

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1886.

NUMBER 9.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

RELIGION is not in the purview of human government.—*Madison.*

WE take it as a fundamental principle laid down in the Scriptures, and corroborated by history in all ages, that the church of Jesus Christ, in a state of reformation, receiving the smiles of his approbation, has never sought for civil establishment. It is only when pride, ambition, and an inordinate love of popularity, have become predominant in the hearts of her leaders; or when latitudinarianism and indifference to the truth of God prevail, that the church, becoming as useless as the vine that has fallen from its trellis and become unfruitful, seeks to be sustained by the secular arm, and fondled on the knee of civil power.—*Rev. Wm. Ballantine.*

"THAT religious persecution is a greater evil than any other, is apparent, not so much from the enormous and almost incredible number of its known victims, as from the fact that the unknown must be far more numerous, and that history gives no account of those who have been spared in the body, in order that they might suffer in the mind. We hear much of martyrs and confessors—of those who were slain by the sword, or consumed in the fire; but we know little of that still larger number who, by the more threat of persecution, have been driven into an outward abandonment of their real opinions; and who, thus forced into an apostasy the heart abhors, have passed the remainder of their lives in the practice of a constant and humiliating hypocrisy. It is this which is the real curse of religious persecution. For in this way, men being constrained to mask their thoughts, there arises a habit of securing safety by falsehood, and of purchasing impunity with deceit. In this way, fraud becomes a necessary of life; insincerity is made a daily custom; the whole tone of public feeling is vitiated, and the gross amount of vice and of error fearfully increased. Surely, then, we have reason to say, that, compared to this, all other crimes are of small account; and we may well be grateful for that increase of intellectual pursuits, which has destroyed an evil that some among us would even now willingly restore."

"Secretary Leiper" on the "American Sentinel."

THE "National Reform Association" has some paid traveling agents or lecturers who, for some reason not apparent, are called "Secretaries." Among these is Mr. J. H. Leiper. In the columns of the *Christian Statesman* he noticed the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But when he wrote his comment he had seen only the March number, and appears to have read that quite superficially; and of course he knew but little of the position of the SENTINEL, and of the arguments which it contains. In this we have a great advantage over him. We have been acquainted with the *Statesman* for a number of years. We had the opportunity of attending their National Convention in Pittsburg, Pa., in 1874, which they consider of greater interest than any other they ever held. We have watched their movement with deep interest from its very inception in 1863. Having had but little public opposition, they have considered their positions invulnerable, and themselves almost infallible and Heaven-appointed teachers of a new science of Christian Government. It is this feeling of self-complacency or self-conceit that leads Mr. Leiper to say of the position of the SENTINEL that it grows out of "voluntary darkness or willful infidelity." We think the *Statesman* or its correspondents (the *Statesman* itself noticed us courteously) will find it much easier to bring such "railing accusations" against the SENTINEL than to refute its arguments. This first effort, that of Mr. Leiper, is a sad failure to refute our positions, and even to comprehend them.

Mr. Leiper quotes from the SENTINEL wherein it was shown that "if a question arises as to what is or what is not Christian law, usage, or institution, it must be determined by a court of justice. There is no disputing this conclusion, and yet it is a conclusion which ought to startle every one who contemplates such a change in our Government as would make such a proceeding possible." Now we still believe that the idea of settling religious questions in the courts of our States and Nation is, and should be, startling to all who have a just regard for our civil and religious liberties. Mr. Leiper does not attempt to show that our conclusion is unjust; he does not question the propriety of settling religious disputes in our civil courts; but he attempts to justify their efforts to bring about such a state of things, and uses the following language:—

"What a startling thing it must have been for Nehemiah, the governor, to undertake to teach the traffickers in wines, grapes, and figs,

etc., a lesson based on the Fourth Commandment. . . . What a crank Jonah was to undertake the audacious folly of preaching politics," etc.

We think it has been sufficiently shown in the SENTINEL, that the theocratic Government of Israel, with its necessary union of Church and State (for a theocracy must be a religious government), is no model for any government since that dispensation. Does Mr. Leiper consider that, if the amendment is adopted, they will elect men to the position occupied by Nehemiah? Do these "reformers" think that, in the Government of their choice, they will occupy the position of the prophets of old? If they affect such a thing they will have to give such evidences of their calling as they have never yet shown. If they do not intend to assume the office and position of the prophets, why do they make such references as this of Mr. Leiper? There is more of arrogance than argument in such words as those he uses.

And Jonah did not "preach politics." He did not attempt to remodel the Government of Nineveh, nor did he seek for any place or office in its administration. He received a message directly from the Lord; he gave that, and that only, without any personal interference with the affairs of the Government. We fail to see any parallel to the work of the self-styled National Reformers, in that of Jonah. And we do not think they can show that any parallel exists. Such references may be captivating to those who but superficially examine these subjects, but they contain no argument whatever.

We have a lesson to read to the National Reformers which we learned from the action of the church authorities, controlling the civil power, in Salem, Mass. If they had read this lesson of history to any purpose they would cease to refer, for a warrant, to those whose position and circumstances were so different from their own.

RELIGION WITHOUT THE CHURCH.

This point is a hobby with the Amendmentists. Concerning it Mr. Leiper says:—

"If the SENTINEL and many others had the wisdom to distinguish between the church and religion—between protection and usurpation, it might avoid many of its blunders."

This is said in the effort to ward off the just charge that they are trying to unite the Church and the State. They say; not the State and the Church, but, the State and religion. But this distinction does not exist in fact, and is not regarded by Mr. Leiper and the party which he represents. This we will now prove. He speaks of our writing as follows:—

"J. H. W. stumbles at an utterance of Rev.

J. M. Foster in *Christian Statesman*, of March, 1884: 'According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the Church.' This statement J. H. W. emphatically denies. As a believer in the Bible, how will he undertake to expound Isa. 49 : 23 and 60 : 12, in accord with his views of the relation of Church and State? Does he know how to read history?" etc.

With expositions of prophecy we have not now to do. We have shown, and will continue to show, that this "Reform" party entirely misapprehends the difference between the past and present dispensations. In the above quotation it will be seen that Mr. Leiper, following Rev. J. M. Foster, utterly ignores the distinction which he says we have not the wisdom to distinguish; and he reveals the "true inwardness" of the National Reform movement. Mark, they do not say the State exists to serve the interests of religion; but, "the State exists for the sake of and to serve the interests of THE CHURCH."

The truth is that religion and the Church are inseparably connected. Religion cannot exist without religious people. Christianity cannot exist where there are no Christians; and Christians, wherever found, constitute the Christian Church. If the Nation is to serve the cause of religion, it must by some means determine *what* religion or *whose* religion shall be enforced by the State. Will the Amendment party have the Nation set aside the churches, and adopt a religion to suit the people outside of the churches? Will they consent to thus distinguish between religion and the Church, in the action of the Government? Let the *Statesman* answer. In its issue of March 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan uses the following language:—

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

But the very life and essence of *religion* is found in church doctrines, ordinances, and laws. None but a Jesuit would pretend to distinguish between the true religion and the doctrines, ordinances, and laws of the true Church. In the above extract we have the plan of our future Government outlined by the Amendmentists themselves. The State must uphold or enforce the true religion—always noting the distinction between religion and the Church, but—"the churches must settle these questions" of theology, or define the religion which the State must enforce! It is the sphere of the State to serve the interests of the Church, and to "adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," the churches always deciding what is the true religion. This is no union of Church and State—oh, no. There is a wide distinction; the State is only the servant of the Church, and it is the office of the Church to dictate to the State what "usages, laws, and institutions" of religion it must maintain! How wonderful is the logical acumen of the Religious Amendmentists! What a nice distinction they can trace, which none but themselves have "the

wisdom to distinguish"! We do not accuse Mr. Leiper of intending to deceive his readers. We believe that he himself is deceived by the deceitfulness of the theory which he is endeavoring to maintain.

And to make more full proof of his blindness he says that we do not distinguish "between protection and usurpation." But this is the very distinction we have made, and to which we have tried to call the attention of the Amendmentists. In the May number of the *SENTINEL* we said of them: "They are not asking for protection, for this they now have most fully; *they are seeking for power.*" The truth is that *protection* is now assured by our Government to these religionists, but with this they are not satisfied; they are not content to have the Government protect them in their religious convictions and practices; they must needs *usurp* authority over the convictions and consciences of those who do not agree with them. The Amendmentists are the very ones who utterly ignore the distinction between protection and usurpation. But we plead for *protection for all*; and this they vigorously oppose, because they cannot bear the idea of seeing others equally favored with themselves.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL.

Mr. Leiper continues his notice of us in the following language:—

"But see how he stultifies himself in answer to the following question sent him: 'Can laws which guard religious rights and protect religious privileges be considered oppressive to non-religionists?' His answer is: 'By no means.' But the laws which have already created a hue and cry among the ranks of non-religionists are those that are designed to give rest to all citizens on the Sabbath, and the privilege to Christian people of worshipping God undisturbed in their homes or churches."

We must differ with Mr. L. in his judgment of our answer. We are willing to trust the decision of every candid reader that we did not stultify ourself; in our answer we said:—

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

"The duty of the Government is not exhausted when it has protected the rights of the religious. Governments are not established for the benefit of any one class of their subjects. It is no more the duty of the Government to protect the religionist, than it is its duty to protect the non-religionist. The non-religionist . . . has no right to disturb his neighbor, or hinder him from living out his religion; and his religious neighbor has no right to disturb him in the peaceful possession of his home because he is not religious; he has no right to compel him to observe religious rites in which he does not believe. Neither has any class of religionists any right to disturb others because they profess a religion different from their own. And it is equally the duty of the Government to protect them *all*, whatever their religion may be, or whether or not they have any at all."

Dare Mr. Leiper or the *Statesman* copy this reply and deny our conclusion before its readers? We doubt; they may evade, and accuse us of self-stultification, by keeping our position from their readers. Our answer must commend itself to all who have any regard for *the rights of others*; who even approach to the moral duty of loving their neighbors as themselves. But it seems very plain that in this class the National Reformers are not included.

It seems impossible to make these self-styled reformers recognize the difference between morality and religion. In argument for "religious legislation" Mr. Leiper says:—

"Such legislation will, as it should, provide for the protection of the family. But this implies marriage and divorce laws. Where would J. H. W. have us go for a safe guide in such legislation? The family is the nursery of the State, hence no laws of greater importance or farther reaching are enacted by any Government. . . . And has our objector not yet learned that the race is indebted to the religion of Christ for the pure blessing of the family?"

No, we have not learned it; and we invite Mr. Leiper to give evidence to that effect if he has it to give. We say, as we have before said, that it is the duty of the Government to enact marriage and divorce laws, because *marriage is not a Christian institution*. It antedates the fall of man and the introduction of a gospel system. Mr. Leiper is altogether at fault on the question. He really stands with the Catholics, who make marriage a Christian or Church ordinance. To be consistent he must deny that marriage is valid outside the Church. His position would deprive infidels and unbelievers of the privilege of marriage, for such have no right to the benefit of the ordinances of Christianity. But we dissent. It was an institution given to *the father of the race* before the fall, and belongs to the race without regard to their relation to Christianity. Speaking of our assertion that a civil government cannot enforce laws on a purely moral basis, Mr. Leiper says:—

"Monogamy is a law of Christianity. Is it impossible to enforce it?"

This remark is both irrelevant and untrue. The Saviour, in his answer concerning divorce, placed the marriage institution on *its original basis*. He enacted nothing new in regard to it. He said: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; *but from the beginning it was not so.* Matt. 19 : 8. In verses 4, 5, he shows to what this refers. He there says: "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh?" Where had they "read" these statements? In Gen. 1 : 27, and 2 : 24. "In the beginning" God made them male and female—not male and females. They two—not they three or they five—shall be one flesh. A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife—not to his wives. Monogamy was embraced in the original marriage institution. It is not a law of Christianity; but the Saviour freed the law from the errors of tradition and restored it to its original position.

Mr. Leiper thinks that we evince wondrous ignorance of the origin and basis of civil gov-

ernment, and that we "ignore the plainly taught Bible principle that civil government is a divine ordinance." If he had read the several numbers of the SENTINEL he would know the truth of that concerning which he is sadly ignorant. There is not a sentiment expressed or a word spoken in the SENTINEL which at all implies that we ignore that fact. Besides frequent reference to the fact, at least two articles have been published on that subject. But Mr. Leiper and his *confreeres* do evince great ignorance of the true principles of civil government, and of its relation to religion. We remember that Paul said, "There is no power but of God;" and that he and those to whom he wrote, and whom he exhorted to yield subjection to "the higher powers," were the subjects of a king, and not citizens of a republic; and that this king was a Pagan and not a Christian ruler. And Peter said: "Honor the king." We know all this; but this does not prove the correctness of the conclusions of the National Reformers. They openly refuse to honor, and deny the authority of, the civil Government unless it is molded and modeled to their peculiar notions. There is not a word in the New Testament to justify their position.

We have here noticed the main points of Mr. Leiper's comments on the SENTINEL. Some other assertions of his we may notice in the future.

J. H. W.

Significant Facts.

THE *Christian Statesman* reports that the Church of the United Brethren has put a National Reform preacher into the field, Rev. R. Rock by name, and will support him; and that a preacher, Rev. J. P. Mills by name, from the Methodist Episcopal Church, will enter upon the National Reform work, on the same terms, about Sept. 1, 1886.

The late General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, by its Committee on National Reform, expressed its gratification "to learn that the presentation of the Christian theory of civil government by the advocates of National Reform, is educating the people to recognize that civil government is an ordinance of God; . . . that Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, is . . . the Ruler of nations, and has laid down in his word the fundamental enactments by which the enactments of our civil code are to be tested; and that *this word ought to be recognized as the fundamental law of the Nation*, and be incorporated into its very Constitution." It regards "the continued advocacy of this Reform as imperatively necessary;" and by resolution commends "to the generous financial support of our people the secretaries and advocates of this movement."

The Ocean Grove Assembly set apart Wednesday, July 21, as National Reform Day, which, says the *Statesman*, "will afford a fine audience of the best people, without effort or cost on the part of the friends of the cause." Likewise the Chautauqua Assembly management granted the morning and afternoon sessions of Friday, July 23, to National Reform. This the *Statesman* correctly called "another magnificent opportunity for the presentation of the principles of the National Reform Association."

Nor is this all. For more than a year the National Reform party has been specially and assiduously courting the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and it has succeeded in so far rhyming itself into these ladies' favor that we are quite certain it will never reason itself out again. Joint conventions are now being held by the two bodies, and we see their vital union virtually consummated. Already in their joint convention held at Canonsburg, Pa., May 19, an address of welcome was delivered "by Mrs. Rev. J. F. Hill, in which *the oneness of the two organizations* was very ably set forth." Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. West, and Mrs. Hoffman, are all Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association. Mrs. Woodbridge made a straight-out National Reform speech both at Ocean Grove and at Chautauqua, on the occasions referred to above.

Besides this Mrs. Woodbridge was appointed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to carry to the Cleveland Convention of the Knights of Labor, last May, "the salutations of the Union, and a brief argument in behalf of the cause of temperance"; but the lady allowed her National Reform zeal to carry her beyond her appointed mission and she closed her speech to the Assembly with these words:—

"Thus would the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union join hands with the Knights of Labor in placing this 'Government upon the shoulders of Him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' and in crowning Christ, our Lord, as the Ruler of nations."

This the *Christian Statesman* pronounces a "cause for rejoicing," and "an especial gratification to the friends of National Reform."—See *Statesman June 3, 1886*.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done noble work, in which we have rejoiced and should ever rejoice, while she kept in the line of her legitimate and chartered work. But just as soon as she proposes to sell herself to work the iniquity of lifting the National Reform party into power in its union of Church and State, and the establishment of its hierarchy in this country, then we are prepared to write of her, "The glory is departed."

The Prohibition Party also is coming up to the work. The New Jersey Prohibition Convention, and that of Washington County, Pa., adopted resolutions which the *Statesman* says read like the resolutions of a National Reform Convention. The Maine Prohibitionists declare that "we aim, in a word, at the application of Christian principles to political life. . . . The application of Christian principles to politics would secure an equal voice, without regard to sex, in making laws which all must alike obey." The Illinois platform declares that, "We reverently recognize the supreme authority of Almighty God. . . . We regard the Christian Sabbath as a boon so valuable to humanity, that the State cannot be true to its trusts which neglects to guard it from desecration."

The Reformed Presbyterian Church, which from the beginning has borne the National Reform party upon her sides and dandled it upon her knees, contributed to the work last

year "almost \$7,000;" and at its late Synod, held at Rochester, New York, it recommended "that the sum of \$10,000 be raised for the treasury of the National Reform Association, by the churches under the care of this Synod," the coming year.

Besides all these distinct organizations, the churches, as such, almost all favor it; and the National Reformers are willing, if not anxious, to make advances even to the Catholic Church to gain her favor—and they will get it. Now we say: With the general breaking up of parties, and the casting about for new issues upon which to catch the votes of the multitude, let this movement be agitated for but a very few years at most, and then brought to a vote upon some one leading question under which can be veiled the real issue, and we should like to see the one who can show what is to hinder the success of the National Reform movement, and in that the union of Church and State with all that that involves as the ultimate result.

In view of these facts, which simply show the fast-growing power, and the wide-spreading influence of the National Reform movement, we submit to any candid mind whether the AMERICAN SENTINEL has not a mission, in its determined opposition to that movement. Do we not well to expose the fallacies, to lay bare the sophistries, and to uncover the insidious iniquity of this scheme of Church and State? Do we not well to call the attention of the American people to this menace to human liberty and human right? We know precisely what it is about which we are talking. We know exactly what we are doing. But we very much fear that the American people will not realize till it is too late, the danger that lies in the National Reform movement. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but Americans have forgotten it. May God help the people to awake and be vigilant.

A. T. J.

National Reform and the Jews.

THAT such persons as Jews, and others with ourselves, who do not believe the doctrine of Covenanters on the headship of Christ, would be eliminated from the enjoyment of civil communion, so far as actual citizenship—the use of the elective franchise—holding office, etc., is concerned, by the insertion of the second amendment, is not only our inference, but that of Reformers themselves. Hear what a Reformer said in a public speech at Zanesville, Ohio, Oct. 1, 1872. After recounting the conscientious difference between the Jew and himself in reference to religion, especially relative to Christ, he says in regard to the Jew:—

"Well, what have been the consequences of following the lead of such a conscience?—This—that God has said the Jew shall not be a nation longer; he shall not have power to make a civil government; he shall not constitute a majority anywhere. He shall have no king but Cæsar. Now, then, if God will not allow the Jew to make civil governments, or to exist in a national capacity, and this, too, for his sin against the Author of Christianity, shall the Christians go to him to learn how to make a constitution, what to put in it, and what to leave out? As for the Jew, when our Christian Amendment is adopted, he can sit in his store, and buy and sell, and make himself rich. He can enjoy all the comforts of domestic relations,

and will be protected by the law in all his rights as a citizen, and if he chooses to swear support to a constitution which he does not like (as some monarchists in principle do now, but which I would not advise him to do) he can also hold office, if he can find enough people to think him worthy of it."

We cannot help stopping in the midst of this extract, and exclaiming, Magnanimous, *very!* Put the Jew under civil disabilities, and then suggest he can violate his conscience if he deems proper, and under these auspicious (?) circumstances why, "if he can find enough people to think him worthy he can also hold office!" Glorious privilege, indeed! Excellent exhibition of Christian charity for the conversion of the Jew! But we are not done with the extract. He says further:—

"And if he does not choose to vote or hold office under a Christian Constitution, he can abstain, and it will not hurt him nor injure any one else. He will then be merely where God has put him, without power to exercise civil authority."

We had thought that the arguments to sustain African slavery were dead and buried. But, to our amazement, we have them here resurrected, and animated with new life and vigor, and sent forth on a new mission. Before the trumpet of the American jubilee sounded in the ears of Africa's sable sons, were they not where God put them? Was not the Bible ransacked to find some *sin* of their ancestors that would justify the infliction of the *wrongs* of slavery? Was not the origin of the race burl-squed by the Scottish bard,

"How graceless Ham laughed at his dad,
Which made Canaan a nigger,"

The only argument in the mouths of thousands, to justify the enslaving of colored men, the supposed descendants of Canaan the son of Ham? These arguments were again and again torn to shreds by a common-sense logic, that the humiliation of a people, though foretold in Scriptures, would never justify others in the infliction of wrong, unless they were the divinely constituted executioners of Heaven's vengeance. Strange indeed, that these same arguments should become potent again in the mind of any one to justify the imposition of civil disabilities upon the Jew, because his ancestors, some nearly two thousand years ago, in religious frenzy, crucified the promised Messiah! Did the unnatural act of Jacob's sons in selling their young brother, justify the Egyptians in treating their descendants cruelly? God's terrible judgments on that nation contain the answer. We rejoice that our national escutcheon is not stained, like that of old England, with the persecution of the Jew. Here he is treated as a man, and offered the same privileges as others.

From the above we take it as an admitted fact—admitted by the advocates of the measure themselves, that were the amendments inserted, some would either have to violate their conscience, or surrender their civil privileges.—*Rev. Wm. Ballantine.*

THE creation of a national and uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which disgraced their English persecutors, and Laud was justified by the men whom he wronged."—*Bancroft.*

"National Reformers" the Enemies of American Institutions.

THE readers of the SENTINEL must know that in its opposition to the so-called National Reform movement it is actuated by no personal feelings whatever. Although frequent reference is made to the men and papers that are working for the amendment, it is not done with the design of impugning their motives or calling especial attention to them, but because the only way we can show the errors of the National Reform movement is by quoting what its supporters say for it. We believe that many if not all of the leaders in the movement are honest in their motives, but they have become blinded by a selfish ambition which they mistake for religious zeal. To show that the movement is directly contrary to the spirit of the golden rule, we quote from an article by Rev. J. J. McCarrell, entitled "The Civil Sabbath," in the *Christian Nation* of June 9. He says:—

"Those who have come from afar, and find life a burden here, knew the character of our institutions before they came. If they have helped to develop our resources and fight our battles, we are not slow to recognize the full value of those services. We accord to them the full rights of citizenship, and all the blessings of preserved nationality, the common reward of all alike. But we decline to accept the doctrine that those services confer upon them the privilege of bringing upon our beloved land a worse scourge and destruction than those averted by the civil war. If any of our citizens find our institutions intolerable, our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, our attempts to secure sobriety, quietness, and decency, too great a burden for their freedom-loving souls, there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are just as wide as our gates of ingress. They are three thousand miles broad, and are shut neither by day nor by night. If these oppressed and over-burdened souls wish to seek a better country under the sun, the way is open, and not a tongue will ever wag dissent."

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we would be second to none in upholding "American institutions" against any attempt on the part of "those who have come from afar," to overthrow them. With anarchy and Anarchists we have no sympathy. When men combine to overthrow the laws that protect the rights of men we would oppose them in every lawful way. But we have no more objection to this kind of work when done by "those who come from afar" than when done by those born in the land. Now let us notice the inconsistency and the selfishness and disregard of the rights of others, that is manifested in the above paragraph.

The writer says that foreigners who do not choose to conform to our customs and usages should leave; and the keeping of Sunday presumably on the authority of the fourth commandment, is regarded as one of those usages. If men do not want to keep Sunday according to the strict law of Pennsylvania, they have no business here. Now we would like to know how the Amendmentists can harmonize such a position with the position which they take on the Chinese question. The Chinese are heathen; they do not acknowledge God, but bow down to the most disgusting idols, thus breaking the first and second commandments; they know

and care nothing about Jesus Christ; like all heathen, they think it no wrong to defraud or steal, if they are not detected; and they pay not the slightest regard to Sunday, and know no rest-day but their New Year Holiday. Many American citizens are endeavoring to have these Chinese driven from our country, and have succeeded in securing laws prohibiting their further immigration. But the Amendmentists utterly condemn all such proceedings. They claim that such a course is unjust. Now we ask how they can harmonize their wish to drive off the man who objects to their strict Sunday laws, with their objection to driving off the Chinaman who not only disregards Sunday, but who openly and repulsively violates all the commandments? The application of National Reform principles to-day, or ten years from to-day, would make it necessary to press every ocean steamer into the service of carrying Chinamen back to their native land. It would exclude the Chinese from this country as effectually as would the wildest scheme ever advocated by Kearney or O'Donnell. So we say that National Reformers are inconsistent.

Now as to their selfishness. This country was settled by those who came here that they might worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, free from oppression for opinion's sake. The principle of religious freedom is the principle on which this Government was founded. It is the first and best of our "American institutions." Now the error of the National Reformers is in regarding the particular beliefs and practices of the pilgrim fathers as American institutions, which must be upheld at all hazards, forgetting that the principle of liberty, both civil and religious, is the only distinctive American institution. They say, "Our fathers, who settled this country, venerated the 'Christian Sabbath'; they have bequeathed it to us as an American institution; and if we would not be false to their memory we must see that the Sunday is kept by all men, and kept as they kept it." But in that very resolution they are false to the memory of our fathers who bequeathed to us the principles of liberty which we possess. True loyalty to American institutions would be to say, "Here are some who do not hold as we do on some points of religious faith and practice; now we will not only allow them to hold and carry out their ideas, but will protect them in so doing, just as we ourselves would like to be protected in our opinions." This would not only be in accordance with American institutions, but it would be in harmony with the golden rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Of course it is always understood that in guaranteeing all men liberty of thought and action, the Government stipulates that no one shall disturb others in the exercise of their rights. Nothing less than this would be liberty to all. But the further error of the National Reformers is in supposing that all who differ with them are infringing on their rights. Mr. McCarrell of Pennsylvania, together with enough other Pennsylvanians to make a strict Sunday law, imagine that because they want to keep Sunday strictly everybody else must do the same. It may be that their neighbor

does not believe that Sunday ought to be observed; he may be a strict and conscientious observer of Saturday; but that makes no difference; "we are *the* people, and you must do as we do; if you don't like our ways, you may go somewhere else." And this they call upholding American liberty! Surely, American history has been written to no purpose, so far as National Reformers are concerned.

But Mr. McCarrell and his fellow Amendmentists, in their selfish blindness, forget that some of those who differ with them have not, like the Chinaman, some other place to go to. Says he, "If any of our citizens . . . find our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, . . . there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are just as wide as our gates of ingress." Does he not know that there are in this country thousands of native-born Americans, many of whom can trace their ancestry even to the *Mayflower*, who strenuously and conscientiously object to these strict Sunday laws which oblige them to rest on Sunday after having devoted the preceding day to rest and sacred worship? Where shall these go? The gate of ingress through which they entered this country was that of birth, and if they are to return whence they came, annihilation awaits them.

If we happen to differ with these National Reformers, they certainly differ with us to the same extent; then why should *we* leave the country any more than they? This is our country as much as it is theirs. We will not attempt to characterize the proposal of Mr. McCarrell as it deserves, but will simply quote a few words from the speech of Mr. Blaine in regard to a similar proposal by Lord Salisbury concerning the Irish: "Lord Salisbury gives the remedy. He says, if the Irish do not want to be governed by the British they should leave. But the Irish have been in Ireland quite as long as Lord Salisbury's ancestors have been in England. . . . Therefore we have to say that Lord Salisbury may be called impudent. We would not transgress courtesy if we called him insolent. We would not transgress truth if we called him brutal." We can only add, "We would not be uncharitable if we substituted 'the National Reformers' for 'Lord Salisbury,'" and applied Mr. Blaine's language to them.

Now we claim that these conscientious observers of the seventh day, have the same right to protection that the strict observers of Sunday have. The "American institution" of equal liberty for all, grants each party the right to worship on the day which they regard holy, and forbids either party to interfere with the worship of the other. It also guarantees to the non-religionist the privilege of observing no day at all, but forbids him to disturb those who conscientiously rest.

We submit to any candid, unprejudiced person that the liberty that is guaranteed by our Constitution as it now stands, is all that can be asked by any consistent follower of the golden rule; and that they who ask for a religious amendment to the Constitution, are seeking to overthrow the only distinctive institution which America has; and if all who are seeking to overthrow American institutions should be banished, the National Reformers should be the first to go.

E. J. W.

The Principles of National Reform.

IN our August number we showed by indubitable proofs that the National Reform movement is nothing but an effort to place this Government on a foundation of Reformed Presbyterianism, and to subject it to the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. We showed in their own words that, "National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the Nation."

Now the Reformed Presbyterian Church claims to be the direct and only lineal descendant of the Covenanters, and prides itself upon being the modern representative, and the sole conservator, of genuine Covenanter principles. Therefore by studying Covenanter principles, and their practical application, we may form some idea of what the result would be if the National Reform party should succeed in making "practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian [Covenanter] Church" in this Nation. We have not space for one-twentieth, no not one-one-hundredth, part of the evidence that might easily be given in illustration of the "practical application" of these principles. Our quotations must be few and brief. The best summary on the subject of these principles, that we have seen, is an article by "A Presbyterian Minister" in the *New York Independent* of Nov. 11, 1880, entitled "Is It Right—A Protest." And the best summary of the application of the principles, that perhaps anybody has ever seen, is chapter V. of Buckle's "History of Civilization." It is the principles rather than their application which we shall here discuss; for in reading these it can readily enough be seen what their application would be in the hands of the National Reformers, when clothed with power to make the application.

The Covenants which embody the principles of the Covenanters, and, per force, of the National Reformers, are entitled "The National Covenant or Confession of Faith," and the "Solemn League and Covenant," and are both of Scotch Presbyterian origin. The first of these, "The National Covenant or Confession of Faith," was "first subscribed in 1580; again, by all persons of all ranks in 1581; again, in 1590; again, in the language of its title, 'subscribed by Barons, Nobles, Burgesses, Ministers, and Commons, in 1638, approved by the General Assembly, 1638 and 1639; and subscribed again by persons of all ranks and qualities in the year 1639, by an ordinance of Council, upon the supplication of the General Assembly, an act of the General Assembly, certified by an act of Parliament 1640;' and, finally, in compliance with the urgent demands of Scottish Presbyterians, subscribed by Charles II., in 1650 and 1651, as being, along with the Solemn League and Covenant, the one prime and only condition of their restoring him to power."

Among many other like things, that Covenant declares, in approval of various acts of the Scottish Parliament, in these words:—

" . . . do condemn all erroneous books and writs concerning erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies papistical, . . . and ordains the home-bringers of them

to be punished . . . and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault as idolaters."

The religion "presently professed," remember, was the Covenant—the National Reform—religion. And note, all opposition to that religion, in doctrine or in worship, in books or in rites, was to be punished for the second fault as idolatry. What then was the punishment for idolatry? John Knox had already laid down the law on this point, and here it is in his own words and in his own spelling:—

"None provoking the people to idolatry ought to be exempted from the punishment of death.

The whole tribes did in verie dede execute that sharp judgement against the tribe of Benjamin for a lesse offense than for idolatry. And the same ought to be done wheresoever Christ Jesus and his Evangill [Gospel] is so received in any realme province or citie that the magistrates and people have solemnly avowed and promised to defend the same, as under King Edward [VI.] of late days was done in England. In such places, I say, it is not only lawful to punish to the death such as labor to subvert the true religion, but the magistrates and people are bound to do so unless they will provoke the wrath of God against themselves."—See "*Knox's Works, Laing's edition, vol. IV., pp. 500-515;*" or "*Lecky's History of Rationalism, vol. II., pp. 50, 51, note 6.*"

For the protection of the religion "presently professed" the Covenant further declares of it:—

"Which by manifold acts of Parliament, all within this realm are bound to profess, to subscribe the articles thereof, to recant all doctrine and errors repugnant to any of the said articles, . . . and all magistrates, sheriffs, etc., . . . are ordained to search, apprehend, and punish all contraveners; . . . that none shall be reputed loyal and faithful subjects to our sovereign Lord or his authority, but be punishable as rebellers and gainstanders of the same, who shall not give their confession and make their profession of the said true religion."

Again the Covenant declares that it is the duty of the magistrates to—

"Maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus."—"*And that they should be careful to root out of their empire all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God who shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the aforesaid crimes.*"

So much for the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith;" but by this may be understood the National Reform declaration that the duty of the Nation is, "an acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national Covenanting with" God.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.

The "Solemn League and Covenant" is of the same tenor, and came about in this way: In the trouble between the English Nation and King Charles I., Presbyterianism arose to power in England, and they called on their Covenanter co-religionists of Scotland to help them out of the trouble. This the Covenanters would do only upon the English complying with the "imperative demand of the Scot's Parliament that the religious system of Scotland should be adopted as that of England." The Covenanters of course proposed the Covenant, but Vane, the chief negotiator for England, "stipulated for a *League*," as well as a Covenant, and so was formed the "Solemn League and Covenant."—*Knights' England, chap. 92.* This, as the basis of union and of action, was entered into in 1643, and was to be "the perpetual bond of union" between the kingdoms. In it, it was declared:—

"That we shall, in like manner, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness."

As to how that should be done the following will show. In 1639 there had been passed an "Act Ordaining by Ecclesiastical Authority the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration," in which this is found:—

"And having, withal, supplicated His Majesty's high commissioner and the lords of His Majesty's honorable Privy Council to *enjoin* by act of council all the lieges in time coming to subscribe to the Confession of Faith and Covenant."

The way in which it was to be enjoined, was this:—

"And in all humility supplicate His Majesty's high commissioner and the honorable estates of Parliament by their authority to ratify and enjoin the same, *under all civil pains*."

In compliance with these humble supplications the Edinburgh Parliament, in June 1640, passed an act to—

"Ordain and command the said Confession and Covenant to be subscribed by all His Majesty's subjects, of what rank and quality soever, *under all civil pains*."

"All civil pains" includes everything that a government can inflict, even to death itself. These were ordinances of the Scotch Parliament, but the English Parliament during the Covenanter régime, was not one whit behind.

Under the "Solemn League and Covenant," the Presbyterian Parliament of England dealt "the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received."

"An Ordinance for the Suppression of Blasphemies and Heresies," which Vane and Cromwell had long held at bay, was passed by triumphant majorities. Any man—ran this terrible statute—denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of Scripture are the 'word of God,' or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of Judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his heresy, 'shall suffer the pain of death.' Any man declaring (among a long list of other errors) 'that man by nature hath free will to turn to God,' that there is a purgatory, that images are lawful, that infant baptism is unlawful; any one denying the obligation of observing the Lord's day, or asserting 'that the church government by presbytery is anti-Christian or unlawful,' shall, on refusal to renounce his errors, 'be commanded to prison.'—*Green's Larger History of England, book VII., chap. 10, par. 11.*

The execution of Charles I. severed the League, and Charles II. was immediately proclaimed in Scotland, with the proviso, however, that "before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant." This was made known to Charles in Holland, but he refused to accede to it. The next year however, 1650, he sailed to Scotland and before landing he accepted the terms, consented to subscribe to the Covenants, and received the test. But all the while he was devising schemes for the subversion of the Covenants and the whole Covenanter system, of which the whole history of his reign, as well as of that of his brother James II., is but a dreadful illustration.

When James II. had deprived himself of all allegiance of his subjects, and William and Mary came to the English and Scotch thrones in his stead, Presbyterianism was finally established as the religion of Scotland. But it was Presbyterianism without the enforcement of the Covenants, for honest William declared in memorable words that "so long as he reigned there should be no persecution for conscience' sake." Said he:—

"We never could be of that mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party."—*Green's England, book VIII., chap. 3, par. 36.*

And when William and Mary were inaugurated as sovereigns of Scotland, when it came to taking the oath of office, William refused to swear to the persecuting part of it.

"A splendid circle of English nobles and statesmen stood round the throne; but the sword of State was committed to a Scotch lord; and the oath of office was administered after the Scotch fashion. Argyle recited the words slowly. The royal pair, holding up their hands towards Heaven, repeated after him till they came to the last clause. There William paused. That clause contained a promise that he would root out all heretics and all enemies of the true worship of God; and it was notorious that, in the opinion of many Scotchmen, not only all Roman Catholics, but all Protestant Episcopalians, all Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, all Lutherans, nay all British Presbyterians who did not hold themselves bound by the Solemn League and Covenant, were enemies of the true worship of God. The king had apprised the commissioners that he could not take this part of the oath without a distinct and public explanation; and they had been authorized by the convention to give such an explanation as would satisfy him. 'I will not,' he now said, 'lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor.' 'Neither the words of this oath,' said one of the commissioners, 'nor the laws of Scotland, lay any such obligation on Your Majesty.' 'In that sense, then, I swear,' said William, 'and I desire you all, my lords and gentlemen, to witness that I do so.'—*Macaulay's England, chap. 13, par. 63.*

As the acts of settlement adopted under William, and the oaths taken by him, not only failed to adopt and enforce the Covenant, but were in express contradiction to it, the Covenanters, "accordingly, occupied an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William, and acted on by the church," that is by the great body of the Scottish Church, which accepted the principles of William and the acts of settlement. "They maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both" the church and the sovereign from the principles and the obligations of the Covenant, and, says Macaulay, many of them "would rather have been fired upon by musketeers, or tied to stakes within low water mark, than have uttered a prayer that God would bless William and Mary."—*Id., par. 64.*

The Covenanters then standing as dissenters from the church and the Government that would not adopt the Covenant, and as the sole defenders of the doctrines of the Covenants, adopted the name of "Reformed Presbyterians." Thus the Covenanters are the Reformed Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterianism is National Reform. The principles of the

Covenants and the Covenanters, which we have here set forth, are the "distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church," and for the spread of which that church is set; and "National Reform is simply the practical application" of these principles "for the reformation of the Nation." These are the literal, solid facts in the case, and we ask the American people whether they are ready just yet to be "reformed" by "the practical application" of such principles? A. T. J.

Civil Government and Religion.

ALL civil governments act authoritatively and sustain their authority by the compulsory law of force. They grant to the subject no discretion. They assume their own infallibility, as against the right of the individual practically to dispute it. They put their opinions into execution, if necessary, by the sword. Where, then, is there any proper place in things spiritual—things that have their center in God and refer mainly to the interests of the after-life—for any merely human government to exercise its authoritative power over the individual will? Shall it adopt a creed for the people, and thus decide what creed they shall adopt? Shall it regulate their mode of worship? Shall it tax them for the support of a religion which it thinks to be true, but which some of them may think to be false? Shall it make its conscience the law for their conscience? There is no religious belief and no religious duty to which it can add the civil sanction without invading the inalienable rights of the individual conscience; and, at the same time, assuming an authority which belongs to God only. It may justly require that no one shall make his religion an excuse for crime against the temporal good order and safety of society, and so it may protect every one in the free and peaceable exercise of his religion; but beyond these two points it cannot go without taking the fatal step which logically involves the whole principle of State religion.

Concede religion to be one of the ends for the attainment of which governments exist among men, and all laws necessary and proper for carrying this end into effect follow as a matter of course, and this is in its very nature the essence of religious despotism. Every step in this direction places the religious liberty of the individual at the pleasure of the government, armed with the whole power of society to enforce that pleasure. If government may tax him to support and teach religion, then it may establish for him a religion which he must observe whether he believes it or not. The only escape from this result is that theory of civil government which limits it to things temporal, and denies to it any jurisdiction or any duties beyond impartial protection in the sphere of things spiritual. This, and this only, secures religious liberty, as against any oppression by the civil power.

The correctness of this theory is strongly confirmed by the general fact of history, that when religion and civil government are legally united, neither derives any benefit from the union, but both are seriously damaged by it. The most characteristic feature of such a union

is that of a bad religion and a bad government at the same time, each being harmed by the other. Let it be remembered that the governments of the world have almost always been wrong on the subject of religion; that the majority of them have been opposed to the religion of the Bible, and quite often persecuted it; that they have generally used religion for selfish and ambitious purposes; that by uniting it with the State they have corrupted both; and that, for a rule, their religious propagandism has been mainly that of error, rather than truth.

These facts prove most conclusively that civil government is a failure when it attempts to administer and regulate religion; and, hence, in the interests of pure religion, as well as those of good government, every Christian, every statesman, and every citizen should protest against any theory that carries even a single drop of State religion in its veins. We cannot import rulers from the skies or impart to earthly rulers the inspiration and infallibility of the skies. Governments must be managed by men; and, if history proves anything, it proves that men are very poor managers when they exercise the civil power in relation to religion. Their positions make them despots in theory, and in practice they often become demons incarnate, treading under foot the rights of conscience with a ferocity as reckless as it is cruel.

The theory which unites government and religion and makes the latter one of the ends to be pursued by the former, if good at all, is equally good for all governments—for "the powers that be" in Turkey, Japan, and China, as really as for those of these United States. Apply the theory in China, and it means State power employed to sustain, propagate, and enforce Buddhism and idolatry. Apply it in Turkey, and it means the same power thus employed in the interests of Mohammedanism. It so happens that the world is fruitful in religious systems; and, unless we adopt the doctrine that all these systems are equally true or equally false, the theory, as thus applied, would lead to the most opposite results, and entirely confound the distinction between the true and the false. If when applied to Christianity it would promote the truth, it would, with equal certainty, promote the grossest superstition and error when applied to Paganism. A change of circumstances often gives one a view of things otherwise not so readily taken.

Let us then suppose a Protestant to transfer his residence to China and to become subject to the government of that country. While in this country, we will further suppose, he belonged to the class demanding that religion shall be included in the educational régime of the public schools, and was horrified at the idea of not having King James's version of the sacred Scriptures read in these schools for religious purposes. How does he reason when the principle comes to be applied to him in China? The Chinese Emperor agrees with him in his principle, and proposes to tax him, not to support and teach Protestant Christianity, but to support and teach the religion of China, which he regards as an abominable idolatry. This would probably open his eyes to the nature of his own doctrine. Yet, if it is the right of

one government to enter the province of things spiritual, and tax the people to support and propagate religion, then it is the right of all governments to do so.

The principle, if valid at all, is just as valid for Paganism as it is for Christianity, for idolatry as it is for the purest worship, for the most superstitious form of Roman Catholicism as it is for the most enlightened Protestantism. No Protestant would ask for its application in any other than a Protestant country; and this is a good reason why he should not ask for it there. If it is not good in China or Catholic Spain, it is no better in these United States. The principle is the same, no matter to what religion it is applied, or whether Pagans or Christians, Catholics or Protestants form the majority of the people. It is the principle of State religion, good everywhere or good nowhere. If Protestants were in the minority in this country and Catholics in the majority, the former certainly would not advocate a public school system, to be supported by general taxation, in which Catholicism should be taught.

The conclusion from this line of thought is that civil government, though the best possible machinery to secure certain ends connected with our temporal interests, is not a contrivance adapted to secure the ends that relate to our spiritual welfare. "Surely," says Macaulay, "if experience shows that a certain machine, when used to produce a certain effect, does not produce that effect once in a thousand times, but produces in the vast majority of cases an effect directly contrary, we cannot be wrong in saying it is not a machine of which the principal end is to be so used."

The learned essayist might justly have said that it is not a machine properly adapted to this end at all. The notorious and world-wide failures of civil government to make itself useful in the department of things spiritual, when attempting to manage and conduct them, furnish the most complete demonstration that, however useful it may be elsewhere, it is not suited to this purpose. A sledge-hammer is a very good instrument with which to break a rock, but a very poor tool with which to mend a watch or perform a delicate operation in surgery. So civil government is a very good agency within certain limits and for certain objects; but beyond these limits and objects it has no function to perform, and when its powers are extended beyond them they are found in practice to be immensely more injurious than beneficial to the very interests they seek to serve.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D., in Religion and the State.*

THE *Christian Statesman* says that at Chautauqua Dr. Vincent, Chancellor of Chautauqua University, "intimated his dissent from the views of National Reformers." That only shows Dr. Vincent's wisdom and love of human right. The difficulty with us is to see how any one who has any regard for the principles of Christianity, or for natural right, can do anything but "dissent from the views of National Reformers."

"WHETHER it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Acts 4:19.

OUR COUNTRY, THE MARVEL OF NATIONS: ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, AND WHAT THE SCRIPTURES SAY OF IT.

By U. SMITH.
Author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and Other Popular Works.

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

HISTORICAL, POLITICAL, AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a

CHAIN OF PROPHECY,

Of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the Prophet of God, hundreds of years ago. The SUNDAY QUESTION, MODERN SPIRITUALISM, AND NATIONAL REFORM are prominent among the topics ably discussed in this work.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type and elegantly bound. Price \$1.00.

The publishers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of "The Marvel of Nations" whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with their paper, one year, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1869 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN FROM THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE END OF TIME.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE,
Author of "The Life of Christ," "Sketches from the Life of Paul," "Bible Sanctification," and other popular works.

PRINTED AND BOUND IN THE VERY BEST STYLE. OVER TEN THOUSAND SOLD IN SIX MONTHS.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other. Beginning with our Lord's great prophecy given while viewing Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, in which he outlines the history of the whole dispensation, it sketches the fulfillment. It pictures the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Temple. It calls our attention to the bitter persecutions of the Christians in the first centuries, and notes the rise and growth of the Papacy. It gives a clear conception of the character and influence of the Waldenses, who, through centuries of persecution, maintained the purity of their faith, and by their missionary efforts prepared the nations of Europe for the Reformation.

Brief and lifelike sketches are given of the works, the successes, and the persecutions of Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale, Huss, Jerome, Knox, and other reformers and martyrs.

Considerable space is given to the life, work, and influence of later reformers and great religious leaders, such as George Whitefield, the Wesleys, and William Miller, and this is followed by chapters treating upon The Origin of Evil, The Agency of Evil Spirits, The Snares of Satan, and the Judgment.

The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

Over 500 pages; 22 full-page cuts. Price, \$1.50

To foreign countries, post-paid, 85c

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.,
Or the nearest Agent or Book Depository.

A MINE OF INFORMATION. HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

By ELI. J. N. ANDREWS.

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

EVERY TEXT OF SCRIPTURE concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length; and the COMPLETE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS in regard to the Sabbath and first day is given. The comparative merits of the seventh and the first-day Sabbaths are fully shown. A copious index enables the reader to find any text, or the statement of any historian.

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

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

THE HOME OF THE SAVED.

By ELI. J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Gives the Bible evidence upon the interesting topic of the earth made new, as the inheritance of the saints. 82 pp. Price, 10 cents.
SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., SEPTEMBER, 1886.

EX-GOVERNOR ST. JOHN said to a National Reform Secretary the other day:—

"We are putting your National Reform idea of God's supremacy in Government, into our Prohibition platforms every time, and we are never going back on it."

And so they go, and the cause grows.

A FRIEND in an Eastern State writes:—

"I am more and more satisfied with the AMERICAN SENTINEL. Some fears were entertained that it might not be kept up to the standing of its first numbers, but all such fears are dispelled. The July number is fully equal to the preceding ones. I wish it all success, for it cannot fail to do much good."

AS EVIDENCE of the favor with which the SENTINEL is being received we may mention that from the beginning there have been printed ten thousand copies of each number, all of which have been taken, and to supply further demand we have been obliged to print one thousand copies extra of each of the back numbers. So send in the orders. Back numbers from Number One to the present can be furnished in any quantity desired. Nearly one hundred thousand copies of the SENTINEL used in nine months represents an influence, and an amount of work, that is truly gratifying to the friends of the cause in defense of which it was established.

NOW THAT the women, especially the leaders in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are making themselves especially prominent in the advocacy of the National Reform movement, we shall be compelled in opposing it, to oppose them *so far as they are connected with it*, but no farther. We are sorry to have to do even this much, for it seems almost ungallant, but by their actions necessity is laid upon us. We shall, however, always remember that they are ladies, and treat them as such; while, at the same time, condemning *in toto* the National Reform doctrines and their support of them, and opposing, by all honorable means, all effort for the advancement of that cause.

In the political world it is votes that count. The man who can "control" votes is always in demand, and is always sure of office so long as his "influence" lasts. The man who can control the largest number of votes, can get the largest office. So it will be in the "new dispensation," which the National Reformers propose to bring in. Since religion will be upheld by the State, in accordance, not with the will of the people, but, with the will of those who "control" the votes of the people, position in the church, as in the State, will be determined by one's ability to "influence" votes. Imagine Peter asking the leaders of the "National Reform" party, "What shall we have?" The reply, unspoken, perhaps, would necessarily be something like this: "That depends upon your success as a politician; if you can control 300 votes you may have a clerkship; if you can

control 700 votes you may be pastor of a city church with the privilege of going to Congress; and if you can control 10,000 votes you may be bishop, and brevet-corrector of heretics?" Perhaps we have not the correct scale, for we don't know how such service is usually paid, but the principle is there.

An Evidence of Impending Ruin.

CANON FARRAR is a man of extensive and varied knowledge, and as he is himself a dignitary of the Church of England, anything he says that would militate against the principle of Church and State union must have double weight. In his "Early Days of Christianity," chapter 1, paragraph 9, in speaking of the condition of the world about the time of the Christian era, he says:—

"It is certain that the old Paganism was—except in country places—practically dead. The very fact that it was necessary to prop it up by the buttress of political interference shows how hollow and ruinous the structure of classic Polytheism had become."

There is the whole principle in a nutshell. Every man knows that when one power seeks an alliance with another, the party seeking the alliance, by that act confesses either that she is the weaker power, or that unaided she is not able to do what she designs to do. Is it any wonder, then, that the effort which the National Reform party is so strenuously making, should be in the mouths of infidels an argument against Christianity? Can it be wondered at if they say, "You claim that Christianity is to conquer the world, but you are forced to admit that she has not the power"? What else could they be expected to say? Thus the "National Reformers" are forging a weapon for the enemies of Christianity.

We do not for a moment admit that the above infidel argument against Christianity is a just one, because Christianity is not seeking an alliance with any power. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and he persistently repelled all efforts to connect him and his work with secular authority. He further showed how distinct in character Christianity is from civil power, by saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." We believe and know that the gospel, unaided by secular power, is able to do, and will do, all that God designed that it should accomplish.

The effort for a religious amendment to the Constitution has nothing to do with Christianity, except to lower it in the estimation of non-believers, and, indeed, of all who accept National Reform theories. These National Reformers, as has been intimated, are not seeking to ally Christianity with the State, but to prop up their peculiar ideas of Christianity by an alliance with the civil power. And the fact that they are seeking political aid, shows, as Canon Farrar said of the old Paganism under similar circumstances, how weak is the phase of Protestantism which they represent. Let it be well understood, then, that whenever "the church," so-called, seeks the aid of the civil power, it thereby proclaims its inherent weakness because of the absence of the vivifying principles of pure Christianity.

Some More Clashing Voices.

WE here present some more matter for the "Clashing Voices" column of the *Christian Statesman*. In the Pittsburgh National Reform Convention, Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., said:—

"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 yet Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the District Secretaries of the National Reform Association, says:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

And Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, in speaking of the results of the Amendment, to infidels, says:—

"The worst result would be to disfranchise them."

In the New York Convention Rev. John Hogg said:—

"Jesus said, 'Whosoever believeth in me shall never die,' and what is true of an individual is also true of a nation. The nation that takes hold upon God and the Lord Jesus shall never die. (Applause.) . . . If we mean to live, we must have it [the Constitution] imbued with a divine life. . . . Let us acknowledge God as our Father, and Sovereign, and Source of all good, and his blessing will be upon us. Crime and corruption will come to an end, and the benign reign of Jesus, our rightful Lord, will be established. (Applause.)"

In the same convention Rev. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Becoming a kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, we shall fill the earth and endure forever."

And yet in the *Christian Statesman* of July 15, here comes Rev. J. P. Lytle, D. D., in the Convention at Wooster, Ohio, the very latest, and says:—

"Nations are not chosen to everlasting life; . . . they have no spiritual union with Christ; and they shall all eventually go down to the 'sides of the pit' of destruction, and 'hell will be moved to meet them at their coming,' as it was for Egypt, and Babylon, and Tyrus, and Assyria."

We wish Rev. M. A. Gault, who manages the "Clashing Voices" business, would turn his attention to these. We should like very much to know how all these men can be telling the truth. Or, are we to understand that the National Reformers adopt the maxim of Mahomet, that "all contradiction is removed by the rule that any text is abrogated or modified by any subsequent passage"?

"THEN Peter and the apostles said, We ought to obey God rather than men."

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

TERMS.

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

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