

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1887.

NUMBER 4.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE National Reformers are justly alarmed at the growth of Socialism in this country, and they fancy that legislation will prove a sovereign remedy. But Professor R. T. Ely, a political economist, says:—

"It is an undoubted fact that modern Socialism of the worst type is spreading to an alarming extent among our laboring classes, both foreign and native. I think the danger is of such a character as should arouse the Christian people of this country to most earnest efforts for the evangelization of the poorer classes, particularly in large cities. What is needed is Christianity, and the Christian church can do far more than political economists toward a reconciliation of social classes. The church's remedy for social discontent and dynamite bombs, is Christianity as taught in the New Testament."

But that is a commodity of which National Reformers, at least those who write for the press, seem to be woefully destitute. Lacking that, they are forced to use an inferior and useless weapon.

THE Catholic Archbishop, of St. Louis, once said: "Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes."

If heresy and unbelief are crimes against the State, they ought to be punished as other crimes. And when, under National Reform manipulation, this country shall uphold and maintain that which they call "the Christian religion," unbelief and heresy will be crimes in this country, and will be punished as such. The only difference between National Reform and Catholicism is that the former attempts to conceal its intolerant spirit, while the latter boasts of it.

In his Lenten letter of March, 1873, Bishop Gilmour (Catholic) said: "Nationalities must be subordinate to religion." The Rev. J. W. Foster said in the *Statesman*, March, 1884, "The State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the church." Who knows but that Mr. Foster learned his National Reform principles from Bishop Gilmour?

What Is the Harm?

WHEN the cry of warning is raised against adopting the proposed Religious Amendment to our National Constitution, we are met with the query, What is the harm? If this is a Christian nation, why not say so? Or, seeing that it is desirable that it shall become a Christian nation, if there is the least hope that we can effect such a desirable object by changing the Constitution, and thereby the form of our Government, why not do so? And if Christ is really the King of nations, the King of our nation, why not acknowledge him in the "fundamental law of the land"?

All this appears very harmless and very plausible, *to some*, but we emphatically say, not to us. We think there is danger in the scheme. This is not a Christian nation; and no constitutional provisions, general elections, or legislative enactments, will ever make it a Christian nation. Any legal declaration that we are a Christian nation would be sheer mockery—a legal falsehood. And, as a Scripture fact, Christ is not yet constituted king of nations. We propose to show, next month, that the arguments of National Reformers on this subject are inconsistent, and contrary to the Bible. Their confident assertions are based on misapprehensions of the present position of Christ, and of the nature of his mediatorial work.

The theory of "National Reform," as now advocated in our country, is the doctrinal theory of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This their teachers openly avow. Now, they may suppose that they, as prime movers in the scheme, will have the highest seats in "the coming kingdom." But we predict, and we think with safety, that they will be sadly disappointed. There is another church power, holding the same theory, which is far in advance of them in every way, as far as concerns any prospect of religio-political preference. Of course we refer to the Catholic Church.

Our zealous Reformers may scout this idea, but we have good reasons for our belief.

1. The Reformers are perfectly willing to unite with the Catholics in their effort to change our Constitution. This has been a plea of the Catholics for a long time, as some of them have said in conversations on the future of our country and of their church. The Reformers laud the Catholics for their Church and State principles. The *Christian Statesman* said:—

"We cordially, gladly, recognize the fact that in South American Republics, and in France, and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates

of National Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism."

Of course, and why not? Is not the Pope—the head of the church—"higher than the kings of the earth"? Has not "power over the nations" been committed to him? And this shows what grade of Christianity will be satisfactory to these Reformers, if only it be "National"—such Christianity as Rome has upheld in South America, in France, and other European countries, as Spain, Italy, and Austria, and in Mexico. It is the Christianity of persecution, of the Inquisition, of the *auto da fé*, of the extermination of heretics or dissenters. It is Church and State, the State subordinated to the Church. Catholics have always been firm in the faith of the modern Reformers, that "the State and its sphere exist to serve the interest of the Church." The history of the Romish Church is replete with illustrations of the principles of the National Reformers! Call up the millions of martyrs, and they will testify that the Catholic Church has been, for centuries, a most powerful advocate and administrator of National Christianity! The *Statesman* further says:—

"In a world's conference for the promotion of National Christianity, many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics."

Yes, Spain, for instance. In that highly-favored kingdom, where National Christianity has flourished and held undisputed sway for many centuries, there could hardly be found a Protestant to raise his voice in its favor. It is "represented only by Roman Catholics." And a further reason is, that Protestants are exceedingly scarce in that country, for, in almost every part of the kingdom, National Christianity is so highly successful that people can only avow their dissent at the peril of their lives. And the Catholic Church is cordially, gladly, recognized as the advocate and representative of National Christianity by the National Reformers of America, who take delight in avowing themselves as the ardent opposers of Church and State! Consistency has no place in that association.

Rome is politic; she is persistent, but she knows how to "bide her time." She is rather coy when other bodies make advances; and she never makes advances to them. She is too self-assured for that. What are the probabilities for the future? The Reformers have answered the question. Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel is one of the ablest of the modern Reformers. We have considered him one of the coolest and most conservative. Speaking of the common interest of the great religious bodies to uphold Sunday-keeping by law, he said:—

"This common interest ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first professors, and the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances and gladly to accept co-operation *in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it.* It is one of the necessities of the situation."

That they will be subjected to rebuffs is certain. Rome feels her strength, and will do nothing that can be construed into a concession. Of late many of the Protestant denominations have been "speaking to the hearts" of the Catholics, throwing out compliments, as the *Statesman* has done, pronouncing the Catholic Church "a branch of the Church of Christ;" all of which causes the Catholics to smile in derision. Among the foremost of those who send compliments to Rome, stands H. W. Beecher. Yet in the controversy between the bishop and his priest, McGlynn, the bishop charged the priest with attending a public meeting and sitting on the platform with Mr. Beecher! But, as Mr. Scovil says, the necessities of the situation compel the Reformers to co-operate with Catholics on their own terms. They are willing to compromise, but Rome never makes compromises to her own disadvantage. If the Romish diplomats do not make all this turn to the interest of "the church," then they will make a new page in history.

2. The Romish Church is a *political power* in the United States, and other churches are not. It is a common thing, and has been for years, to hear of efforts being made by politicians "to secure the Catholic vote." If the people were half awake they would look upon this state of things as a standing menace against our republican institutions. Who ever heard of any effort to secure the Methodist vote, the Presbyterian vote, or the Baptist vote? Why not as well as the Catholic vote? Because the right of private judgment accorded to Protestants, prevents their acting in so close concert. It is understood that the Catholics are acting "under authority"—an authority outside of considerations of duty to the country; outside of regard for American institutions; that their votes are not strictly their own, if the church authorities require them to vote *in a body*. Their system and church discipline require all this. Inducements *have been held out to them* by political parties, and, consequently, the Catholics today really govern our large cities, and these cities are great centers of political influence.

In the controversy with McGlynn, the bishop said that Catholics must avoid socialistic and *irreligious* organizations. But, as the report says, from which we copy: "This does not mean that they are not to take an active part in politics whenever the authorities direct them to do so."

Here is the secret of the whole matter. Their political affiliations and movements are directed by "the authorities." Their votes are cast in the interests of "the church"—a foreign power. And our short-sighted public men have pursued a course to unify this

vote, and to strengthen its influence. And now, worst of all, the over-blind and misnamed Protestants are working in the same line, and serving the same foreign cause, for the sake of—what? Of fastening "National Christianity" upon our land, even such as Catholic Rome has bound upon the nations of Europe. "Tell it not in Gath . . . lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice." And yet we are met with the query, "What is the harm?"

3. Not only are the Catholics courted by politicians and the "Reformers" (was ever a name so misapplied?), but our Government itself is debasing itself before Rome. The following is of sufficient interest to publish entire. It is from the *Christian Statesman*:

"Politicians are already beginning to set their sails for breezes from the Vatican, which are to decide the next presidential election! A Roman Catholic journal quotes, with tokens of exultation, the following extract from a political newspaper:

"WORTHY OF NOTE.—The fact that President Cleveland sent Cardinal Gibbons a letter of congratulation *on the occasion of that prelate's investiture with the purple*, is worthy of note, as indicating the change that has taken place since the time when it would have been considered a grave offense for a chief executive to notice in any way, *not to speak of felicitating*, a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church. One need not go back many years to arrive at such a time, and no longer ago than during the presidency of the late General Grant, considerable unfriendliness existed at Washington, in certain quarters at least, towards Catholicity. The speech on the school question, which President Grant himself delivered at Des Moines, is sufficient proof of that assertion."

"Yes, indeed! Worthy of note and of comment too. No American citizen has any moral right to assume 'the purple' here spoken of. The Cardinalate is not an order of the Christian ministry, but a principedom in an alien and anti-republican court, a court which, by the *Syllabus*, has made war on every principle of the American Constitution. By accepting its 'purple,' Bishop Gibbons has accepted the yoke of this alien and odious despotism, and President Grant did right in repelling all advances of the kind. I am a friend of President Cleveland's administration, but this must be stopped. CITIZEN."

Now that sounds very well; the comment is truthful. But indignant "citizen" must not forget that this "anti-republican court" was making war upon nothing but a "godless Constitution"—a Constitution which, the Reformers say, it is criminal to uphold! Besides, the power that has thus made war upon our infidel Constitution is the best representative of National Christianity on earth! And National Reformers are anxiously waiting for the time when that power will condescend to "strike hands" with them; and they have already expressed a willingness to co-operate in any form which Rome may be willing to exhibit or dictate! O Reform! what a sweet-sounding word, and how appropriately applied to the work of the "National Reform Association"!

But one more proof we have to offer; and it is enough. We will let the *Christian Nation* tell the story in its own language:

"A REMARKABLE AFFAIR.—The revenue cutter, *W. E. Chandler*, attracted a good deal of attention on Monday morning, June 21, as she steamed down the bay to Quarantine. The *Chandler* had been seen frequently in

these very waters. There was nothing unusual about her, except that she carried a strange flag—a flag not in the international code. No vessels carry it, and in fact it is only the second flag of its kind that has been displayed in the United States. It was made especially for this occasion. What was it? A large banner bearing the symbol of the Holy See upon a white field. A Papal flag floating to the breezes from the bow of a United States revenue cutter!

The facts are these: Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, has been elected to succeed Cardinal McClosky. The investiture of the new Cardinal is attended with great ceremony. Ambassadors are sent from Rome to officially inform the new Cardinal of his election and to confer the beretta. These ambassadors were among the passengers on board the Cunard steamer *Servia*. A committee of reception had been appointed to go down the bay to meet them. They went, and they went on the revenue cutter. Surveyor Beattie accompanied the party as the representative of the Treasury Department. The United States Custom flag floated at the stern, and the Pope's flag was flying at the bow of the cutter. As the *Chandler* drew near, the *Servia* dropped her ensign twice in salute to the Papal banner, and received an acknowledgment in return.

"It was this strange flag flying from the cutter that attracted so much attention, and since it has aroused questions in many minds. Why was the Pope's flag displayed on an American ship in American waters? Why was a revenue cutter placed at the disposal of a private committee? Why was the Treasury Department represented? Why was such unusual respect shown these Pontifical ambassadors who were coming on ecclesiastical business? They were in no sense representative men coming on public business. Our country is far famed for its religious toleration, but there is perhaps just a little too much pandering to Popery, which is, in spirit and in principle, the enemy of genuine liberty. The Roman priesthood has ever been one of the most oppressive, absolute, and degrading despotsisms exercised over the minds of men. The chains of priestly domination are so strongly riveted that there can be no liberty of opinion or freedom of conscience.

"When Popery had the power it persecuted, and when it has been the weaker power it has ever aimed at the ascendancy, and its votaries have become either restless agitators or the ready tools of arbitrary power and oppression. It is alarming to see so much attention paid to the leaders of a system which has been essentially despotic, which never appeared but as a persecutor, and has ever been the ally of tyranny and the foe of liberty."

The story is well told. Just one sentence we wish to notice. It says: "Our country is far famed for its religious toleration." Yes, it is too tolerant—quite too tolerant. It is time this error was corrected. "Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion." (Speech in Reform Convention.) Again: "There is perhaps just a little too much pandering to Popery, which is in spirit and in principle the enemy of genuine liberty." Oh, no; it was just well-merited respect paid to the highest representative of National Christianity on earth! We have the word of the "Reformers" for it; and as for the Pope being "in spirit and in principle the enemy of genuine liberty," will the Reformers please to tell us when and where was "National Christianity" anything but the enemy of genuine liberty? They profess so great knowledge of history, let them cite the

page of history where National religion proved itself the friend of genuine liberty.

Our point is proved. Romanism is a political power, such as the Reformed Presbyterian Church will never be. It needs no special wisdom to foretell which will be the dominating church influence when this Government is turned into a religious government, and the most popular form of so-called Christianity is placed "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Reader, American citizen, can you have confidence in the professions of the National Reformers, with such evidences of their duplicity—of their willingness to "pander to Popery" for the sake of planting in this land that form of Christianity with which Popery has so long used to enslave the masses of Europe? Yes, there is harm—there is danger ahead. If you do not wish a restoration of the Inquisition, a revival of the terrors of the Dark Ages, then turn "to fight the armies of the aliens" by preserving our liberties from the insidious attacks of the "advocates of National Christianity."

J. H. W.

The National Reform Idea of Tolerance.

In several numbers of the SENTINEL reference has been made to the speech made by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., in the New York National Reform Convention, but that speech is so fully representative of the principles of National Reform, that we feel justified in giving it a more extended notice than we have yet done. There are two or three points in it which we wish here to notice. Said the Doctor:

"We want State and religion—and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require religion, it shall be revealed religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land 'an undeniable legal basis.' We use the word religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God."

Here, then, is the National Reform definition of religion, officially declared. *Religion is a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.* And they are going to have in this Nation "State and religion." That is to say, they are going to have "State and a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." In other words, they are going to have the State to associate itself with every man in his "personal relation of faith and obedience to God;" and the State must see to it that every "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God" shall be none other than the *Christian* relation of faith and obedience. For it is the State that rules; it is the State that bears the responsibility; it is the State's, and not the individual's, personal relation of faith and obedience to God that must take precedence. Therefore under their own definition, it is clear that the direct aim of National Reform is to have the State to interfere with, to regulate, and control every man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. And that is nothing else than a religious despotism. Yet they affect to deny that under such an order of things there would

be any oppression. But oppression is absolutely inseparable from the success of the scheme. For to deprive every man of his own choice and the exercise of his own personal relation of faith and obedience to God, is the National Reform idea; but without coercion all men are not going to yield this right; while coercion in such a matter is only the cruellest oppression.

Well indeed might Mr. Edwards say, as he does:

"We are warned that to engrave this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists, who would be sufferers under it."

Whether he be atheist, deist, Jew, Seventh-day Baptist, or what not, every man who has a particle of respect for personal right, freedom of thought, or liberty of conscience, *must be* a sufferer under it. And we cannot avoid the impression, that when these men set forth such abominable doctrine, it must be that the loudest warning comes from their own hearts and consciences, unless, indeed, by the constant assertion of such outrageous principles, they have deadened their consciences.

But what reply does Mr. Edwards make to this warning? This:

"The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language. And then, further, they are almost wholly of foreign importation, and that of comparatively recent date, so that they did not share in the first settlement of this country; they did not brave the hardships; they did not profess the principles which have made that first settlement memorable. . . . They breathed no protests; they suffered no martyrdom."

His reply to the "warning" is as atrocious as is the doctrine that gives rise to the warning. He replies to an objection by reasserting the doctrine, and adding to it a deliberate insult.

It might not be altogether impertinent to inquire, just here, To how great an extent did the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., or any of the National Reformers, "share in the first settlement of this country"? Of the hardships that made that settlement memorable, how many did he brave? What kind of a martyrdom has he ever suffered? and how many times has he suffered it? If these are the things upon which alone rests the surety of the title to the honor and dignity of American citizenship, what part was there enacted by the National Reformers that in *them* should be lodged the sum total of all such honor and dignity, and *that* to such a sole and transcendent degree of merit that to them and them alone it should be granted to bestow the privileges and immunities of citizenship in this great nation?

But Mr. Edwards continues his kind endeavor to relieve the minds of the people of all fear that "to engrave this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive." And, after giving a clear definition of the

terms, atheist, deist, Jew, and Seventh-day Baptist, he says:

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our Amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together. . . . The first named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party. Now look at it—look at the controversy. The question is not between opinions that differ, but opinions that are opposite, that are contradictory, that mutually exclude each other. It is between Christianity and infidelity. It is between theism and atheism, between the acknowledgment of a God and the denial that there is any God."

Notice: the question is "between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial of any God." This in the face of his own statement just before, that "the deist admits God;" and "the Jew admits God, Providence, and Revelation;" and "the Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity." All this, and yet the contest is between the acknowledgement of a God, and the denial that there is any God; between theism and atheism; between Christianity and infidelity! How does it happen then that a people who "believe in God and Christianity," must be classed with atheists and treated as atheists? Here is how:

ACCIDENTAL ATHEISM.

They "are enjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy."

So then, bear in mind, fellow-citizens, that to "differ with the mass of Christians" is atheism. You may believe in God, and the Bible, and Christianity; you may practice in accordance with this belief ever so consistently; yet if you "differ with the mass of Christians" on a single point, you are an atheist; you may believe and practice all this, yet if you use a single argument against National Reform, the question instantly resolves itself into a contest between Christianity and infidelity—and *you* are the infidel; between theism and atheism—and *you* are the atheist; between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial that there is any God—and *you* are the one who denies that there is any God. If they will do these things in a green tree, what will they not do in a dry? If this is the result of a difference with this National Reform "mass of Christians" now while they are simply grasping for power, what will the result be when once they shall have secured the power that they want? What right then shall the "atheist" have? Mr. Edwards tells us. Here are his words of comfort and assurance to those who fear oppression under the National Reform rule:

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic. . . . So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him."

How blessedly tolerant a National Reform régime would be! If you differ with it on a single point, you shall be tolerated as is a

lunatic; that is, kept under surveillance, so long as, like a craven, you allow yourself to be cowed into silence. But as soon as you begin to speak your sentiments, then you are "dangerous," then you are "raving," and the gentle National Reform rulers will have such a tender regard for you that they will supply you with bars and doors securely fastened.

But Mr. Edwards proceeds:—

"I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man."

But he shall be tolerated. He may live, and go free, hold his lands, and enjoy his home; he may even vote; but for any higher, more advanced citizenship, he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified. And we are aiming, not to increase, but to render definite his disqualification."

That would be a model government indeed that would allow a *conspirator* to "go free, hold his lands, and enjoy his home, and even vote." It is not the custom of governments to allow these privileges to persons who are plotters against the life of the government. Nor does National Reform propose really to do anything of the kind. We know, and in former numbers of this paper have abundantly shown in their own words, that National Reform does not intend to allow dissenters to vote nor to be citizens. No doubt Mr. Edwards means that he will tolerate him as he would a conspirator, and allow him these privileges "so long as he does not rave," and "is not dangerous," and so long as it is not known that he is a conspirator. But as soon as the "atheist" begins to utter any sentiments that "differ with the mass of Christians," then he is raving, is dangerous, and a conspirator, and they will "tolerate" (?) him as such. Yes, continues this Reverend Doctor of Divinity:—

"Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith."

After the expression of *such* principles, there is no just ground for surprise that after a few more words he should exclaim: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

NATIONAL REFORM GOLDEN RULE.

That is to say, He does not tolerate me, and I must not tolerate him. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith; therefore I must make him grieve in lamentation and woe because of my faith. He hates me and my faith, and I must hate him and his unbelief.

And this is National Reform "Christianity." This gentleman is one of the worthies to whom is committed the interpretation of Scripture on all "moral and civil, as well as ecclesiastical points," and whose decision must be "final." This is the way that the sublime principles of the sermon on the mount are to be exemplified when this nation becomes the National Reformed "kingdom of Christ." But to correspond to such an exposition and exemplification, the sermon on the mount will have to be "re-enacted." It now reads, in the words of Christ, as follows: "I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for

them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven."

But National Reform says unto you, Hate your enemies, curse them that curse you, do evil to them that hate you, and persecute them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may agree "with the mass of Christians," and be true children of National Reform; those who do not tolerate you, why should ye tolerate them? Therefore all things whatsoever ye would *not* that men should do to you, do ye *that* unto them; for this is the law of National Reform.

EXALTING THEMSELVES ABOVE GOD.

This idea of re-enactment is not altogether hypothetical in this connection, for in the same speech Mr. Edwards said that,

"If there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out—there cannot be many of them—and we are prepared to accept them *and have them re-enacted*."

That is to say, They were enacted by the Lord of Heaven and earth, and if they have not been abrogated, please point them out and WE will have them re-enacted.

How much higher does arrogance need to exalt itself before it becomes dangerous? These men assume the authority to reckon and denounce as "atheists" all who oppose National Reform, and plainly assert that under the power which the "Reformers" would wield, all such "atheists" shall be relegated to the place and condition of the lunatic and the conspirator. But as though that were a small thing to do, they boldly usurp the place of the Most High, and consequentially inform us that in certain portions of the word of God what has not been abrogated *they* will have re-enacted.

Can it be possible that in all this land there is anybody who sees no danger in clothing with civil power such an association of men? Could anything be more intolerant than that which they deliberately propose to do? And yet all this is only the expression of their idea of *tolerance*! We wish they would convey to us some idea of what in their estimation would be *intolerance*.

It is high time that all understand that National Reform is a standing menace to human liberty; and that the success of National Reform will be the utter destruction of human liberty in free America.

A. T. J.

MANIFESTLY there is an irreconcileable difference between Papal principles and the fundamental principles of our free institutions. Popular government is self-government. A nation is capable of self-government only so far as the individuals who compose it are capable of self-government. To place one's conscience, therefore, in the keeping of another, and to disavow all personal responsibility in obeying the dictation of another, is as far as possible from *self-control*, and therefore wholly inconsistent with republican institutions, and, if common, dangerous to their stability."—*Rev. Josiah Strong.*

When we remember that National Reform principles are essentially Papal principles, we see in the above a strong indictment of so-called National Reform.

Natural Result of Rigid Sunday Laws.

LAST month in an article on the "Ethics of Sunday Legislation," we showed that, since Sunday is an institution of the church, the enactment of laws enforcing its observance is the first step toward a union of Church and State, and that the enforcement of such laws can be nothing else but persecution for conscience' sake. We promised to give in this number of the *SENTINEL* a demonstration of these propositions by actual facts. We can fulfill our promise no better than by reprinting the following from the speech of the Hon. Robert H. Crockett in the Arkansas Senate, in behalf of a bill which he had introduced for the granting of immunity from the penalties of the Sunday law to those who observe the seventh day. The facts therein stated, coming as they do from a disinterested party, except as he is interested in liberty and justice, and in the good name of his adopted State, must have much weight on this question. Mr. Crockett's sense of the outrages perpetrated in Arkansas was so vivid that he overlooked the fact that similar ones had been perpetrated in Tennessee. But the arraignment against legislation which allows religious bigots to wreak their spite on those whose only offense is that they are in the minority, is sufficiently strong, even though he did not mention a tithe of the persecutions. Following is the speech:—

Sir, I take shame to myself as a member of the General Assembly of 1885, which repealed the act of religious protection which this bill is intended to restore. It was hasty and ill-advised legislation, and like all such, has been only productive of oppressive persecution upon many of our best citizens, and of shame to the fair fame of our young and glorious State. Wrong in conception, it has proven infamous in execution, and under it, such ill deeds and foul oppressions have been perpetrated upon an inoffensive class of free American citizens in Arkansas, for conscience' sake, as should mantle the cheek of every lover of his State and country with indignant shame.

For nearly a half century the laws of our State, constitutional and statutory, were in accord with our national Constitution, in guaranteeing to every citizen the right to worship God in the manner prescribed by his own conscience, and that alone. The noble patriots who framed our nation's fundamental law, with the wisdom taught by the history of disastrous results in other nations from joining Church and State, and fully alive to so great a danger to our republican institutions and their perpetuity, so wisely constructed that safeguard of our American liberties that for forty years after its ratification there was no effort to interfere with its grand principle of equal protection to all, in the full enjoyment and exercise of their religious convictions. Then petitions began to pour in from the New England States upon the United States senate "to prevent the carrying and delivery of the mails upon Sunday"—which

they declared was set aside by "divine authority as a day to be kept holy."

The petitions were referred to the committee on postal matters and the report was made by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, one of the fathers of the Democratic party. I quote the following from that report, which was adopted unanimously and "committee discharged":—

"Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has withheld the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen. And while he respects the rights of others he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions. . . . The obligation of the Government is the same on both these classes; [those who keep Saturday and those who keep Sunday] and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority."

Listen to that last sentence—but again I quote:—

"What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any of its citizens, however small. Despotism may invade these rights, but justice still confirms them. And again:—

"Let the national Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World. Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances."

Sir, it was my privilege during the last two years to travel through our Northwestern States in the interest of immigration. I delivered public lectures upon the material resources of Arkansas, and the inducements held out by her to those who desired homes in a new State. I told them of her cloudless skies and tropical climes, and bird songs as sweet as vesper chimes. I told them of her mountains and valleys, of her forests of valuable timber, her thousands of miles of navigable waters, her gushing springs, her broad, flower-decked and grass-carpeted prairies, sleeping in the golden sunshine of unsettled solitude. I told them, sir, of the rich stores of mineral wealth sleeping in the sunless depths of her bosom. I told them of our God-inspired liquor laws, of our "pistol laws," of our exemption laws, and oh, sir! God forgive me the lie—I told them that our Constitution and laws protected all men equally in the enjoyment and exercise of their religious convictions. I told them that the sectional feeling engendered by the war was a thing of the past, and that her citizens, through me, cordially invited them to come and share this glorious land with us and aid us to develop it.

Many came and settled up our wild lands and prairies, and where but a few years ago was heard in the stillness of the night the howl of the wolf, the scream of the panther,

and the wail of the wildebeest, these people for whom I am pleading, came and settled, and behold the change. Instead of the savage sounds incident to the wilderness, now is heard the tap, tap, tap, of the mephanie's hammer, the rattle and roar of the railroad, the busy hum of industry, and softer, sweeter far than all these is heard the music of the church bells as they ring in silvery chimes across the prairies and valleys and are echoed back from the hill-sides throughout the borders of our whole State.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE UNSCRIPTURAL.

These people are, many of them, Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists. They are people who religiously and conscientiously keep Saturday, the seventh-day, as the Sabbath, in accordance with the fourth commandment. They find no authority in the Scripture for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week, nor can anyone else. All commentators agree that Saturday is and was the scriptural Sabbath, and that the keeping of Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, is of human origin, and not by divine injunction. The Catholic writers and all theologians agree in this.

These people understand the decalogue to be as binding upon them as fully to-day as when handed down amid the thunders of Sinai. They do not feel at liberty to abstain from their usual avocations, because they read the commandment, "Six days shalt thou labor," as mandatory, and they believe that they have no more right to abstain from labor on the first day of the week than they have to neglect the observance of Saturday as their Sabbath. They agree with their Christian brethren of other denominations in all essential points of doctrine, the one great difference being upon the day to be kept as the Sabbath. They follow no avocations tending to demoralize the community in which they live. They came among us expecting the same protection in the exercise of their religious faith, as is accorded to them in all the states of Europe, in South Africa, Australia, the Sandwich Islands, and every State in the Union except, alas! that I should say it, Arkansas! Sir, under the existing law there have been in Arkansas within the last two years three times as many cases of persecution for conscience' sake, as there have been in all the other States combined since the adoption of our national Constitution.

PERSECUTION FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE.

Let me, sir, illustrate the operation of the present law by one or two examples. A Mr. Swearigen came from a northern State and settled a farm in — County. His farm was four miles from town, and far away from any house of religious worship. He was a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and, after having sincerely observed the Sabbath of his people (Saturday) by abstaining from all secular work, he and his son, a lad of seventeen, on the first day of the week, went quietly about their usual avocations. They disturbed no one—interfered with the rights of no one. But they were observed, and reported to the grand jury—indicted, tried, convicted, fined—and, having no money

to pay the fine, these moral, Christian citizens of Arkansas were dragged to the county jail and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days—and for what? For daring in this so-called land of liberty, in the year of our Lord 1887, to worship God.

Was this the end of the story? Alas, no, sir! They were turned out; and the old man's only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his children, was levied on to pay the fine and costs, amounting to \$38. The horse sold at auction for \$27. A few days afterward the sheriff came again and demanded \$36, \$11 balance due on fine and costs, and \$25 for board for himself and son while in jail. And when the poor old man—a Christian, mind you—told him with tears that he had no money, he promptly levied on his only cow, but was persuaded to accept bond, and the amount was paid by contributions from his friends of the same faith. Sir, my heart swells to bursting with indignation as I repeat to you the infamous story.

ANOTHER INSTANCE.

Another, and I am done. Sir, I beg you and these senators to believe that these are neither fancy nor exaggerated sketches. Five years ago a young man, newly married, came to — County, from Ohio. He and his wife were Seventh-day Baptists. The young girl had left father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all the dear friends of her childhood to follow her young husband to Arkansas—to them the land of promise. The light of love sparkled in her bright, young eyes. The roses of health were upon her cheeks, and her silver laugh was sweet music, of which her young husband never wearied. They purchased a little farm, and soon, by tireless industry and frugal thrift, their home blossomed like a rose in the wilderness. After awhile a fair young babe came to them to brighten the sunshine, and sweeten the bird songs. They were happy in each other's affection and their love for the little one. For them "all things worked together for good;" for, in their humble, trusting way, they worshiped God and loved their fellow-men.

Two years ago the law under which their prosperity and happiness had had its growth was repealed! Accursed be the day which brought such a foul blot upon our State's fair fame! A change, sudden, cold, and blasting as an arctic storm came over their lives and pitilessly withered all their bright flowers of hope. Under this repeal, persecution lifted its ugly, venomous head. The hero of my sad story was observed by an envious, jealous neighbor, quietly working, as he believed God had commanded him, on Sunday. He was reported to that inquisitorial relic of barbarism, the grand jury—indicted, tried, convicted, and thrown into jail because his conscience would not let him pay the fine.

Week after week dragged its slow length along. Day after day the young wife, with baby in her arms, watched at the gate for his coming, and like Tennyson's Marianna—

"She only said: 'My life is dreary—
He cometh not,' she said.
She said: 'I am weary—aweariness—
I would that I were dead.'"

Then baby sickened and died—the light in

the young wife's eyes faded out in tears—her silvery laugh changed to low, wailing sobs. Pale-faced Misery snatched the roses from her cheeks and planted in their stead her own pallid hue. Sir, how can I go on? At length the cruel law was appeased, and this inoffensive citizen (except that he had loved God and sought to obey him) was released from prison and dragged his weary feet to the happy home he had left a few short weeks before. He met his neighbors at the gate bearing a coffin. He asked no questions, his heart told him all, No, not all! He knew not—he could never know—of her lonely hours, of her bitter tears, of the weary watching and waiting, of the appeals to God, that God for whom she had suffered so much, for help in the hour of her extremity, of baby's sickness and death. He could not know of these. But he went with them to the quiet country burial-place and saw beside the open grave a little mound with dirt freshly heaped upon it, and then he knew that God had taken both his heart's idols and he was left alone. His grief was too deep for tears. With staring eyes he saw them lower the body of his young wife into the grave. He heard the clods rattle upon the coffin, and it seemed as if they were falling upon his heart. The work was done and they left him with his dead, and then he threw himself down between the graves with an arm across each little mound, and the tears came in torrents and kept his heart from breaking. And then he sobbed his broken farewell to his darlings and left Arkansas forever. Left it, sir, as hundreds of others are preparing to leave if this General Assembly fails to restore to them the protection of their rights under the Constitution, national and State.

On next Monday, at Malvern, six as honest, good, and virtuous citizens as live in Arkansas are to be tried as criminals for daring to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences; for exercising a right which this Government, under the Constitution, has no power to abridge. Sir, I plead, in the name of justice, in the name of our republican institutions, in the name of these inoffensive, God-fearing, God-serving people, our fellow-citizens, and last, sir, in the name of Arkansas, I plead that this bill may pass, and this one foul blot be wiped from the escutcheon of our glorious commonwealth.

The Christian Cynosure on National Reform.

THE *Christian Cynosure*, it appears, has partially read—very partially indeed—the December number of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, and is thereby moved to make some comments upon it, its aim, and its work. As the *Cynosure* is itself an advocate of National Reform, some of its comments are worth a passing notice. Of the *SENTINEL* the *Cynosure* says:

"Its one sole aim is to antagonize and resist those who would have our national Constitution amended by inserting the single word 'Christian' so as to distinguish between the 'free exercise' of the *Christian* religion, and the 'free exercise' of child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and whatever crimes are called religion. . . . The sole object of the promoters [of the Religious Amendment]

being to prevent the Constitution from covering crime."

Although one of the editors of the *Cynosure* is a Vice-President of the National Reform Association, yet that paper has a very poor understanding of the National Reform movement, if it really supposes that the design of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution is the insertion of "the single word Christian." Perhaps we can enlighten the *Cynosure* somewhat. We shall try. Therefore we would inform it that in the first National Convention for National Reform that was ever held, a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking for the adoption of measures by that body, for amending the Constitution of the United States. This memorial asked that the Preamble to the Constitution should be amended to read as follows—the amendment in brackets:—

CHRISTIANITY THE TEST OF CITIZENSHIP.

"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," etc.

This of itself is a good deal more than the insertion of "the single word 'Christian,'" but this is not near all that they propose, not by a long way. This memorial continues:—

"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 the Amendment, in the Preamble."

That is to say that the Constitution throughout shall be subjected to a revision so as to make it conform, and give effect, to this amended Preamble. In other words, the whole Constitution shall be revised to suit the National Reformers. It is evident that National Reform involves a vast deal more than the insertion of "the single word 'Christian'" in the Constitution. If the *Cynosure* will read the November *SENTINEL*, 1886, it can get some idea of how much more. The *Cynosure* needs to be a good deal better acquainted with National Reform, before it undertakes to comment upon the opposition to that movement. Therefore read the *SENTINEL*, Mr. Editor, read the *SENTINEL*. . . .

Even though it were true that all that is intended by National Reform were the insertion of the single word "Christian," we should yet oppose it just as much as we do, so long as the effect of such insertion would be to give to Christians the sole right to citizenship and its privileges and immunities. We have as much regard for Christianity and the Christian name as anybody has, but we do not believe that any set of men have the right to a monopoly of that name, nor under it the monopoly of all human right.

But says the *Cynosure*, the insertion of this "single word" in the Constitution is "to distinguish between the 'free exercise' of the *Christian* religion, and the 'free exercise' of child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and whatever crimes are called religion." In this expression the *Cynosure* shows as great destitution of a knowledge of the Constitution as

in the other it showed of National Reform. Does that paper mean seriously to assert that the Constitution of the United States guarantees the free exercise "of child-murder, polygamy, assassination," and other "crimes" as it guarantees the free exercise of religion? Does the *Cynosure* know no distinction between crime and religion? If it does not, it is time that it understood that the National Constitution does know such distinction. It might be well also to inform the *Cynosure* that there are now both State and United States laws prohibiting child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and other crimes, and even misdemeanors. Therefore if its further statement be true, that the sole object of the promoters of the Religious Amendment is "to prevent the Constitution from covering crime," then the "sole object" of the National Reformers is wholly purposeless; for when their "sole object" should be accomplished, they would have only what they now have.

But to prevent the Constitution from covering crime, is not the sole object of the promoters of the Religious Amendment. Their object is to so amend the Constitution that it shall recognize and define as crime, that which is not and cannot be crime. They want the Constitution so amended that under it there shall be no distinction between *sin* and *crime*; but that all sins shall be crimes, and punishable by the civil law. If it be admitted that all sin is crime, then we freely confess that the *Cynosure* is strictly correct in saying that the "sole object" of the promoters of National Reform "is to prevent the Constitution from covering crime." That is, their "sole object" is to so amend the United States Constitution, that under it the National Reformers may put themselves in the place of God to pass upon, to define, and to punish, sin.

Then the *Cynosure* mentions Masonry and Mormonism, and says that these are "a sort of gentlemen whom our *AMERICAN SENTINEL* seems to treat with silent respect, though surrounded by them." So far as Mormonism is concerned, any person who is a reader of the *SENTINEL* knows by these words that the *Cynosure* has not read it to any appreciable extent. As for Masonry, if there were on foot a movement to establish a Masonic hierarchy in this Government, as there is to establish a National Reform hierarchy; or if we should see in Masonry any such menace to civil and religious liberty, as there is in National Reform; then we should endeavor to ventilate such iniquity in Masonry, as we do now that in National Reform. But we do not propose to spend any of our time to so little purpose, as the *Cynosure* has spent all these years.

Next, the *Cynosure* undertakes to tell exactly what the National Reformers want. That we may the more clearly set forth these wants we shall number them.

1. "We want a Bible oath in our courts, and chaplains, and Thanksgivings such as we now have and have had from the first."

That is to say, we want a religious amendment to the National Constitution, to give us what "we now have," and what we always "have had from the first!" In other words, they want what they already have, and they

will subvert the Constitution to get it. That seems to us a queer sort of proceeding for men of sound minds.

2. "A recognized standard of law and morals so as to know by what God to swear witnesses, and to furnish definitions for public vices and crimes."

As there has never yet been any difficulty in knowing by what God to swear witnesses; and as the law already furnishes definitions for all public vices and crimes, it would seem that this want stands on about the same level as the other one, and that agitation to obtain it is agitation to get what we already "have and have had from the first."

GROUNDLESS FEARS.

3. "We wish for a Constitutional barrier against the religion of Dahomey, which celebrates the king's birthday by piling up human heads."

Well did anybody ever! What in the world has our Constitution to do with erecting a barrier against the celebration of the birthday of the king of Dahomey? Is the editorial staff of the *Cynosure*, or are the National Reformers, afraid that the king of Dahomey is going to send an expedition all the way to the United States to get human heads to pile up in celebration of his birthday? and are they afraid that he will select *their* heads out of all the sixty-five millions here? If they are very sore afraid, we can re-assure them by assuring them that such an attempt on the part of the king of Dahomey, or any other king, would be an invasion of this country; and there is now a "Constitutional barrier" against invasions. Clause 16, of Section VIII of Article I, declares that Congress shall have power, "To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions."

But should the terrible king of Dahomey succeed in sinking our navy, and in eluding our militia, and should he actually capture the editorial staff of the *Cynosure* or some other of the National Reformers, there is still another "Constitutional barrier" against him, for clause 11, of the same Section before cited, declares that Congress shall have power, "To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules CONCERNING CAPTURES on land and water." Oh, dear *Cynosure*, you and all your fellow "Reformers" are perfectly and constitutionally safe from being compelled to bear any part in the sanguinary celebration of the birthday of the king of Dahomey. As for the rest of us we will all willingly take our chances, rather than to risk the rule of a National Reform *régime*. So as this seems to be the most instantly and really urgent of all your "wants," and as there is now a double "Constitutional barrier" to protect you, you might just as well stop all further agitation for your National Reform Amendment.

But there is yet one more want that the trembling and affrighted *Cynosure* utters.

4. "We wish to exclude from our court-houses Chinese oaths, sworn by yellow paper and dead cocks' heads, and the secret oaths to have throats cut and bodies mangled to enforce partiality or protection for criminals and concealment of crime."

We cannot possibly see how the ends of justice would be promoted by compelling the

Chinese to testify upon an oath that would be no more to him, than one "by yellow paper and dead cocks' heads" would be to the editor of the *Cynosure*. To the Chinese such an oath is as sacred, as is the regular judicial oath to the average American; and to compel him to abandon an oath which to him is sacred, and take one which, if anything at all to him, is profane, what more surely, what more ground, would there be upon which to rest confidence that he was telling the truth? Instead of there being any *more*, there would be a good deal less,—in fact there would be no such surely at all. The trouble is, the National Reformers cannot see anything but that all our courts must be courts of theology and tests of faith, instead of courts of law and tests of truth and justice.

As for "the secret oaths to have throats cut and bodies mangled" etc., we did not know before that there was any need of a Constitutional Amendment to exclude these from our court-houses, because we never before heard, nor do we now believe, that either our courts or our court-houses, administer, entertain, or include any such oaths. It is probable, though, that in this the *Cynosure* intended a stroke at Masonry, but it is made in such a blundering way that unless the reader were acquainted with the reason of the existence of the *Cynosure*, he would not detect the object of its aim. We do not believe that there is either righteousness or propriety in secret oaths, but even though there were a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting them, we should like to know how it could be made effective without the establishment of an inquisition to pry into the secrets of every man's life, and worm out of him, or force from him, the confession of his secret oath. And as between Masonry and even such an inquisition, we desire rather to take our chances against the danger from the secret oath, rather than against the danger which would inevitably inhere in such an inquisition.

WHO IS SINCERE?

The *Cynosure* closes by saying:

"We can scarcely regard him [that is, the *SENTINEL*] as sincerely believing that we would 'call all the bayonets of this mighty nation' to aid us in voting into our Constitution what our fathers intended to and supposed they had put there."

That is not exactly what the *SENTINEL* said. We did not say that they would call all the bayonets of the nation, to aid in *voting into* the Constitution what they want, but *in support* of their National Reform "kingdom of Christ" after they *have* voted it in. But the difference is very slight, and we are not sure but that they will do the one as well as the other, before they get through with their National Reform scheme.

As for the sincerity of our belief on this point, we can assure the *Cynosure* that our *belief* of it is just as sincere as is the National Reform *avowal* of it. And that avowal by no less an authority than National Reform District Secretary, Rev. M. A. Gault, is made in these words:

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in government without bloody revolution, will depend entirely upon the

strength and resistance of the forces of anti-Christ."

And again:

"It cost us all our civil war to blot slavery out of our Constitution, and it may cost us another war to blot out its infidelity."

Now we do sincerely believe that bloody revolutions are not accomplished without the use of bayonets; and we actually know that slavery was not blotted out without calling into active and bloody use all the bayonets of this mighty nation. Therefore as the National Reformers coolly and deliberately contemplate the alternative of a bloody revolution, and a war as terrible as our civil war, we do sincerely believe that, if it could not be done without, they would call all the bayonets of this mighty nation to aid in the accomplishment of that wicked work upon which they have set their hearts.

Dear *Cynosure*, you ought to read up on National Reform. You don't understand it very well. For your own benefit, and that you may really understand the principles of National Reform, we urge you to read the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*. We "sincerely believe" you ought to.

A. T. J.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS AND GENERAL HISTORY.

BY ROBERT H. LABBERTON.

AS A CLASS TEXT-BOOK it is superior to any other in Unity, Brevity, Clearness, Logical Arrangement, and Suggestiveness.

AS A REFERENCE Book it should be in the Library of every school-room in the country; every Student of History should possess a copy.

In your Reading Circle or at home when you wish to consult an Atlas you need a map for a particular date. Your modern Atlas will not give it. This is the only Atlas which has a map for every period.

A MAP for any particular date can instantly be found by anyone, each map having over it in figures, the year or period it covers.

It is the only Atlas in which each nationality has, and always retains, its own distinctive color; hence every period has a map, and they are progressive, forming in themselves a panorama of events effective in the highest degree.

NEW MAPS OF ANCIENT EMPIRES.

It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires.

The text is brief, suggestive, fascinating, but gives in an attractive form the leading events in the history of the world (not a bundle of particular histories), free from unnecessary details. It has an index.

Labberton's New Historical Atlas and General History is indispensable to Libraries, Reading Circles, School Officers, Teachers, Students, etc. It contains 198 Maps, printed in colors, 30 Genealogical Charts, and is complete in one volume, 4to. Cloth, 312 pages. Sent by Mail or Express, prepaid, for \$2.50.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

GOOD HEALTH. A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

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

Address, GOOD HEALTH, Battle Creek, Mich

THE TRUTH FOUND.

THE NATURE AND OBLIGATION OF THE SABBATH OF THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

BY ELD. J. H. WAGGONER.

The title of this little book sufficiently explains its character. It contains more scriptural information in regard to the Sabbath than any other book of twice the size, and yet it is so simplified as to be easily comprehended. The author quotes the opinions of many learned men concerning the Sabbath, and their conflicting theories are strongly contrasted with the clear, straightforward teaching of the Bible. 64 pp. Price, 10 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1887.

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.

No one who sees this number of the SENTINEL should pass by the article on pp. 28-30, which is chiefly a reprint of a speech by the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, of the Arkansas Senate. We are very sure that whoever begins to read it will finish it. The circumstances of its delivery were these: In 1885 the Arkansas Legislature repealed that section of the Sunday law which granted to observers of the seventh day the privilege of laboring on Sunday without being molested. Immediately a bitter persecution began against those who conscientiously rested on the seventh day of the week, and labored the other six. At the last session of the Legislature, Senator Crockett introduced what might be called a religious liberty bill, and it was in support of this bill that he made the speech which we quote.

The cause of religious liberty owes a great deal to Senator Crockett. He made this bill the object of his special care, and so successful were his efforts that it passed both Houses by a large majority. The effect of his noble efforts in behalf of religious liberty is not confined to Arkansas, whose citizens reap the immediate benefit; but his eloquent words will stir up honest people in all parts of the United States, to protest against the iniquity of interference by the State in matters purely religious. Senator Crockett is a grandson of Col. David Crockett, the hero of the Alamo, of whom he has shown himself to be a worthy descendant.

THE Christian Cynosure says:

"The Arkansas Legislature has passed a bill repealing the law punishing for engaging in secular pursuits on Sunday those who religiously observe one day each week as Sabbath. Under the existing law there have been numerous prosecutions of Second Adventists for working on Sunday."

At last the Cynosure has awakened to the fact that there have actually been persecutions in the United States, for conscience' sake. Several months ago a statement of the persecutions under the Sunday law in Arkansas and Tennessee, was made in a sermon in Chicago, and the editor of the Cynosure called loudly for proof. He didn't believe that anybody had been persecuted, but said that if such things had been done, the matter ought to be investigated. The matter was investigated. The one who preached the sermon went South a few weeks later, and wrote to the Cynosure a statement of the facts in the case. Some of them are given in the speech published on another page of the SENTINEL. The Cynosure published the statement, but said no more about putting a stop to such proceedings. Having been assured that per-

secutions had actually taken place, the editor seemed to be satisfied. He did say, however, that the report "lacked confirmation." Still it seems, from his tardy acknowledgment, that he really believed it all the time. He could hardly have helped doing so; but not a word in condemnation of the persecutions has appeared in the Cynosure. Is it necessary to add that the editor of the Cynosure is one of the Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association?

National Reform Physicians.

In his "clashing voices" department in the *Christian Statesman* of February 3, Mr. Gault quotes the following voice from James E. McGinnis, in the St. Louis *Republican*:

"This is not a Christian State, nor is it under a Christian Constitution, but one made for Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, Infidels, and Christians alike; and that this may long remain the land of perfect religious liberty, is the fervent aspiration of every patriot and real lover of his kind."

True enough; but among patriots and real lovers of their kind your ardent National Reformer is not to be classed. And so Mr. Gault lifts his voice and causes it to "clash" against the one just quoted, as follows:

"You forget that it is impossible for our Government to show the same favor to every system of religion. It must discriminate in favor of one or the other. Christianity furnishes the only perfect system of morals, the only system that secures perfect liberty. This is why the Government does and must discriminate in favor of Christianity. For instance, if our Government would abolish Sabbath laws, it would disfranchise every Christian citizen. Such religious liberty is far from being perfect."

One peculiarity about the writings of M. A. Gault is that there is never any connection between his propositions and the proofs which he adduces in support thereof; between his premises and his conclusions. So in the above quotation; taken as a whole it is meaningless, but the detached statements may be understood. He says: "You forget that it is impossible for our Government to show the same favor to every system of religion." We do not forget it, because we never knew it; and the writer in the *Republican* evidently is as ignorant as we are on that point, for he asserts that our Constitution as it is, does grant equal liberty to all religionists, and that therein its fairness lies. We would like to have some National Reformer demonstrate why this Government cannot treat all systems of religion alike.

According to Mr. Gault's statement, the National Reformers are working for what already exists. For, (1) He states that it is *impossible* for this Government to show the same favor to every system of religion. Then it must be that the United States does not show equal favor to men of all beliefs. (2) Mr. Gault goes farther, and declares that this Government *does discriminate* in favor of Christianity. If that is so, the National Reformers' occupation is gone, for that is just what they profess to be working for.

The story goes that a man was induced to believe that he needed a physician, and upon

consulting one he was asked about his condition. In reply to questions, he stated that his strength was good, that he had a good appetite, and that he slept well. To which the physician replied, "Very well, we shall soon change all that." Just such physicians the National Reformers will prove themselves to be for this country. There is freedom now; every man has liberty to worship God in whatever way he thinks God requires; but the National Reformers propose to change all that, so that no form of religion shall be tolerated except the one *they* think is right. When that time comes, then know that the ruin of the nation is at hand.

At the Wooster, Ohio, Convention the National Reformers adopted the following as a part of their platform:

"The rights of man are properly understood and maintained only where responsibility to God is deeply felt. This is sufficient guarantee that our movement cannot infringe upon any just conception of individual liberty."

The self-assurance of these model Reformers is something to be admired. We protest that this is no guarantee at all. All history attests that individual liberty *has not* been secured, in any instance, by uniting religion with the State. The following proposition, timely three centuries ago, is as conclusive as that copied above:

"The rights of man are properly understood and maintained only where responsibility to God is deeply felt. This is sufficient guarantee that the supremacy of the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ, and the establishment of the holy inquisition cannot infringe upon any just conception of individual liberty."

To "the Church" this was a very reasonable proposition, and "very full of comfort." But to dissenters and genuine Reformers, it had a different look. In the light of what we have read from the "National Reformers" we are inclined to believe that the "true inwardness" of the movement and the platform is concealed in the phrase, "just conception of individual liberty." It was shown in the SENTINEL, from their own avowals, that with them, "just conceptions" of individual rights are that no one shall be a *bona fide* citizen and eligible to office who is not in full sympathy with "the characteristic faith" of the nation! With this understanding their platform is quite consistent!

"JESUS answered, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." John 18: 36.

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 subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.