making it less free than it would otherwise be.

"Men are most likely to form just opinions when they have no other wish than to know the truth, and are exempt from all influence, either of hope or fear. Government, as Government, can bring nothing but the influence of hopes and fears to support its doctrines. It carries on controversy, not with reasons, but

with threats and bribes. If it employs reasons, it does so, not in virtue of any powers which belong to it as a Government. Thus, instead of a contest between argument and argument, we have a contest between argument and force. Instead of a contest in which truth, from the natural constitution of the human mind, has a decided advantage over falsehood, we have a contest in which truth can be victorious only by accident. . . . Nothing is so galling to a people not broken in from the birth, as a paternal, or, in other words, a meddling Government, a Government which tells them what to read, and say, and eat, and drink, and wear. Our fathers could not bear it two hundred years ago; and we are not more patient than they."

"If the relation in which Government ought to stand to the people be a paternal relation, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that persecution is justifiable; for the right of propagating opinions by punishment is one which belongs to parents as clearly as the right to give instruction. A boy is compelled to attend family worship; he is forbidden to read irreligious books; if he will not learn his catechism, he is sent to bed without his supper; if he plays truant at church-time, a task is set him. If he should display the precocity of his talents by expressing impious opinions before his brothers and sisters, we should not much blame his father for cutting short the controversy with a horse-whip. All the reasons which lead us to think that parents are peculiarly fitted to conduct the education of their children, and that education is a principal end of the parental relation, lead us also to think that parents ought to be allowed to use punishment, if necessary, for the purpose of forcing children who are incapable of judging for themselves, to receive religious instruction and to attend religious worship. Why, then, is this prerogative of punishment, so eminently paternal, to be withheld from a paternal Government? It seems to us, also, to be the height of absurdity to employ civil disabilities for the propagation of an opinion, and then to shrink from employing other punishments for the same purpose. For nothing can be clearer than that, if you punish at all, you ought to punish enough. The pain caused by punishment is pure unmixed evil, and never ought to be inflicted, except for the sake of some good. It is mere foolish cruelty to provide penalties which torment the criminal without preventing the crime. Now it is possible, by sanguinary persecution unrelentingly inflicted, to suppress opinions. In this way the Albigenses were put down. In this way the Lollards were put down. In this way the fair promise of the Reformation was blighted in Italy and Spain.

"What reason can be given for hanging a murderer, and suffering a heresiarch to escape without even a pecuniary mulct? Is the heresiarch a less pernicious member of society than the murderer? Is not the loss of one soul a greater evil than the extinction of many lives? And the number of murders committed by the most profligate bravo that ever let out his poniard to hire in Italy, or by the most savage buccaneer that ever prowled on the Windward Station, is small indeed when compared with

the number of souls which have been caught in the snares of one dexterous heresiarch. If, then, the heresiarch causes infinitely greater evils than the murderer, why is he not as proper an object of penal legislation as the murderer? We can give a reason, a reason short, simple, decisive, and consistent. We do not extenuate the evil which the heresiarch produces; but we say that it is not evil of that sort against which it is the end of Government to guard.

"The world is full of parallel cases. An orange-woman stops up the pavement with her wheelbarrow; and a policeman takes her into custody. A miser who has amassed a million suffers an old friend and benefactor to die in a workhouse, and cannot be questioned before any tribunal for his baseness and ingratitude. Is this because legislators think the orange-woman's conduct worse than the miser's? Not at all. It is because the stopping up of the pathway is one of the evils against which it is the business of the public authorities to protect society, and heartlessness is not one of those evils. It would be the height of folly to say that the miser ought, indeed, to be punished, but that he ought to be punished less severely than the orange-woman."

#### An Effective Prescription.

THE leaders in the National Reform movement claim that they are disfranchised by our Constitution in its present form, and they are presenting memorials to Congress with this plea of disfranchisement. In the issue of the *Christian Statesman* of June 17, 1886, is a memorial to Congress which contains such a plea in the following words:—

"We who present this petition are unable . . . to accept this Constitution as a right fundamental law for the nation, and are therefore debarred, on conscientious grounds, from participation in the Government. We can neither take office under it ourselves, nor by voting for others, lay this Constitution upon them as the rule of their official conduct."

Now our Congressmen will have an excellent opportunity of demonstrating, in a most forcible manner, how well these National Reform men are following the golden rule, and how much brotherly love they are exercising, and also what a weighty method of reasoning these men are compelled to adopt, to defend their theory. Suppose that, for the cure of such disabilities, Congress were to recommend to them one of their own prescriptions, as given by Rev. E. B. Graham, thus:—

"If you do not like our Government and its features, you can go to some wild, desolate land; and there set up a Government modeled after your own imagination, and then, if you can stand it, stay there till you die."

And in order to make it still more effective, Congress might adopt the plan recommended by that other ardent advocate of the National Reform theory, Rev. R. C. Wylie, namely, "adopt a plan that will prevent a repetition" of any such memorials. We have not the least doubt that these memorialists would discover in a moment that that would be tyranny and terrible persecution. But if their system applied to others would be the salvation of the country, we do not see why it should not be

equally beneficial if applied to themselves. It is a poor rule that will not work well both ways, and yet we are sure that that is what they would never allow.

A. H. WILL.

#### The Strength of the Movement.

WE here lay before our readers the list, "in part," of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. These are the names given by the *Christian Statesman*, yet it says this is the list only "in part." \* We ask for it a careful reading, and a wide circulation. When it is borne in mind that these are only a part of the vice-presidents of an association whose avowed purpose it is to subvert the present Constitution, so far as it relates to religious liberty; an association which counts as atheists all who oppose it; and which flatly declares that "there is nothing out of hell" that it "would not tolerate as soon" as this atheism; we are sure that whoever reads this list will confess that this thing is not being done in a corner, and that the AMERICAN SENTINEL in opposing the National Reform movement is not fighting "as one that beateth the air."

#### PRESIDENTS.

From 1863 to 1866:

John Alexander, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.

From 1866 to 1869:

Hon. Wm. Strong, late Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

From 1869 to the present time:

Hon. Felix R. Brunot, Pittsburgh, Pa.

#### VICE-PRESIDENTS. (In part.)

##### MAINE.

Hon. Joshua H. Drummond, LL.D., Portland.

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Rev. Wm. Clark, D.D., Amherst.

##### VERMONT.

Hon. Ex-Governor Roswell Farnham.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

President Julius H. Seelye, D.D., Amherst College.

Professor Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., Law Department of Boston University.

Rev. Edwin B. Webb, D.D., Shawmut Ave., Congregational Church, Boston.

Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Rev. Geo. H. Gould, D.D., Worcester.

Rev. Wm. R. Clarke, D.D., Lynn.

Professor J. R. Herrick, D.D., South Hadley.

Hon. J. Rockwell, Superior Court of Massachusetts.

Hon. Thos. W. Bicknell, Editor of the *Journal of Education*, Boston.

##### CONNECTICUT.

Hon. James Phelps, Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut.

##### RHODE ISLAND.

Rev. James I. Lane, Bristol.

##### NEW YORK.

Right Rev. F. D. Huntington, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Central New York.

Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D.D., Rochester.

Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn.

Rev. Arthur Mitchell, D.D., New York.

Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, New York.

President David H. Cochrane, Ph. D., LL.D., Collegiate and Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.

##### NEW JERSEY.

Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary.

Rev. J. Banvard, D.D., Paterson.

Rev. J. H. McIlvaine, D.D., Newark.

Rev. E. R. Craven, D.D., Newark.

Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D., Englewood.

##### PENNSYLVANIA.

John Alexander, Esq., Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. R. Nicholson, D.D., Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. David R. Kerr, D.D., United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny.  
 Rev. John B. Dales, D.D., Philadelphia.  
 Rev. Joseph T. Cooper, D.D., Pittsburgh.  
 President Milton Valentine, D.D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburgh.  
 Rev. D. Steele, D.D., Philadelphia.  
 Rev. C. H. Edgar, D.D., Easton.  
 President A. B. Miller, D.D., Waynesburgh College.  
 Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., Lincoln University, Oxford.  
 Rev. Wm. Speer, D.D., Washington.  
 Rev. R. Audley Browne, D.D., Newcastle.  
 Rev. A. Rittenhouse, Professor of History and English Literature, Dickinson College, Carlisle.  
 Professor David B. Willson, Ref. Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny.  
 Rev. W. P. Breed, D.D., Philadelphia.  
 Rev. D. K. Freeman, D.D., Huntington.  
 Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., LL.D., Scranton.  
 Rev. H. H. George, D.D., President of Geneva College, Beaver Falls.  
 Rev. Joel Swartz, D.D., Gettysburgh.  
 Rev. Alex Young, D.D., Parnassus.  
 Rev. E. E. Swift, D.D., Allegheny.  
 Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.

NORTH CAROLINA.  
 Rev. Arnold W. Miller, D.D., Charlotte.  
 President Solomon Pool, D.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.  
 Hon. G. W. Brooks, U. S. District Court of North Carolina.

SOUTH CAROLINA.  
 Rev. Henry J. Fox, D.D., Charleston.  
 Rev. Ferdinand Jacobs, D.D., James Island.

GEORGIA.  
 President O. L. Smith, D.D., Emory College, Oxford.

ALABAMA.  
 Hon. B. F. Saffold, Supreme Court of Alabama.

MISSISSIPPI.  
 Right Rev. W. M. Green, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church.  
 President Walter Hillman, LL.D., Central Female Institute, Mississippi.  
 Rev. Wm. K. Douglass, Warden of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Dry Grove.

LOUISIANA.  
 Hon. R. K. Howell, Supreme Court of Louisiana.

TEXAS.  
 Hon. N. W. Battle, Judge of the Criminal Court, Waco, Texas.

TENNESSEE.  
 Vice Chancellor J. Gorgas, University of the South.  
 Rev. John S. Arbuthnot, Gallatin.  
 President P. M. Bartlett, D.D., Marysville College.  
 Professor E. Kirby Smith, University of Nashville.

KENTUCKY.  
 Brev't. Brig. Gen. James A. Ekin, Louisville.

OHIO.  
 Hon. M. B. Hagans, Superior Court of Cincinnati.  
 Right Rev. G. T. Bedell, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church.  
 Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, President of Wooster University.  
 Professor O. N. Stoddard, LL.D., Wooster University.  
 Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Columbus, President of Ohio W. C. T. U.  
 Rev. R. Dubs, D.D., Bishop Evangelical Association.  
 Rev. George P. Hays, D.D., Cincinnati.  
 Dr. George Watt, Xenia.  
 Rev. F. Merrick, D.D., Ex-President of the Ohio Wesleyan University.  
 Rev. W. Wishart, D.D., Ontario.  
 Right Rev. Thos. A. Jaggar, Bishop of the Diocese of Southern Ohio.  
 Rev. J. Weaver, D.D., Bishop of the United Brethren in Christ, Dayton.  
 Rev. E. D. Morris, D.D., Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati.  
 Rev. C. H. Payne, D.D., President of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.  
 Rev. D. S. Gregory, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, Wooster University.  
 Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, National Superintendent of the Department of Sabbath Observance, W. C. T. U.

Rev. P. H. Wylie, Macedon.  
 Rev. S. A. Ort, D.D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield.  
 Rev. A. B. Leonard, D.D., Springfield.  
 Rev. F. M. Spencer, D.D., President of Muskingum College, New Concord.  
 Rev. J. F. Morton, D.D., Cedarville.

INDIANA.  
 Hon. W. H. Cumbach, Ex-Lieut.-Governor of Indiana.  
 President Reuben Andrus, D.D., Indiana, Asbury University.  
 President Thomas Holmes, D.D., Union Christian College, Merom.  
 Rev. Milton H. Wright, Editor of the *Star*, Richmond.  
 President Daniel Rice, D.D., Logansport Female College, Logansport.

ILLINOIS.  
 Miss Frances E. Willard, President of the National W. C. T. U., Chicago.  
 Rev. Jonathan Blanchard, Wheaton College.  
 Rev. J. J. Esher, D.D., Bishop of the Evangelical Association, Chicago.  
 Rev. J. Dickson, D.D., Bishop of the United Brethren in Christ, Decatur.  
 Rev. Edward Sullivan, D.D., Chicago.  
 Mrs. Mary A. West, President of Illinois W. C. T. U.

MISSOURI.  
 Hon. J. W. McClurg, Ex-Governor of Missouri.  
 Rev. Edward F. Berkeley, D.D., Kirkwood.  
 Mrs. Clara Hoffman, President of Missouri W. C. T. U.

IOWA.  
 Hon. C. C. Cole, LL.D., Supreme Court of Iowa.  
 Hon. James Dawson, Washington.  
 Rev. David McKee, Clarinda.  
 Mrs. Judith Ellen Foster, President of the Iowa W. C. T. U.

WISCONSIN.  
 Rev. Noyes W. Miner, D.D., Oshkosh.  
 Rev. George M. Everhart, D.D., Kenosha.

MICHIGAN.  
 Professor Joseph W. Ewing, Superintendent of Schools, Ionia.

MINNESOTA.  
 Rev. S. Corbett, D.D., Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA.  
 Hon. Robert W. Furnas, Ex-Governor of Nebraska.  
 Rev. John D. Easter, D.D., Omaha.  
 Rev. E. B. Graham, Omaha.  
 Rev. H. P. McChurkin, D.D., Wahoo.

KANSAS.  
 Right Rev. Thomas H. Vail, D.D. LL.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Kansas.

COLORADO.  
 Rev. W. H. McCreery, Loveland.

NEVADA.  
 Hon. A. N. Fisher, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.  
 Hon. Edgar W. Hillyer, U. S. District Court of Nevada.

NEW MEXICO.  
 Hon. Hezekiah S. Johnson, Supreme Court of New Mexico.

WYOMING.  
 Hon. J. W. Kingman, Supreme Court of Wyoming Territory.

UTAH.  
 Rev. R. G. McNeice, Salt Lake City.

DAKOTA.  
 Hon. George W. French, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Dakota.

CALIFORNIA.  
 Right Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of California.  
 Hon. Lorenzo Sawyer, U. S. Circuit Court, San Francisco.

IDAHO.  
 Hon. David Noggles, Chief Justice Supreme Court of Idaho.  
 Hon. Madison E. Hollister, Supreme Court of Idaho.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY.  
 Hon. Roger S. Greene, Supreme Court of Washington Territory.

"THEN saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

MONEY orders, drafts, etc., should be made to "Pacific Press;" never to individuals, as they may be absent, and business thereby be delayed.

**PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL**  
 AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE BI-MONTHLY, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

**A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,**  
 Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and house-keepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by every member.

Price, 50 Cents per Year.  
 Address, **PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.**

**GOOD HEALTH.**  
 A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

GOOD HEALTH is emphatically a Family Journal, being cheap, plain, and practical, qualities which have won for it the largest circulation of any Health Journal in America. It is devoted to all reforms, but is ultra in none. It is unpartisan and unsectarian. Its only creed is nature's laws. It treats of Health, Temperance, General Literature, Science, and many other interesting and practical subjects; it is a live journal, and every way adapted to the wants of the family. There is something in it for everybody. Price, \$1.00 a year.

Address, **GOOD HEALTH, Battle Creek, Mich.;**  
 Or, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**

**THE ATONEMENT:**  
 AN EXAMINATION OF A  
**REMEDIAL SYSTEM, IN THE LIGHT OF  
 NATURE AND OF REVELATION.**

BY ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.  
 THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

This work is a critical and exhaustive treatise on the plan of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures, showing its harmony with the principles of justice and mercy, its consistency with reason, and its final results as affecting the destiny of the human race.

308 pp.; cloth, \$1.00.  
 Address, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**  
 Or, **REVIEW AND HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.**

**OUR COUNTRY'S FUTURE FORETOLD.**  
**THE UNITED STATES IN PROPHECY.**

BY ELD. U. SMITH.

This is a full exposition of a portion of prophecy which applies to our own Government, showing the position the United States holds in prophecy, and the part it has to act in the closing scenes of time.

**THE SUNDAY MOVEMENT,**  
 Which is now attracting such general attention, is thoroughly canvassed, and abundant testimony is given to prove that it is fast coming to be the ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION in this country. Dealing with our own land and applying to our own time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. New edition; revised and enlarged. Cloth, 225 pp., 75c. Paper covers, new edition, condensed, 186 pp., 25c. Address, **SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.**

**HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.**  
 AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OF GROWING POPULARITY.

ESTABLISHED IN 1882.  
 FOUR YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY,  
 BECAUSE FOUNDED, AND MANAGED UPON SOUND PRINCIPLES.  
 THOROUGH INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTS OF  
 LEARNING IN ALL THE GRADES AND  
 THROUGH THE CLASSICAL COURSE.

FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS INVESTED IN BUILDINGS AND APPARATUS.

FACULTY CONSISTS OF TWELVE INSTRUCTORS OF EXPERIENCE.  
 DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

1. Instruction in the various trades, with two hours per day spent in active work with tools.
2. Methods in the Class Room are such as to secure the best kind of mental discipline.
3. A rigid parental discipline to cultivate high moral character.
4. Expenses within the reach of all. Twenty dollars per month covers all expense of tuition, board, lodging, washing, lights, fuel, etc. The Fall Term begins August 2, 1886.

S. BROWNSBERGER, A. M., President.  
 Healdsburg, Cal.

# The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., AUGUST, 1886.

IN the *Christian Statesman* of July 15, there is a "Monthly Reading of the W. C. T. U." on "God in Government." As a specimen of woman-suffrage-religio-political-sentimentalism it is a magnificent success, and a curiosity. Get it. As a sample of its lustrous scintillations we give just this one: "Evil tends toward its own cure."

THE *Christian Statesman* is not the only organ of National Reform. The *Christian Nation*, 252 Broadway, N. Y., is another weekly paper devoted wholly to the National Reform work. The *Statesman*, however, is, we believe, the official organ. With this exception we do not see that the *Christian Nation* is in anywise second to the *Statesman*. And, by the way, the *Christian Nation* also is of Reformed Presbyterian origin and affinities.

SAYS the Father to the Son: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee, the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Say the "National Reformers" to the Son, "We will give to thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession, although thou hast never asked it of us." Here are some "clashing voices" which Mr. Gault has evidently overlooked.

WHEN the SENTINEL first appeared, the *Christian Statesman* welcomed it with apparent evidence of pleasure because the work of National Reform, which had been languishing for want of opposition, would now be caused to prosper. But since then not a word has the *Statesman* said about the SENTINEL, nor has it made the slightest reference to us. The joy of the *Statesman* at the opposition of the SENTINEL must certainly be of that kind which may be fitly described as *unspeakable*. And we are glad.

IN a speech at the Wooster National Reform Convention, Rev. J. P. Lytle, D.D., said:—

"The national guilt contracted by the people in the affair of the Gibeonites was atoned for by hanging up unto the Lord, seven of Saul's sons."

We have not space here for argument about this exposition, only to say that it is contrary to the Scripture. But we not only complain of the exposition; we dread the application that will be made of the principle when the National Reformers obtain the power to make atonement for national sin.

THE prophet Isaiah says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon his shoulder; . . . of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end. . . . The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Strangely enough the "National Reformers" use this text as one of their arguments to prove that they are to restore the kingdom to Christ. In order to fit their case it should read, The zeal of the Na-

tional Reform Association will perform this. The reader will say that such a perversion of the text would be blasphemy. So it would; but it would be no more blasphemous than is their foolish assumption of power to do that which can be done only by the Lord of hosts.

THE report of the Committee on Resolutions at the late Wooster National Reform Convention, in mentioning the death of two eminent National Reform preachers, says they were "like the three mightiest of David's *worriers* of old." David's "three mightiest worriers" is somewhat of a puzzle to us. It is easy enough to name the two that worried him most. These were Satan and Absalom, but as for the third we cannot make him out. We rather suspect that the Committee had Joab in view, for no doubt he worried David a great deal. He took advantage of the ruler's sin to exalt himself, and so ruled the ruler with a high hand; and this is precisely what the National Reformers are aiming to do in this Government. It is just possible however, that an eccentricity of the types has made the report say "worriers" instead of *worriers*. But even in that case the eccentricity is not at all inappropriate, for if the National Reformers do not yet prove to be the mightiest of this nation's "worriers," we shall freely confess ourselves most happily deceived in them.

## Model for Religious Amendmentists.

THOSE who are laboring to procure an amendment to our National Constitution, in favor of religion, strongly profess their apprehension that infidelity and even Paganism will run riot in our fair land if not restrained by the strong arm of civil law. They are not the first to indulge such fears. Two centuries ago our worthy sires of New England engaged in the same laudable work, and carried it on to considerable success in some instances, as the "heretics and malignants called Quakers," and also the Baptists, could testify, having experienced some of the "tender mercies" of those who were zealous for the honor of our long-suffering and compassionate Saviour.

But sometimes their plans miscarried, as in the following case. This letter from a very pious Puritan explains itself. It cannot fail to be of interest at this time, as a bit of history which is so nearly trying to repeat itself, as its second centennial:—

"September, 1682.

"TO YE AGED AND BELOVED JOHN HIGGINSON:—  
"There be now at sea a shippe (for our friend Esias Holdcraft, of London, did advise me by the last packet that it would sail sometime in August) called ye *Welcome*, R. Greenwas, Master, which has aboard a hundred or more of ye heretics and malignants called Quakers, with W. Penn, who is ye scamp at ye head of them. Ye General Court has accordingly given secret orders to Master Malachi Huxett, of ye brig *Porpoise*, to waylaye ye said *Welcome*, as near ye coast of Codd as may be, and make captives of ye Penn and his ungodly crew, so that ye Lord may be glorified and not mocked on ye soil of this new country with ye heathen worshipp of these people. Much spoil can be made by selling ye whole lot to Barbadoes, where slaves fetch good prices in rumme and sugar; and we shall not only do ye Lord great

service by punishing ye wicked, but shall make gayne for his ministers and people.

"Yours, in ye bowels of Christ,  
"COTTON MATHER."

We recommend this as a model for those ardent Christians who are so intent upon putting down, by human authority, those who presume "to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences," in this age of enlightened Christian liberty. Cotton Mather was a man of undoubted piety, zealous for the cause of God, and a fine example of what "zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge," will produce. An order to "waylaye ye ungodly scamps" of these last days who refuse to observe "ye venerable day of ye sun," would be refreshing to the senses of those whose souls long for "Christian legislation" against those Mordecais who refuse to bow to their ideas, and to accept as Christianity their own mixture of Platonism and Roman Catholicism. If there is no hope of "making gayne for ye ministers" by selling them in exchange for "rumme and sugar," they might still be made to add to the interest of religion by putting them up to be "raffled for" in a "church fair," and thus make "fun for the million," who are invited, as pleasure seekers, to fill the treasury of the Lord! We have Scripture example for this, too. Samson was used for a similar purpose; but we let each one carry out the comparison to suit his own taste.

## A Disinfectant Needed.

REV. J. C. McFEETERS is a prominent National Reformer, and deposes as follows:—

"Jesus sustains a national relation to every nation. And it becomes every nation to acknowledge that national relation. But that acknowledgment is wanting. . . . The anointed Son of God shall yet be honored with this acknowledgment. . . . And if this acknowledgment come peaceably. . . if it come peaceably, we expect it to come at first through a political platform, for the platform is the living voice, or *fetid breath*, of dominant parties."—*Christian Statesman*, August 14, 1884, p. 6.

This idea of the political platform being the "fetid breath" of dominant parties set us querying somewhat after this manner: Suppose the National Reform Party were to become the dominant political party in this country. Then, according to the religio-political scheme which it proposes, would it not be what is described in Rev. 18:2, "The hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird"? Then would not the term "fetid" fitly characterize the political odor that should issue from such a "hold"? And has not Mr. McFeeters exactly hit off the sanitary condition of the platform of the National Reform Party were that Party to become dominant? Has he not "buildd better than he knew"?

## THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

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

TERMS.

SINGLE COPY, per year, . . . . . 50 cents.

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

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.