



THE

SENTINEL

LIBRARY

* "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty." * *

THE
SENTINEL
 LIBRARY,
 - A -
 Semi-Monthly
 PUBLICATION,
 Devoted to
 THE DEFENSE
 OF
 American Institutions
 AND
 The Preservation
 OF THE
 UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION
 AS IT IS.
 ..000..
 TERMS,
75 Cents
 A Year.

A LUTHERAN VIEW
 OF THE
National Reform Movement.

BY REV. CARL ACKERMANN.

*Essay read before the Eastern Conference of the Northern District,
 at Loudonville, Ohio, Jan. 15, 1889, and published in the
 "Lutheran Standard" by request of the Conference.*

PUBLISHED BY THE

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,

12th and Castro Sts.,
Oakland, Cal.
 Copyrighted 1889.

43 Bond Street,
NEW YORK.
 All Rights Reserved.

Entered at the Post office in Oakland.

THE BIBLE STUDENTS' LIBRARY.

The Following Numbers are now Ready, and will be Sent
Post-Paid on Receipt of Price:

	PRICE.		PRICE.
No. 1. Bible Sanctification.....	10 cts.	No. 27. The Bible. Its Inspira-	2 cts.
" 2. Abiding Sabbath and		tion and Importance.....	
Lord's Day.....	20 "	" 28. S. S. Lessons: Subject,	
" 3. Views of National Re-		The Letter to the He-	
form, Series 1.....	15 "	brews—continued.....	5 "
" 4. The Saints' Inheritance.....	10 "	" 29. Justification by Faith.....	5 "
" 5. The Judgment.....	2 "	" 30. The Perfection of the	
" 6. The Third Angel's Mes-		Ten Commandments.....	1 "
sage.....	4 "	" 31. The Second Advent.....	4 "
" 7. The Definite Seventh		" 32. The Present Truth.....	4 "
Day.....	2 "	" 33. The Two Thrones.....	4 "
" 8. S. S. Lessons: Subject,		" 34. God's Memorial.....	2 "
Tithes and Offerings.....	5 "	" 35. The Millennium.....	3 "
" 9. The Origin and Growth		" 36. The Signs of the Times.....	3 "
of Sunday Observance.....	10 "	" 37. The Second Message of	
" 10. Scripture References.....	4 "	Rev. XIV.....	3 "
" 11. Milton on the State of the		" 38. The First Message of	
Dead.....	4 "	Rev. XIV.....	2 "
" 12. Samuel and the Witch of		" 39. The Lost Time Question.....	2 "
Endor.....	4 "	" 40. Seven Reasons for Sun-	
" 13. Spiritualism a Satanic		day Keeping Exam-	
Delusion.....	4 "	ined.....	2 "
" 14. The Sufferings of Christ.....	4 "	" 41. Thoughts on Baptism.....	25 "
" 15. Law and Gospel.....	3 "	" 42. Elihu on the Sabbath.....	2 "
" 16. Christ in the Old Testa-		" 43. Old Moral Code of Ten	
ment.....	2 "	Commandments not	
" 17. Second Coming of Christ.....	2 "	Revised.....	2 "
" 18. Vindication of the True		" 44. The Sabbath Made for	
Sabbath.....	10 "	Man.....	2 "
" 19. Who Changed the Sab-		" 45. Sketches from the Life	
bath?.....	3 "	of Christ (Spiritual	
" 20. S. S. Lessons: Subject,		Gifts, Vol. 1.).....	25 "
Letter to the Hebrews.....	7 "	" 46. Without Excuse.....	1 "
" 21. The Seventh p't of Time.....	4 "	" 47. Thoughts for the Can-	
" 22. The Ten Command-		did.....	1 "
ments Not Abolished.....	4 "	" 48. Which Day do you Keep?	
" 23. Honor due to God.....	10 "	And Why?.....	1 "
" 24. Is Sunday the Sabbath?.....	1 "	" 49. Can We Know?.....	1 "
" 25. The Sabbath in the New		" 50. Is the End Near?.....	1 "
Testament.....	2 "	" 51. Is Man Immortal?.....	1 "
" 26. The Sanctuary of the Bi-		" 52. Why not Found Out Be-	
ble.....	2 "	fore?.....	1 "

—ORDER BY NUMBER.—

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

OAKLAND, CAL.

43 Bond Street, New York.



A LUTHERAN VIEW
OF
National Reform.



Would the Success of the "National Reform Movement" Lead to a
Union of Church and State.*

THE mutual relation of Church and State has ever been one of the perplexing problems in the government of the affairs of men. Shall the two be united, and if so, how far? Or shall they be altogether separate? These are questions that have engaged the attention of both political scientists and theologians during the greater portion of the Christian era. That the two have been united in one or the other form in nearly all lands, from the time of Constantine to the present, is a fact; but whether such union has been for the good of both or to their hurt, seems still to be an open question with many. The teaching of the Master: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's," though upheld by his disciples

*Read before the Lutheran Conference at Loudonville, Ohio, January 15, 1889, and published by request of the Conference in the *Lutheran Standard*.

the first three centuries of the Christian era, has been since, and is, alas, to-day, rejected by some in many of its bearings. In our own land we have had, from its birth as a nation, complete separation of Church and State, yet there have been men at all times, and eminent men at that, who have deplored this state of affairs and have made attempts to change it in various ways. Proof of this is not wanting. Whether or not the "National Reform Association" (numbering among its long list of vice-presidents many who are eminent in pulpit and law, and publishing two official organs, *The Christian Statesman* and *Christian Nation*) belongs to this class, is the question before us. The clear statement of a union of Church and State is repudiated by the association; but does it not in its principles virtually advocate all that is essential to such a union?

To get into the clear with regard to this question let us—

- I. *Define the functions of Church and State; and*
- II. *Apply these principles to the question before us.*

1. Both Church and State have important fields of action in the affairs of men, and both are divinely ordered. The former is a relation which is inseparably linked with the very existence of the human race; the latter is one which has arisen as a necessary consequence of the mutual relations, privileges, rights, and duties arising from a community of persons.

Man in his dealings with man is prone to disregard the mutual duties that exist between himself and his fellow-man. It becomes necessary therefore to uphold the sense of right and duty, implanted indeed in the heart of man at creation, but darkened and lost to a

great extent by the entrance of sin and his accompanying fall. But arising in this manner, chiefly, perhaps, because the exigencies of the case demanded it, the State as such is by no means only a human arrangement. God himself has instituted the powers that be. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13:1; compare Prov. 8:15, 16. The principles underlying the foundation of government are as immutable as the Almighty himself—they are the principles of right and justice, and have their origin in God. And the application of these principles defines the sphere of the State's activity. Professor Schuette, in his "State, Church, and School," defines this activity as follows:—

"The object and duty of the State may be designated as that of protection. The Government must secure the individual subject against injury to his person, property, reputation, and business; establish the limits of free action and protect him in the enjoyment of it within the lines so marked out. It must defend him against all undue interference with the exercise of his religion and with the government of his family. It must insure to him safety and liberty of action in his social and religious connection and intercourse. It is designed to compel the individual to provide for his material wants not by fraud, theft, and plunder, but honest industry. It is to hold its subjects to settle any personal differences that may arise not by violence or brutal force, but by arbitration or by process of law. When appealed to, it is to assist every one to procure what is his right and due in any matter of argu-

ment, of testament, and of injury sustained in person, character, or property. It must suppress everything generally offensive and demoralizing. Throughout all, it must assert and maintain its own proper authority, punish contempt and the trespass of its commandments. Lastly, when the public safety and peace are endangered it must call upon all to stand as one man and engage them in the defense of life and liberty, home and country." (pp. 61, 62).

From this definition it is clear that the province of the State's activity is the defense of man in his outward relations to his fellow-man, to protect him from harm and injury which may be inflicted on him, and to demand that, in all his actions, he take cognizance of the rights and privileges of others. It takes into consideration his relation to society. "The very object of Government is the preservation of rights, or the protection of its citizens." (*American Sentinel*, May, 1886). "The work of the State is to supervise the life of citizens and to legislate and enforce those things which are necessary for upholding right and punishing crime." (Rev. J. A. Scott, Jr., in *Christian at Work*). "The civil law extends over the body of man, his property, and whatever is external on earth—no farther." (Luther.)

The sphere of activity for the church is upon a different plane. She takes into consideration the spiritual wants of man. By nature he is a religious being. Reverence for things divine is implanted in his nature. Hence, no people have ever fallen so low as to be without some form of worship. Plutarch, the heathen biographer and moralist, has said: "You may find States without walls, without laws, without coins, without lit-

erature; but a people without God, without prayer, without religious exercises and sacrifices, no one has ever found." It is the object of the work of the church to satisfy this innate religious feeling, religious want, the hunger and thirst of the soul. For that purpose God has also given the church the necessary means. By inspiration he guided the prophets and apostles to record his holy will. And by his Spirit he makes that inspired Word a power of God to break the heart of stone and new-create it unto life and immortality. But it must be proclaimed, and to proclaim and teach the Word for the above purpose is the God-given sphere of the church's activity. Her commission was: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15), and that same commission stands to-day. With the Word as the sword of the Spirit she is to do her work, and with it alone. "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 2 Cor. 1:21. To the church alone belongs this office. She is to Christianize men, not by force of arms or human agencies, but by and through the Word. Force may bring forth a confession of Christianity, but only the Word can change the heart. Word and Sacrament are the only means of grace, and therefore the only means which the church can and dare use in her work of grace. "Her career lies within the kingdoms of earth, but is not of them."

As already stated, then, both Church and State are of divine origin, and have at least in so far a common object that they both seek the welfare of man and the glory of God. But "one is established by God as the

Creator, and is therefore pre-eminently a dominion of his creative power and of providential wisdom and goodness; the other is established by God as the Redeemer, and is therefore a kingdom in which his grace and sanctifying power especially preponderate." "The ministry of the one is to sanctify and save man in soul and body; the ministry of the other is to protect him in his outward relations, actions, possessions—to prosper him in his earthly calling." ("Church, State and School," p. 146.)

When we come to apply these principles to the work of the National Reform Association, we are met (as stated before) at the outset with a denial of any intention on their part of a union of Church and State, a denial which has been reiterated time and again. "We want no such union," they say; "we all repudiate it in principle." "Furthermore the thing is so odious in the eyes of Christians in America that such a union is forever impossible here." And taking for granted that every element of their definition of a union of Church and State is necessary to bring about such union, or that their definition alone is correct, we must confess they are surely not laboring for such union now, though human nature must change if it will not eventually come to that, with a religious amendment in the Constitution of the land.

"A union of Church and State," says Rev. J. H. McIlvaine in *Christian Statesman*, "is not possible without an established church, which, of course, in the present state of Christianity, must be some one branch or denomination of Christians to the exclusion of others. This would place all other denominations under the

disadvantages and disabilities of dissenters. In direct opposition to this, we hold that all such arrangements are contrary to the true idea of Christianity, and equally so to that of State; and that they ever have been and must ever be a great *fons et origo malorum*—a source of innumerable social and moral evils.”—*Centennial American Cour.*, September, 1887.

Again, Professor Blanchard, in Pittsburg Convention,* 1874, said: “But union of Church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers and oversight of its doctrines. For such a union none of us plead. To such a union we are all opposed.” (Minutes, p. 69.) And M. A. Gault says, in the *Christian Nation*: “Let us say for the thousandth time that we are eternally opposed to uniting Church and State in the sense of compelling men by civil law to observe church regulations as such.”

These claims seem definite enough at first sight, but they leave out of question, so to say, the whole state of affairs as they existed in the Middle Ages—the domination of the Church over the State—and at the same time seem to indicate at least that the National Reformers are not so sure, after all, but that the success of their movement will bring about a union in some form. Besides another claim is set up, namely, that while a union of Church and State is repudiated, they want and labor for a union of religion and State—a distinction that smacks very much of sophistry,

*The Cincinnati Convention, 1872, the New York Convention, 1873, and Pittsburg Convention, 1874, are pronounced by National Reformers the most important conventions they have held since the organization of the Association.

and reminds one of the trickery of politicians. The Supreme Court of Ohio has well said on this point: "Properly speaking, there is no such thing as 'religion of State.' What we mean by that phrase is, the religion of some individuals taught and enforced by the State. The State can have no religious opinions; and if it undertakes to enforce the teaching of such opinions, they must be the opinions of some natural person or class of persons."

But let us hear what National Reformers understand by religion and State:—

"Church and State is always an unmixed evil; but religion and State is another thing. That is a good thing—and that is what we aim to make a feature of our institutions, and we are going to have it."

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from any intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of Protestants; or, that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that all these sects will combine to effect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and were it ever so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring, ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing—and that is what we aim to make a feat-

ure in our institution.”—*Dr. J. Edwards, Minutes National Convention, N. Y., 1873, pp. 59, 60.*

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion, as it already has the Oneida Community in New York, the Mormons in Utah, and the Joss House in California.”—*Professor Blanchard, Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1874, p. 71.*

“If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation’s king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox.”—*Rev. J. C. K. Milligan in Christian Statesman, March 21, 1884.*

“It is the duty of the State, as such, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion.”—*J. M. Foster, in Statesman, 1884.*

“‘This religion as understood by Protestants, tending, by its effects, to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen, and magistrate, was by the people [of Massachusetts] established as a fundamental and essential part of their constitution,’ and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution.”—*Hon. T. H. B. Patterson, Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1874, p. 89.*

“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 relig-

ion 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."—*Doctor Edwards, Minutes N. Y. Convention, 1873, p. 60.*

From these extracts, which might be multiplied, it is certainly clear that when, in Article II. of their constitution, one of the chief objects of this society is stated to be, "To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian Nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," nothing less can be meant than that the statutes of our Government be so amended as to insert a confession of the religion of Jesus Christ in so far as the concensus of the Evangelical Christian religion will permit, and make the Holy Scriptures the formal rule of civil government; yea, that our government "enter into an alliance with the church of Christ and profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," and that all who will be citizens of this new commonwealth must submit to this "legalized Christianity." What tyranny and persecution followed the introduction of such a state of affairs in Massachusetts, every reader of history is conversant with. And has man so changed that it would be less so now?

There are many who seem to think that a recognition of the Christian religion in the National Constitu-

tion is surely not to be deplored, and that is all, they say, the National Reformers want. The above extracts already disprove such claim. But they have spoken on this point also. The Rev. T. P. Stevenson, one of the inaugurators of the movement, and its corresponding secretary, and with Doctor McAllister, founder and co-editor of the *Christian Statesman*, says in an editorial, June 1, 1869: "The design of the pending movement of National Reform is not to secure mention of God in the National Constitution merely because such mention would be decent and becoming. It is not, in the view of its most earnest supporters, to express a sentiment which the Nation already feels, and to exhibit a Christian character which as a nation we already possess. The necessity for the reform lies far deeper than such arguments would imply. The success of our cause would have a far more momentous effect. Our labors are an attempt to bring this Nation into subjection to God; and the conviction that we are not as a nation in allegiance to the King of Nations, but in rebellion against him, and so in imminent danger of destruction, is the real impulse of the movement."

The object then is not simply the insertion of the name of God into the Constitution, but to bring the nation "into subjection to God" by force of law—of "legalized Christian institutions and usages." And does not that subvert the principles enunciated above? Does it not place powers into the hands of the State which are beyond its appointed sphere? We have seen that the work of the State is to protect men in their rights, and that everything which defines their relation to their God is the work of the church. Na-

tional Reformers would Christianize the land, as it were, by legal enactment (see Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1887, etc). It would make all who would be full subjects of these United States to confess God and his Son Jesus Christ—to confess him, if not from conviction yet with the lips. The result would be, we would have a race of hypocrites, and civil rulers and magistrates who are in heart servants of Satan will become the interpreters of Scripture, and will be called upon to decide what is and what is not the religion of the Constitution. And that is one of the most objectionable features of a union of Church and State. But say the Reformers: "The State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church;" and "we will not allow the civil government to decide between the churches and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws." (*Christian Statesman*, February 21, 1884.)

Be it so. The National Reformers will then decide what that "Constitutional Religion," that "National Christianity," is, and what "Christian institutions and usages" are legalized, while judges and civil rulers will be called upon to enforce them. But when that time comes, we will have retrogressed to the period of the Dark Ages, the arrogance of the Popes of those terrible days will have full sway, and no element will be lacking to a perfect union of Church and State. Dr. Crosby has well said: "The moment you put religion into the hands of the Government, you do what Constantine did, and will bring about the dark ruin of the tenth century." And the Supreme Court of Ohio pertinently, though too strongly, says of attempts at

legalizing Christianity: "Legal Christianity is a solecism, a contradiction of terms. Where Christianity asks the aid of the Government beyond mere impartial protection, it disowns itself. Its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never (better seldom) rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both."

Besides, what right have the National Reformers or any other body of men to take that which is common property, and which has been framed for civil purposes only, and make it to serve as a partial confession at least of their religious belief? The Constitution is as much the property of the infidel, atheist, or Jew, as it is the Christian's property. Every one of them, when he becomes a citizen, does, if not fully in fact, yet in spirit, subscribe to all its provisions and requirements, and binds himself to uphold the same. Such an insertion is therefore but an abridgement of religious liberty—the great blessing we as a people have and do so abundantly enjoy. It is binding on the consciences of some men—the number may be small—a religious confession to which they are in heart opposed. It is the first step towards the Inquisition. "Over the soul can and will God allow no one to rule but himself alone. Therefore, whenever human governments assume to dictate or legislate respecting the soul, they invade the dominion of God and can but mislead and destroy the soul." (Luther, *Er. Ed.* vol. 22, p. 82. See also Augsburg Confession, Art. 28.)

But there are other aims yet of the Religious Amendment Party which go to establish the dangerous character of their principles.

Says W. J. Coleman, one of the district secretaries of the association: "What effect would the adoption of the Christian amendment together with the proposed changes in the Constitution have upon those who deny that God is sovereign, Christ the ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once. . . . They are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand towards it if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel." (*Christian Statesman*, November 1, 1883.) Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, writing on the same subject, says: "The worst result would be to disfranchise them." (*Christian Statesman*, February 21, 1884.)

And the *Christian Nation*, September 15, 1886, says: "Of course a government organized on a basis embracing Christianity could not, with propriety, intrust those with office who are hostile to its characteristic faith. And none of this class have any right to claim that they should be equally eligible to office with those who are *bona fide* citizens.

And Secretary J. M. Foster mentions as one of the duties of nations, "a constitutional provision of moral and religious qualification for their officers." (*Christian Statesman*, February 21, 1884.)

The object then of the association is really to carry into effect their claim of "Righteous men for civil of-

rice," and forever to keep out all such as will not at least outwardly confess allegiance to their doctrines. "And we are told there is no union of Church and State in this!" It reminds one of the spider's invitation: "Will you walk into my parlor?"

Well has the *Champlain Journal* said on this point: "However slight, it is the first move for a union of Church and State. If we may cut off ever so few persons from the rights of citizenship on account of difference of religious belief, then with equal justice and propriety may a majority at any time dictate the adoption of still further articles of belief, until our Constitution is but the text-book of a sect beneath whose tyrannical sway all liberty of religious opinion will be crushed."

The baneful influence religious qualifications for civil office will have upon the church is manifest. Office-seekers will at once become church-members, and will vie with the most faithful in their outward devotion and zeal. The church will be a stepping stone to position, unprincipled men will enter the fold, and while devouring the offices will, like the Pharisees of old, "for a pretense make long prayers." This fact early enforced itself upon the attention of the National Reformers. The Minutes of the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, already say (p. 61): "There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decrying this movement, are ready to become its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind

axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress, but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow they always thought it was a good thing. When our Master comes into his kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Zebedee's children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom." That God would preserve his church in this land from such a state of affairs, must surely be the heartfelt prayer of every one who loves the gates of Zion.

Another feature of a union of Church and State which, it seems, the National Reformers do not hesitate to avow of late years, is the right to use the public moneys for promoting the interests of the church.

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

The same writer, in *Statesman* March, 1884, says of the model State: "The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury."

And again, Wm. Somerville, in an article entitled, "State Recognition of Christianity" (*Christian Nation*, July 7 and 14, 1886), says: "Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons. But shall we take—is it right to take—public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed? Most certainly. The gospel from its very nature is aggressive, contemplates the rectification of corrupt, disorderly and degraded human nature, casts down every high thing that would exalt itself against the knowledge of God, and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

This would require positive violation of conscience on the part of many subjects. Taxes are levied upon all, and if public moneys are appropriated to religious purposes, the Government forces all its subjects to support religion. And that upsets the very foundation of that religious freedom which has been the pride of our land, and which is the greatest blessing that any commonwealth can bestow on any of its subjects. Verily, is not this movement drifting Romeward?

The association pledges itself also in its constitution

to promote the religious element in education, and to do so through the public schools. Important as is this element, and much to be desired in the instruction of each and every one, it does not belong to the State's activity to teach religion. To the family and to the church alone has been entrusted this work ; and just as soon as religion is introduced into the public school, as an object of instruction, the State tramples upon and employs that which is only the right and duty of the family and church.

The manner in which this shall be accomplished has not been left undefined, and their work for the past twenty or more years has been in so far crowned with success that a bill has been introduced into the United States Senate, entitled " A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free schools." Section second of this bill provides that " Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the *principles of the Christian religion.*" The bill then provides that this instruction shall be of an " unsectarian character"—a term often used in theory but, I fear, never realized in fact. The organs of the National Reform Association are furthering this bill as much as possible as a step towards the carrying out of their principles. In this work the Reformers have frequently expressed their willingness to join hands with the Roman Catholics in gaining their ends. Two quotations here will suffice. In the *States-*

man of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, (a vice-president of the association), speaking of the desire to have the co-operation of the Roman Catholics, said: "We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has 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." In a National Reform Conference held at Saratoga, August 15-17, 1887, the corresponding secretary of the association was asked the question: "If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay version (the Catholic Bible) in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?" The secretary's answer was: "*We wouldn't object.* . . . This is not a question of versions, but of the right of the word of God to a place at all in the public schools."

Farther on in the official report we find the following: "Dr. Price of Tennessee: I wish to ask the secretary, has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *concensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools, as they do in Massachusetts?" "The secretary: I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such agreement."

"Dr. Price: I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested, by this conference, to bring

this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement if possible."

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

Such proceedings need very little comment. But we are safe in saying that the Romish Church will never come to an agreement unless she sees that in the end it will serve her purposes.

All of these principles and others (some of which others are not so objectionable) the National Reformers pledge themselves to accomplish and to defend and maintain, if need be, by force of arms. (See *Christian Statesman*, April 1, 1886, etc.) And these principles include, so to say, every element of a union of Church and State except an established church as such, with the appointment of her officers, an element that is by no means essential to such union. But even this would quite probably be forthcoming, sooner or later, if their principles were adopted. The fact then that the Religious Amendmentists disclaim any intention of any union does not decide the question. The principles involved, as we have seen, are dangerous, and cannot but lead to a full and complete union of Church and State.

When, in conclusion, we take into consideration the origin of the whole movement; that it is virtually the outgrowth of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; that nearly all its officers and leading workers to-day are members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; that this church claims to be the lineal ecclesiastical descendant of the Cameronian Covenanters of Scotland, and take pride in this fact; that the Covenanters advo-

ated a "full and perfect union of Kirk and Kingdom, and pledged its subscribers to extirpate heresy (see Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Articles Covenanters and Presbyterianism; Encyclopedia Britannica, Articles Covenanters and Presbyterianism; Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, vol. 1, pp. 685, 696); and that Reformed Presbyterians themselves claim that "the principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work, National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the nation; that the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, *and the only principles*, of National Reform." (Italics are theirs); we must say at best the movement has a dangerous origin. And active as it is, it needs careful watching, lest the precious heritage of our fathers, civil and religious liberty, be taken from us.

Therefore, in the words of the *Christian Union*, "Both as Christians and as patriots, we solemnly protest against the movement now in agitation. It is a measure in every way evil. Its success would be fatal at once to religion and to freedom in America."

Views of National Reform.

Series 1.—151 Pages; Size, 4½x7½ Inches; Price, 15 Cents.

This pamphlet contains thirteen treatises on the various phases of the National Reform Movement. The following are the subjects of the various chapters, each of which is complete in itself: Religious Liberty, National Reform is Church and State, The Republic of Israel, Purity of National Religion, What Think Ye of Christ? Evils of Religious Legislation, The American Papacy, National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, Bold and Base Avowal, National Reform Movement an Absurdity, The Salem Witchcraft, National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy, National Reformed Presbyterianism.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1052 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.;

43 Bond St., New York; 28 College Place, Chicago, Ill.

THE
SENTINEL **L**IBRARY,

A Semi-monthly Publication,

Treating upon the Various Phases of
The National Reform Movement, * * *
* The Union of Church and State, *
* * * and Civil and Religious Liberty.

The following numbers are now ready :—

- No. 1. The National Reformed Constitution. Price, 3 cents
- No. 2. Religious Liberty. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3. Evils of Religious Legislation. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4. The Blair Sunday Rest Bill. Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5. The Blair Educational Amendment. Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6. Purity of National Religion. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7. National Reform and Rights of Conscience. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8. The American Papacy. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9. The Salem Witchcraft. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10. National Reform is Church and State. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11. What Think Ye of Christ? Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12. Bold and Base Avowal. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14. The Republic of Israel. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15. National Reformed Presbyterianism. Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16. A Lutheran View of National Reform. Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17. Religion and the Public Schools. Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18. The National Sunday Law. Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19. Rev. W. F. Crafts against the Editors of the American Sentinel. Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20. Romanism and Civil Liberty. Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21. Why we Oppose Religious Legislation. Price, 3 cts.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price. Address all orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

Twelfth and Castro Sts., OAKLAND, OAL.

Or, 43 Bond St., New York.

451 Holloway Road, London N.