

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1886.

NUMBER 11.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

NEXT year the one hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, will be held in Philadelphia. The *Christian Statesman* is calling for a National Reform Convention, to be held at the same time, to consider means for altering that charter of American liberty, so as to overthrow all that was done by the revolutionary fathers.

DURING many centuries, every Government thought it was its bounden duty to encourage religious truth, and discourage religious error. The mischief this has produced is incalculable. Putting aside all other considerations, it is enough to mention its two leading consequences; which are, the increase of hypocrisy, and the increase of perjury. The increase of hypocrisy is the inevitable result of connecting any description of penalty with the profession of particular opinions. Whatever may be the case with individuals, it is certain that the majority of men find an extreme difficulty in long resisting constant temptation. And when the temptation comes to them in the shape of honor and emolument, they are too often ready to profess the dominant opinions, and abandon, not indeed their belief, but the external marks by which that belief is made public. Every man who takes this step is a hypocrite; and every Government which encourages this step to be taken, is an abettor of hypocrisy and a creator of hypocrites. Well, therefore, may we say, that when a Government holds out as a bait, that those who profess certain opinions shall enjoy certain privileges, it plays the part of the tempter of old, and, like the evil one, basely offers the good things of this world to him who will change his worship and deny his faith. At the same time, and as a part of this system, the increase of perjury has accompanied the increase of hypocrisy. For legislators, plainly seeing that proselytes thus obtained could not be relied upon, have met the danger by the most extraordinary precautions; and compelling men to confirm their belief by repeated oaths, have thus sought to protect the old creed against the new converts.—*Buckle.*

In proportion as the ecclesiastics became legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.—*Dean Milman.*

Religious Legislation.

THERE is an old saying that "there are none so blind as those who will not see." It seems impossible to impress upon the minds of the National Reformers the distinction between religion and morality, or, even, that there is a difference between religion and crime. Legislation against crime is not religious legislation. It is, indeed, legislation on moral questions, but it is legislation on morality purely on a civil basis. It has been abundantly shown in the *SENTINEL* that civil Government cannot, if it would, enforce morals on a moral basis. It takes cognizance of overt actions only. It cannot sway the convictions; it cannot reform the conscience, it cannot renew the heart. If it attempts to coerce the conscience it usurps authority which belongs only to God, the *Supreme Moral Governor*. In its attempts to do so, it may persecute; it may make a class of its citizens act the hypocrite, but it cannot reach the heart on matters of morality, and much less on those of religion.

The demand of these professed reformers is that the Government shall legislate upon and decide religious questions, as well as civil. Yet the *Statesman* has the effrontery to place in its prospectus the declaration that it is opposed to a union of Church and State. This reminds us of the declaration of certain professed reformers (all change is reform with some people), who were accused of trying to destroy the marriage relation. They denied the charge, saying they believed in marriage, that is, they believed in "a heart union of two persons, marriage without the aid of judge or minister; and that when the union of heart ceased, the marriage is annulled, without the aid of a court to divorce them"! To that kind of marriage they were not opposed, neither is the vilest libertine that walks the earth, because it imposes no restraint on his passions. But that is not marriage. If such a practice obtained, the institution of marriage, and family relations, would be broken down.

And so with the Religious Amendmentists. They give the expression, "Church and State," a signification to suit their purpose, and theoretically oppose that, while they zealously advocate exactly that state of things which existed in the Old World in which Church and State were closely united. The relation of the State toward the Church in the time of Constantine, which all denominations recognize as the union of Church and State, was exactly the relation for which they are now pleading. Later, under the Popes of Rome, the full result

of Constantine's arrangement was realized, and we challenge the Amendmentists to show that the same result will not follow the arrangement for which they plead. Such a result is the natural outgrowth of their proposed arrangement.

It is always unsafe to intrust the control of civil Government to the Church—to any church—because it is contrary to the institution of the Head of the church. It is an unauthorized, and, therefore, an unhealthy, combination. It leads to churchly worldliness and worldly ambition. It is subversive of true piety and spirituality in church service. They demand that the pulpits and the churches shall make "the final decisions" in matters both *civil and religious*. We have proved this, by their own language. But that would be churchly usurpation. The highest office that Christ ever bestowed upon his servants is that of "ambassadors;" 2 Cor. 5:18-20, and this only in regard to the gospel proclamation. We challenge the *Statesman*, and all its partisans, to produce a single sentence in the teachings of Christ and his apostles which will warrant them in taking upon themselves the offices of legislators and executives, to which they aspire. They are clamoring to have the church exercise usurped authority, and profess that it is for the honor of Christianity. We object to their demands because they are dangerous to the institutions of our Government, and to the liberties, both civil and religious, of the people.

In the *Statesman* of September 16 there is a quotation and comment as follows:—

"If Congress does not find in our Constitution a basis for Sabbath legislation, then let us elect a Congress who will find such a basis."—*Hon. John Cole, Tingly, Iowa.*

"You are more unreasonable than the Egyptians, for they did not compel the Hebrews to hunt straw where there was none, but you would require Congress to find in the Constitution what is not there, a basis for Sabbath legislation. The Constitution puts the true religion on the same level with all false religions, by prohibiting the establishment of religion or any interference with its free exercise. How can polygamy be suppressed without prohibiting a certain form of religion."

Here is considerable "food for reflection," and several points worthy of careful consideration.

1. Mr. Brunot, President of the National Reform Association, publicly declared that the Sixth Article and the First Amendment of the Constitution are necessary as safeguards against a union of Church and State. But the *Statesman*, and the entire body of workers in behalf of the proposed Religious Amendment, are unceasing in their opposition to these two pro-

visions of our Constitution. They go so far as to say (and very foolishly, too) that the First Amendment forbids the suppression of polygamy! And therefore, according to the showing of their president, they are trying to break down the barriers against a union of Church and State. And this is just what we have affirmed; they are opening the way for such a union, and when it is opened we may read the result in the history of the papacy.

2. They demand that the Constitution shall put a difference between the true religion and all false religions. But in order to do this it must first decide *what is* the true religion. This, as we have before shown, would take religion out of the domain of individual judgment, of conviction, of conscience, and decide for every individual, and that *authoritatively*, what is the religion that he must accept! They demand that the civil Government shall interfere in the free exercise of religion. But they say they want to enforce the religion of the Bible, against all false religions, or those not of the Bible. But there are several hundred religions professedly based on the Bible. Which shall be enforced as the true one? Whose religion shall be suppressed? The Mormons profess to base their entire system, polygamy included, on the Bible. To carry out such schemes, it will not be sufficient to declare that the Bible shall be adopted as the source of the only religion of the commonwealth. Such a declaration would determine no disputes on religion; would settle nothing. As we have before said, so we now say, Not the Bible, but *somebody's construction of the Bible*, will be adopted as the religion of the land. It will be a religion based altogether on human judgment and human authority, and not at all on the authority of the word of God.

To this they may not reply that all religion is based on human judgment, inasmuch as, with the largest liberty, every one depends upon his own judgment as to what the Bible teaches. That is just as it should be, for religion is a matter of the conscience, and rests between a man—every man—and his Maker. Because a man is fallible and liable to err in regard to the teachings of the Bible, shall he therefore bow to the authoritative decisions of somebody who is also fallible, and equally liable to err? According to the teachings of the Amendmentists we must answer, Yes, he shall. But when that answer is made, we have passed entirely over to the position and the teachings of the Church of Rome. We have then no recourse but to accept the infallibility of fallible men. And the Amendmentists cannot evade these conclusions of their doctrines.

3. But our model reformers profess the intention to retain the Republican features of our Government. The majority will elect the officers, and they will then, as now, elect those who will carry out their will on all public questions. The majority will always have it in their power to decide *what religion* shall be enforced by the Government. They may cause the religion of the nation to be changed at their pleasure. *The religion of the nation will then be put upon the market at every general election*, for there will then be religio-political parties; and as political questions are now can-

vassed on the stump, in the saloon, and on the street, so will religious questions then be canvassed. Our Reformers talk as if they could maintain the republic, and yet settle the religion of the country once for all time. Is there a single question of religion that has ever been settled, that remained settled in the minds of the people? Are not the people changing in regard to religion as well as to political questions? Would not candidates be put up on this and that religious issue? By such an arrangement, religion would become contemptible, and one of two things would follow: Religion would be cast out of the Government, as an obnoxious thing, and sink lower in the public esteem than it has ever stood; or, a tribunal would be instituted, analogous to the Pope and his Cardinals, who should decide all questions for the people, and their decisions would have to be taken as final. In a word, the outcome would be, a public repudiation of religion, or the adoption of a second papal system.

4. The Amendmentists persist in their affirmation that polygamy is "a certain form of religion." We affirm that it is an immorality—"a certain form" of crime. We think it has been fully proved in the SENTINEL, that polygamy is, and always was, contrary to God's original institution of marriage; that it originated with wicked men; that it was tolerated but never approved by the Lord; that Christ gave no place to it in his comment on the original marriage institution. It is subversive of that institution—a denial of the terms in which the institution was given. It is subversive of the family and of society. Marriage is not a "Christian institution," but is of original obligation—given before the fall of man, and, of course, would have always existed if man had not fallen; if the system of Christianity had never been required. It is, therefore, an institution which the Government ought to defend and maintain. Most of the States—perhaps all—have had laws against bigamy and polygamy, but it remained for the wise men of the "National Reform Association" to discover that these laws are contrary to the Constitution!

5. But we need not argue that these self-styled Reformers ignore all distinctions of crime and religion. When the SENTINEL was first placed before the public, we did argue that question. If any think that our argument was not conclusive, our proof not sufficient, we invite their attention to the following words found in the same number of the *Statesman*, September 16, 1886:—

"If Government cannot deal with religious questions, it cannot deal with the crime of murder, adultery, or theft, for these are religious questions."

We have no language at command to express our astonishment that men in this age, with every opportunity to be educated upon ethics, will put on record such declarations. And more especially men who pretend to a knowledge of Christianity. Is it possible that these people really believe that all laws against crime, against murder, adultery, and theft, are religious laws, and unconstitutional under our present Constitution? Such is their teaching. If these are religious questions, and if enacting a law against murder, is "religious legislation,"

then we must look again for conclusions. We must conclude, then, that the Constitution does not need amending, because it now warrants, and always has warranted religious legislation, because it has warranted laws against murder. Or, otherwise, our Constitution does need amending, in order that we may legally punish for the crime of murder; because laws against murder are religious laws, and those now existing are unconstitutional, because our Constitution prohibits religious legislation!

Must we, indeed, inquire if there is any distinction between crime and religion? Is there no limit to liberty short of licentiousness? Are men truly sane who demand a Religious Amendment of the Constitution, and demand the abolition of the First Amendment of the Constitution, which forbids interference in questions of religion, in order that murder, adultery, or theft may be legally restrained, or punished? These people are so wedded to a theory that they will put forth the most preposterous propositions, and expect the people to accept them without questioning.

There is one thing in regard to which we think all must agree: When men ignore the most evident and well-established *principles*, they are not safe administrators of the laws which rest upon or grow out of these principles. And there is no association of men of the present age—we will not except those who entirely deny the Bible—who toy with principles, and make them subject to their caprices, more than do the National Reformers. We have reason to hope that we shall never see their wild schemes adopted by the American people. We consider it only our duty to do all in our power to warn the people, if, by any means, such a calamity may be averted. J. H. W.

A Pernicious Fallacy.

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI,—“The voice of the people is the voice of God,”—is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give “the people” a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan's lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in his word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what “the people” say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads “the people” to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done.” This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.

Within a thousand years after the creation,

God saw that "the people" had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was "right in his own eyes" was destroyed by the flood.

It was "the people" who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for himself, who should honor him and keep the knowledge of his will alive in the earth, he found only one man, Abraham, whom he could select as the father of his people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people." Deut. 7:7. The majority of "the people" ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God and had in consequence been rejected by him, we find that "the people" whom God chose as his own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with him. It was "the people who said to Aaron, "Make us gods, which shall go before us;" and when the golden calf was made, "the people" worshipped it. It was "the people" who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt;" and it was "the people" who time and again murmured against the Lord's chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.

In the days when Christ was on earth it was his own people to whom he came, who rejected him. When he was accused before the Roman Governor, it was "the people" of Israel—God's own chosen people—who cried, "Crucify him!"

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with "the people" who constituted the State Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that "the people" were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterward made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor. "And 'the people' gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man." In this case "the voice of the people" was immediately shown to be *not* the voice of God, for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.

Still later we find that "the people" whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State "recognition." In the great empire of Rome, which filled the world, the "Christians" were so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So "the church" was "recognized" by the civil power, to the extent that "its ordinances and its laws" were enforced by "a statutory arrangement." The State undertook to "regulate the administration" of the ordinances, customs, and laws of the church "in conformity with its [the church's] constitution and object." Thus the sect which in the days of Paul was "everywhere spoken against," now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See Isa. 2:2, 3. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for "the world," was a "Christian nation." Mark you, this had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of "the people," but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of "the people"—the church—was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (2 Thess. 2:1-8), and which culminated in the establishment of the Papacy, that "man of sin," "the son of perdition," who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The falsity of that claim is shown by the fact that "the people" who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is his, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of his coming.

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the "National Reformers" use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed Amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church; so was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an Amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of

the sentiment of the Christian people of the country; all Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of "the Christian people" of the empire. Say the "Reformers," "The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation; that is what Rome became. Say they, *We will never persecute*; so said "Christian" Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.

"Woe unto you, . . . because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Matt. 23:29-32.

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called "National Reform" take heed and beware.

E. J. W.

The Principles of National Reform and of the Turk.

REV. JULIUS H. SEELYE, D. D., is President of Amherst College, one of the leading scholars and educators of the United States, and a Vice-President of the National Reform Association. In a late number of the *Forum* he discussed the question, "Should the State Teach Religion?" in which he presented the following as sound doctrine on that question:—

"Religion is not an *end* to the State. It is simply a *means* to the advancement of the State, and is to be used like any other means. To the individual person the sole question about a religion is, whether it is true; but the State only inquires whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming. From this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and religious intolerance. What kind of a religion it should employ, and how far it should carry religious instruction in its schools, is a grave question of statesmanship, respecting which Governments may very easily make mistakes—very grave mistakes. . . . But the greatest mistake any Government is likely to commit respecting religious instruction is to have none. And faith for a people is better than no faith. What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters; and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*. . . . If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and, if it is wise, it will not falter."

If a State is to adopt a religion at all, it is impossible to see how it could adopt any but the religion of the majority. Because, mark the rule, the State is not to inquire whether the religion is true, but only, "whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." Religion therefore being to the State a mere matter of policy, the religion adopted by the State must be the religion of the majority. And in that case the State is brought to the inevitable alternative, either to change its religion with every change of the majority, or else to exert its power to keep the religion which it has adopted, the religion of the majority. Where-

forè it is a most curiously interesting problem to know just how that "from this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and from religious intolerance"? And further, if this rule be such a safe preservative, how happens it that of all the States that have been on this earth, that have acted upon the Professor's theory, not one has been preserved from religious intolerance?

The fact is, that under this theory, preservation from religious intolerance is impossible. The impossibility is inherent in the theory. Of this no better proof is needed than is furnished in President Seelye's own words. He says, "To the individual person the sole question about a religion is whether it is true;" this is very properly said as to the individual, but to the State, whether a religion is true or not does not enter into the case. With the State the sole question concerning a religion is, Can it be used? Is it politic to adopt it? This at once sets the mere *policy* of the State against the *conscience* of the individual, and this too upon the very point, and the only point, where conscience or principle is or can be involved. With the State the question is not one of conscience nor of principle, but of policy solely; while with the individual the question is solely one of conscience, and of principle. And when the State goes about to set itself thus against the individual upon a question, about the truth of which it is not to inquire at all but which is to be the sole inquiry of the individual, then says Mr. Seelye:—

"What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters, and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *the law cares not for the few*."

And then, as though to prevent all possibility of a misunderstanding of his doctrine, he adds:—

"If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and if it is wise, it will not falter."

Was ever persecution or oppression for conscience' sake more plainly argued or more coolly stated?

But there is no better way of putting a theory to the test than to see it in actual practice, and this theory is now in practice in Turkey; not to the perfection, however, that it would be in this country if the National Reform party should succeed; but all it lacks is the energy of the officials whose duty it is to enforce the law. In the *New York Independent* of September 2, 1886, is a clear account of the "Turkish policy toward the Christian schools" in which we find the following practical illustration of Professor Seelye's theory:—

"It has enforced upon its Christian subjects the tax for the support of public schools, and it has opened a great number of primary and high schools for Moslems in all parts of the empire. But it has not opened a single school for Christians as provided by the law, so that the funds raised from the Christians, by taxation, go to the support of the Moslem schools of the empire. If a Christian wishes to send his children to one of the Government primary schools, he finds that the course of study consists mainly of the Koran and the biography of Mohammed;

or, in case of a high school, he finds in addition to these some elementary sciences and a little history, carefully emasculated to avoid any impression on the mind of the pupil, that there is or can be any country in the world so glorious, or so peaceful and generally happy, as the empire of Turkey. He finds also that his children must give up the study of their own native language, and must be content to study Turkish and Arabic. If, with these drawbacks, he still wishes to profit by the schools which are supported by his taxes, he finds that, except in two or three of the largest cities, no Christian will be allowed to study in a Moslem primary or high school, because the Moslems feel that it is wrong for infidels to read so holy a work as the Koran, which is the chief textbook in these schools."

Now we should like for President Seelye, in accordance with his theory, to point out any wrong in this action of the Government of Turkey. In the Government of Turkey the Koran embodies the religion which it has settled as the one which "is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." The Christians are taxed for the support and propagation of that religion. And if children of the Christian are to receive any benefit from the taxes which he is forced to pay, they must receive it from the Koran in the schools where the Koran and its religion is taught. Now the conscience of no Christian subject, there nor anywhere else, will approve of such a system in Turkey thus enforced upon Christians. But the State of Turkey is "courageous," it does not "falter," and therefore upon Mr. Seelye's theory it must be "wise." If the few Christians there, or anywhere in behalf of those who are there, lift up their voices against this practice, then the Turkish Government may say in Mr. Seelye's own words, "We keep in view here the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*." And what reply can be made by Mr. Seelye or those who favor the National Reform movement in this country?

Now, if this theory is wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? But the practical working of this theory is precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to establish in this country. Are the Americans ready for it? To what is this country coming when such monstrous doctrines are so plainly avowed by such men as Professor Seelye? Is America ready to copy after the "unspeakable Turk"? A. T. J.

American Romanism.

THE *Catholic Mirror* of September 18 contains a letter from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he announces to the clergy that Pope Leo XIII. has formulated certain prayers which are henceforth to be "said" after every Low Mass, instead of those now in use. These prayers are to be "said kneeling in all the churches of the world after the celebration of Low Mass." Such is the *order* of the Pope. We do not know the nature of the prayers that are now declared to be out of date, nor why it is that they have lost their efficacy; but we have the text of the prayers which are now declared to be official, and we will favor our readers with them. The first is as follows:—

"O God, our refuge and our strength, graciously look upon thy people who cry to thee; and through the intercession of the glori-

ous and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, of Blessed Joseph, her Spouse, and of thy holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, in thy mercy and kindness hear the prayers which we pour forth for the conversion of sinners, and for the freedom and exaltation of Holy Mother the Church. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

The reader will notice that in this prayer Christ is not altogether ignored. After "the faithful" have implored the intercession of Mary, Joseph, Peter, and Paul, "and all the saints," they are permitted to close with a reference to the name of Christ. It requires no great discernment to see that among Catholics the name of Christ is not considered to be "above every name."

The second prayer is as follows:—

"Holy Michael, the Archangel, defend us in the battle; be our protection against the wickedness and snares of the devil. Rebuke him, O God, we suppliantly beseech thee; and do thou, O Prince of the heavenly host, by the divine power drive into hell Satan and the other evil spirits who wander through the world seeking the ruin of souls. Amen."

Among the "other evil spirits" who are thus charitably consigned to hell are, of course, all those who oppose the Catholic Church; for "the church" regards all souls as ruined, who reject her dogmas and ceremonies. The two prayers, taken together, coming as they do from the Pope himself, afford a fair view of Catholicism at its best. But this is not all. The Cardinal closes with the following announcement:—

"His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. grants to all who recite these prayers, as aforesaid, 300 days' indulgence."

Here we have the veritable antichrist itself revealed. The granting of indulgences fitly accompanies the rejection of Christ as sole Mediator. Here we find the Pope promulgating, as a matter of course, the very things which aroused the holy zeal of Luther, and against which the Reformation was directed; yet to-day not one Protestant in ten thousand will give the matter a second thought. Professed Protestants now regard Catholicism as a "branch" or grand division of the Christian church, and the National Reformers urge the necessity of courting its favor, and even of submitting to repeated rebuffs if in the end they can but secure the alliance of the Catholic Church. When we consider the increased civilized population of the world in the last four hundred years, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Rome has already more than regained that which she lost by the Reformation. We think we are warranted in drawing the following conclusions:—

1. The Roman Catholic Church is the same to-day that it was four hundred years ago. The general diffusion of knowledge has caused her to change her tactics, but she still works for the same ends as then, and secures them. What she accomplished then by force she now gains by flattery. But her doctrines and principles have not changed in the least, and she is just as ready to use force now, when she can, as she was then.

2. Protestantism is now little more than a name. "Protestants" as a class have ceased to "protest." They are content with the

knowledge of the fact that they are the descendants of those who did protest, and they view with indifference the rapidity with which the Church of Rome is extending its conquests over the world.

3. This indifference must arise from the fact that "Protestantism," so-called, has degenerated until it is very like Catholicism. If men were actuated by the spirit of the Reformers, they would as strongly protest against the evils of "the church" to-day, as those noble men did. The Reformation has been deformed, and that which the Reformers regarded as the enemy of the truth, their children are ready to embrace as the conservator of truth. Since "Rome never changes," Protestantism must have changed, in order to bring about this state of things.

4. "National Reform" is Romanism under a different title. The Reformers withdrew from Rome, because Rome and they were antagonistic. If there had been oneness of thought and purpose, instead of antagonism, they would not have separated from Rome. But National Reformers are now seeking an alliance with Rome, and so anxious are they for this alliance that they are determined to press their suit even though they may be repeatedly rejected. If the separation of the true Reformers from Rome indicated their antagonism to her, certainly the desired union of the National Reformers indicates their likeness to her.

5. If professed Protestants are so nearly like the Catholics that they cannot see any menace to the liberty of our country in the insidious advances of the Papacy; and if a degenerate Protestantism is anxious to ally itself with Catholicism, that both "branches" of "the church" may be thereby strengthened,—then when this degenerate Protestantism, under the name of "National Reform," shall have succeeded in its purposes, it will certainly adopt the *tactics*, as it already has the *principles*, of Rome, and will not scruple to persecute those who cannot be won to its support by milder measures. Indeed, the National Reformers themselves concede this point, for Mr. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation*, says that it is most certainly right "to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed." Papal Rome, in her highest period of exaltation, never did more than this. When a Government or power of any kind enforces laws and customs against the conscientious convictions of upright citizens, it is persecution for conscience' sake. The National Reformers make no secret of their adherence to principles like this.

Therefore we say that when National Reformers shall have succeeded in their designs, they will have nothing other than an exact image of the Papacy. Scripture is not silent upon this point. The leopard beast of Rev. 13: 1-8 is quite generally admitted to represent the Papacy; if any doubt this, their doubts may easily be silenced by the most convincing proof. The power brought to view in the verses following is said to "make an image" to this papal beast, and that image we now see in process of construction. Once men predicted

from this prophecy just such an image to the Papacy, in this country; now they do not need to refer to the prophecy to be aware of the fact. It certainly is time for all who value civil and religious liberty to sound the alarm. And the urgent necessity of warning the people against the adoption of papal principles, whether under the name of Romanism or National Reform, is made still more evident by the following announcement of divine wrath upon all who take any part in such iniquitous alliances:—

"If any man worship *the beast and his image*, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14: 9-11.—*Signs of the Times*.

Some Features of the Reformed Constitution.

WE propose to give the American people a view of our Constitution as it will appear when amended to conform to the views of the National Reformers. This is a matter that concerns every one, and will do so more and more, as the National Reform party grows in influence and power. In this matter of reforming the Constitution, and thereby the nation, these National Reformers begin with the Preamble. At the first National Convention ever held by the National Reformers—Alleghany City, Pa., January 27, 28, 1864—a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking the United States Senate and House of Representatives to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in substance as follows, the Amendment in brackets:—

THE PREAMBLE.

"We, the people of the United States [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian Government], and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It will be seen at a glance that this work of "reforming" the Constitution, cannot stop with the Preamble. For as the amended Preamble demands "a Christian Government," it follows that the whole Constitution will have to be made to conform to this idea. This is exactly the aim of the Reformers. In that same memorial to Congress, immediately following the reformed Preamble as above quoted, is the following:—

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and *all other matters*, should be introduced *into the body of the Constitution* as may be necessary to give effect to these Amendments in the Preamble."

To present some of these changes, which will be necessary to make the body of the Constitution conform to the reformed Preamble, is the purpose of this article. As the purpose of this reformed Preamble is declared to be "to constitute a Christian Government," it necessarily follows that all who are to have any part or lot in the Government must be Christians. Therefore Section 1 of Article XIV of Amendments to the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read thus:—

All *Christian* persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside, etc.

This then being a "Christian Government," all officials in the Government will have to be Christians. Therefore Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read as follows:—

No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, *be a Christian*, and an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Section 3 of the same Article will have to read the same way in regard to Senators, thus:—

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, *be a Christian*, and an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

In relation to the President, Section 1, Article II, will have to read about as follows:—

No person except a *Christian*, and natural-born citizen of the United States, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years resident within the United States.

In the matter of the oath this same Section will have to be reformed so as to read something like this:—

Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath of office: I do solemnly swear "*in the presence of the eternal God, that during the whole term of my office I will serve the same eternal God to the utmost of my power, according as he hath required in his most holy word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and according to the same word, will maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus; AND SHALL ABOLISH ALL FALSE RELIGION CONTRARY TO THE SAME; and shall rule the people committed to my charge according to the will and command of God revealed in his word; and shall procure to the utmost of my power to the Church of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace;*" and that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This is a genuine National Reform oath, and is strictly according to the doctrines which that Association preaches. To accord with this, Article VI will have to be reformed about as follows:—

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by *the aforesaid oath, substituting in each case the title of his own office for the words "President of the United States;"*

AND THE TEST OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION SHALL be required as a qualification to every office or public trust under the United States.

This will necessitate the reform of Article I of Amendments to the Constitution, so that its first clause shall read thus:—

Congress shall make laws respecting the establishment of the Christian religion; prohibiting the free exercise of all other religion and of all irreligion; and abridging the freedom of speech and of the press in religious matters.

It is certain that all these changes in the body of the Constitution will not be made without universal and almost endless controversy. To say nothing of the open and confirmed opposition that there will be, it is evident that among those who would favor the changes, there will be great differences of opinion upon the exact shape and wording in which the changed Articles shall be couched. Nor will the controversy be confined simply to the called-for changes in the Constitution. As the reformed Preamble declares the "revealed will" of Christ to be the "supreme law," the changes in the Constitution will be but the culmination of a grand national discussion as to what is the revealed will of Christ, and just how it is to be made applicable in national affairs. This is only what the National Reformers expect. In the *Christian Statesman* February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan writes on this subject, as follows:—

"The changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole frame-work of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens; an outpouring of the Spirit might soon secure it."

But that the National Reformers expect such a condition of affairs as this, is not all. They are doing, and will do, their very best to create it; not out of love for the Bible, nor for Christianity, but for their own self-aggrandizement. This is clearly revealed by Mr. Milligan in words immediately following the passage just quoted. He continues:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decision of most points will be developed there. 'Many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion.'"

Exactly! the churches are "Zion," and "the law shall go forth of Zion." Therefore in the national canvass of "the whole frame-work of Bible legislation," when it comes to the changes in the body of the Constitution, and thus the culmination of the discussion, in the form of law, then Congress, the State Legislatures, and the Supreme Courts will have to receive that law from the churches and pulpits, and the law in its final form will have to be according to the mould or the indorsement of the "leaders and teachers" in the churches, for "the law shall go forth of Zion, and the final decision will be developed there." And then after this august de-

liverance the Rev. Mr. Milligan straightens himself up and admiringly pats himself, and all his fellows, upon the back, after this style:—

"There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy, than the leaders and teachers in our churches."

In connection with these words are certain scriptures which we would commend to Mr. Milligan's consideration: "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Prov. 27: 2. "For men to search their own glory is not glory." Prov. 25: 27. "Not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." 2 Cor. 10: 18. But whether they will heed these scriptures or not there is one thing certain: that is, by the evidences here presented, it is perfectly clear that the direct aim of the leaders in the National Reform movement is the exaltation of themselves into a hierarchy as absolute as is that of Mormonism, or as was that of the Papacy in the supremest hours of the Dark Ages. They deliberately propose to make themselves the arbiters in every controversy, and the interpreters of Scripture on all points, moral, civil, theological, and ecclesiastical. And mark, their decision, it is plainly declared, will be "final." There can be no appeal, for there is none higher than they. There can be no appeal to God, for is not the Lord King in Zion? and don't they represent Zion? and isn't the law to go forth of Zion? Thus they would make themselves the vicegerents of the Lord, and the fountain of all law. And just now, and in view of these propositions of the National Reformers, the American people would do well to remember the truth stated by Dean Milman in relation to what is simply a matter of fact in all history: "In proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments."

Upon the surface, some of the changes in the Constitution, which we have marked, appear very innocent. It is only when we go below the surface that the real iniquity of the thing appears. When the real purpose of the movement is discovered, it is found that the Christianity that is to become national, is just what this hierarchy shall declare to be Christianity; that the "revealed will" which is to be the supreme law of the land, is what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will; it is seen that in submitting to the proposed test of the Christian religion, it is not such a view of that religion as a man's own conscience approves, but such a view as the hierarchy approves; that in submitting to this proposed revealed will as the supreme law, it is not to that revealed will as a man may read it in the Scripture and interpret it by the best light of his own conscience, but to what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will, as interpreted by their own will. Then there is no more the liberty of every man worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but all must worship (?) according to the dictates of the hierarchy.

Then when these "intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy leaders in our churches" shall have succeeded in thus placing themselves in the position of supreme arbiter of all controversies,

and supreme interpreter in all points of the revealed will of Christ, it will be necessary to reform Section 7 of Article I of the Constitution, so that it shall read about as follows:—

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the President, shall, before it become a law, be presented to "the leaders and teachers in our churches," whose "decision" shall be "final."

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President, and to "the churches and pulpits" of the United States, and the "decision" of "the leaders and teachers in our churches" shall be "final."

There, fellow-citizens, are some of the features that our Constitution will present, when it shall have been reformed according to the doctrines of the National Reform party. We do not say that the work is at all complete, but this is all that we have space to present at this time. We have not forced a single point, for every change which we have marked, we can sustain by the writings of the National Reformers themselves. We have simply presented the logic of the National Reform propositions. If the National Reformers object to our conclusions, they will have to lay down different propositions. If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask them to wait till the next issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, when we promise, if the Lord will, to present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt.

A. T. J.

National Christianity in America.

THE following is an article under the above heading, which was written by President T. G. Apple, D. D., LL.D., of Franklin and Marshall College, and printed in the *New York Independent*, August 5, 1886. We insert the article entire, not for the purpose of indorsing it, for the position of the SENTINEL on this subject is well known, but to show the rapidly growing tendency among "leaders of theological thought," toward a national religion. We are free to say that we seriously apprehend the danger of which Mr. Apple grants the possibility, that is, that "such an organization" would "become, in the end, tyrannical," and we are sure that all who love true liberty will do well to share with us the apprehension. We derive no comfort at all from President Apple's doubt that the "danger would ever become realized." The danger has been too often fearfully realized.

"The United States has taken the lead in the establishment of a great free republic. It now remains to organize a national Christianity in this great republic. The history of Christianity clearly reveals its tendency to nationalize itself. Whilst it is catholic in spirit—an interest that will, in the end, bind all nations in one common brotherhood—yet in working out this result it adapts itself to the order of human

life. As nationality is one of the integral forms in which humanity comes to expression in history, Christianity becomes national in Christianizing the nations. Even in those ages when the centralizing tendency of the Roman hierarchy was in the ascendancy, a decentralizing tendency manifested itself in the national churches of modern Europe. This was one of the factors that wrought against the Hildebrandian theory of a consolidated theocracy that tended to crush out the autonomy of national life itself. It appeared most conspicuously in the rise of Gallicanism in the time of Charlemagne, which reappeared in the reforming councils, and was not suppressed until it yielded, for a time at least, in its struggle with Ultramontanism in the late Vatican Council. But it appeared as a strong factor in the other nationalities of Europe in the general revolt against the papacy in the sixteenth century.

"This tendency found expression in the establishment of national churches in modern Europe, in which the pendulum swung over from the one extreme of the Church asserting undue authority over the State to the opposite extreme of the State exercising undue authority over the Church. In America, when a new nation came to its birth through the confederation of the colonies, history moved on without an established national Church. This separation of Church and State came about, in part, by a preconcerted plan, but mainly, we think, by reason of actual necessity. In the minds of some, doubtless, it means that Church and State shall move forward entirely separate from each other, on parallel planes; but it has become already apparent that the two must stand in very intimate relationship as vital interests that have to do with one common life. The question now is, whether we cannot have a national Christianity without a national Church in the strict sense of the term—that is, a form of organization in which Christianity shall exert its full moulding power upon the national life without the entangling alliances that accompany the union of Church and State in the Old World.

"If this is to be reached, in our judgment, the organization required must conform, more or less, to our political organization; for it will be found, we think, that this law has also ruled in the history of Christianity, that in its outward adaptation to the national life it follows the general features of the civil Government, thus in a good sense becoming all things to all men. Our Government is neither a consolidated democracy nor a consolidated monarchy, but a federal republic. What is there to hinder the Christian churches of this nation from forming a federal union, conforming in its main features to our civil national Government? Let the churches organize a general representative body, composed of delegates appointed by the different denominations, for the purpose of mutual co-operation, and the consideration of such questions as pertain to the common interests of Christianity in its relation to the nation. Let it be an advisory body merely, without legislative functions, to meet at stated times or as occasion calls for it. There are questions upon which a deliverance is already urgently called for. It is high time, for in-

stance, for the churches of this country to express a judgment on the subject of marriage and divorce, on the observance of the Sabbath, and other matters of a similar character, which pertain to both Church and State. Other questions would arise that pertain more especially to the Church itself, such as co-operation in the work of foreign missions, evangelization in our large cities, meeting the attacks of infidelity, etc., etc.

"Such an organization may have to come, perhaps, through initiatory stages and steps. Such movements are setting in all around us, movements that look to a closer union of churches of kindred types, the American Congress of Churches, etc. But it seems to us the times are ripe for a more general movement. History is moving very rapidly in this age; and the danger is that the other factors of our national life may advance more rapidly, and gain a better advanced vantage-ground, than Christianity. We believe a beginning could be made by a voluntary free conference of one or two leading men from each of the different religious bodies of the nation, who might successfully discuss a plan of union. There would doubtless be difficulties in the way, one of the greatest of which would be as to what bodies should be included in such a free union, but these would soon disappear.

"Dangers also would be apprehended. The chief of these, perhaps, would be that such an organization, like our national Government, would tend to increasing influence and power, and become, in the end, tyrannical. But we do not believe this danger would ever become realized. Freedom has made such progress in history that we are not much disturbed by the fear of our national Government usurping tyrannical power, and there would be even more watchful care in reference to such a central organization of the churches. If, however, such a fear should prevail, let the experiment be made of an occasional congress, conference, or council. Possibly it might be found that, like the councils in the Roman Church, which has learned wisdom by long experience, or the associations and consociations in our earlier and later Puritan history, such occasional councils would meet the wants in the case.

"At any rate there is a widespread sense of the want of some such union of our American churches as shall give utterance to a national Christianity in America, and for this reason we have here given expression to a few thoughts which, though not at all new, may aid, if but a little, in keeping the general subject before the Christian public through the widely-read columns of the *Independent*."

THE doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.—*Macaulay*.

Publishers' Column.

ACTIVE AGENTS WANTED

—IN:—
Montana, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, and the Islands of the Pacific,

—FOR:—
FAST-SELLING SUBSCRIPTION BOOKS,

—SUCH AS—
THE GREAT CONTROVERSY
Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation,
ILLUSTRATED BY 21 FULL-PAGE CUTS,
Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation,
Man's Nature and Destiny,
The Marvel of Nations,
Plain Facts for Old and Young,
Man, the Masterpiece,
Home Hand Book,
In the Heart of the Sierras,
The Yo Semite Valley, the Big Tree Groves, Etc., Illustrated,
Breakfast, Dinner, and Supper,
Parsons' Hand Book,
Sunshine at Home,
AND OTHER FAST-SELLING BOOKS.

Liberal Commissions Paid. Exclusive Territory Given.

SEND STAMP FOR DESCRIPTIVE CIRCULARS,
TERMS TO AGENTS, ETC.
Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,**
TWELFTH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

PLAIN FACTS FOR OLD AND YOUNG

—EMBRACING—
NATURAL HISTORY AND HYGIENE OF
ORGANIC LIFE,

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Member of the British and American Associations for the Advancement of Science, Editor of "Good Health," and Author of Various Works on Health.

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED,
CONTAINING OVER 600 OCTAVO PAGES.

No work ever issued from the American Press has met with such a cordial reception by the people. It is endorsed by the highest authority as a standard work. It is a necessity, not a luxury. Indispensable to those who would preserve the health and morals of their own children.

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

Sex in Living Forms—Reproduction—Sexual Hygiene—Unchastity—The Social Evil—Solitary Vice—Etc.
A chapter for boys—A chapter for young men—A chapter for old men—A chapter for girls—A chapter for young women.—A chapter for wives and mothers—Diseases peculiar to women.

100 CHOICE HEALTH THOUGHTS.

"Plain Facts" is sold only by subscription.—Agents wanted.
For sample copies, territory and terms, address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
General Agents for the West. Oakland, Cal.

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.**

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, 50 cents.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 2s.

Address, **American Sentinel, 1059 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.**

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., NOVEMBER, 1886.

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

In the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 7, Rev. Robert White presents an article on "Jesuitry in Politics;" but if anybody wants to see the perfection of Jesuitry in politics, just let him watch closely the National Reform movement and its methods.

PROFESSOR McALLISTER, the Treasurer of the National Reform Association, in a late financial appeal in behalf of National Reform, says that National Reform lecturers "are listened to by large numbers and with deeper interest than ever before."

WE have obtained some particulars of the trial of those men in Arkansas for working on Sunday. We regret that we have not space to give them in this paper; but we received them so late that we are compelled to lay the matter over till our next issue, when we promise to give our readers some specimens of Arkansas justice.

THE North Ohio Methodist Episcopal Conference lately held at Canal Dover, unanimously requested the Bishop to appoint Rev. J. P. Mills to the work of "District Secretary of the National Reform Association." The Bishop, Malla-lieu, made the appointment, and shook hands with Mr. Mills, wishing him "abundant success" in his new work.

THE Catholic Church in the United States has learned to talk of the union of Church and State as an "unholy union." Whether the Catholics have learned this trick from the National Reform party, or whether the National Reform party has learned it from the Catholics, we shall not take upon ourselves to precisely decide; but this we know that the expression comes with equal grace from both classes.

A "MONTHLY reading" lately issued by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union on the subject of "Our National Sins," says: "A true Theocracy is yet to come," and "the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers, hence I pray devoutly as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women." This point of "a true Theocracy" we commend to the consideration of President Brunot, who claims that it is a false charge that the design of National Reform is to turn this Republic into a Theocracy. As for the other, we should like for the author of the "reading," or some one else, to tell us how many law-makers there can properly be in a true Theocracy? Perhaps, too, we might remark that the scheme of "the enthronement of Christ in law-makers" by ballot, is but the expression in another form of the National Reform method of bringing the gospel to the masses, as developed in Mrs. Woodbridge's Chautauqua speech.

Convicted by Their Own Testimony.

In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, President Brunot said: "No State can rightly attempt to compel the consciences of its citizens with a particular religion, and, as we believe, no particular religion can rightly attempt to use the State to compel men's consciences to its belief."

Then we should like to know what Mr. Brunot means by acting as the head of a movement that has in view no other aim than that of compelling men's consciences with a particular religion, namely, the Christian religion? Or does the gentleman mean to convey the impression that Christianity is not a particular religion? For it is the sheerest and most absurd sophistry to say that men's acts may be compelled with a particular religion without compelling the conscience; because when in conformity with a particular religion, men who do not believe it at all are compelled to act as though they believed it; this is nothing else than to compel the conscience.

By the way, for the especial benefit of Rev. M. A. Gault, we might in this connection indulge just a little in a "clashing voices" exercise. With the above quotation from President Brunot, please read the following from Vice-President E. B. Graham:—

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its *Christian* features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and . . . stay there till they die."

And the following from the *Christian Statesman*:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality."

Now if it be right for a Government to so persistently enforce upon all, the laws of Christian morality, that the refusal to submit can only result in perpetual banishment to some wild, desolate land, then we should like to know how Mr. Brunot's proposition can be true? But President Brunot's proposition is true. Therefore it is perfectly clear that the aim of Vice-President Graham, the *Christian Statesman*, and the whole National Reform movement, is but to cause the State and the Christian religion to do what cannot rightly be done.

What Do They Mean?

SAYS Rev. M. A. Gault, in his "Clashing Voices," *Statesman*, September 9, 1886:—

"It is outside the province of human Government to supervise the thoughts and opinions of any one. But it is the duty of Government to supervise the morals of the people, as far as their outward acts are concerned. . . . This movement is prompted by love to humanity, laboring to persuade the Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals."

Does Mr. Gault mean to say that God's perfect system of morals only takes supervision of the outward acts? Such is the real logic of his argument. Here is his *major premise*: It is the duty of "the Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals." Here is his *minor*: "It is the duty of Government to supervise the morals of the people, as far as their outward acts are concerned." From these premises, the only conclusion is: Therefore "God's perfect system of morals" supervises the morals of the people

only as far as their outward acts are concerned." And this conclusion is confirmed by his other statement, that, "It is outside the province of human Government to supervise the thoughts and opinions of any one."

But Mr. Gault does not mean at all what his argument proves, he knows full well, and he means it so, that "God's perfect system of morals" does most decidedly "supervise the thoughts and opinions" and the very intents of the heart of every soul of man. Now if the Government is to adopt God's perfect system of morals, how can it possibly avoid the supervision of the thoughts and opinions of its subjects? If it is the duty of human Government to adopt God's perfect system of morals, which supervises the thoughts and opinions of every one, then how can such supervision be outside the province of human Government? Having adopted as its supreme law, a system of morals that supervises the thoughts and opinions of men, upon what principle will the Government stop simply with "the outward acts"? Upon no principle whatever.

If perchance Mr. Gault should not mean either of these deductions, but really means that under God's perfect system of morals the Government shall touch only the outward acts, then it must be that he means that the Government shall uproot the tree of immorality in this nation, by plucking off the leaves; that the inside of the national cup and platter shall be made clean by a Governmental washing of the outside. Then we simply cite him to the words of Christ to the Pharisees on this very subject. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." Matt. 23: 25, 26.

But whether the gentleman means any or none of these deductions, the *fact* is that in the statements which he has made, he has involved himself in a muddle out of which he can never get, in harmony with God's perfect system of morals.

THE ecclesiastical power has no scruple in employing in its own favor those arms of which it deprecates the use, the employment of which it treats as impious usurpation, when put forth against it.—*Dean Milman*.

"THE lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day" Isa. 2: 11.

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.