

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1886.

NUMBER 10.

## The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

### Result of the Constitutional Amendment.

THE method of the National Association is antagonistic to the spirit of American civil liberty. Every argument which has been or can be used in favor of the theological amendment of the Constitution, has been used a thousand times, just as logically, for the union of Church and State. Moreover, every one of these arguments would justify prosecution in the courts of the land for opinion's sake. Suppose that you have carried your amendment. Instantly you have revolutionized the civil spirit of this Republic. From the moment of your victory, you make the holding of certain theological opinions, different from your own, an offense indictable in our courts and punishable in our prisons. When you have gained so much, what have you left of American liberty?

Both as Christians and as patriots, therefore, we solemnly protest against the measure 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.—*Christian Union.*

“If this great movement [Protestantism] had been allowed to proceed without interruption, it would, in the course of a few generations, have overthrown the old superstition, and established in its place a simpler and less troublesome creed; the rapidity with which this was done, being, of course, proportioned to the intellectual activity of the different countries. But, unfortunately, the European governments, who are always meddling in matters with which they have no concern, thought it their duty to protect the religious interests of the people; and, making common cause with the Catholic clergy, they, in many instances, forcibly stopped the heresy, and thus arrested the natural development of the age. During almost a hundred and fifty years, Europe was afflicted by religious wars, religious massacres, and religious persecutions; not one of which would have risen, if the great truth had been recognized, that the State has no concern with the opinions of men, and no right to interfere, even in the slightest degree, with the form of worship which they may choose to adopt.—*Buckle.*”

### The Salem Witchcraft.

A LESSON FOR OUR TIMES.

THE movers for the Religious Amendment of our National Constitution constantly refer to the action of the prophets, priests, and rulers of Israel, as precedents for the course they wish to pursue. Thus Mr. Leiper, in his strictures on the AMERICAN SENTINEL, cited the case of Nehemiah as a warrant for their proposed action. We deny the relevancy of his citation, and will strengthen our denial with facts and a very forcible illustration.

A “Christian Government,” one in which the “usages, laws, and institutions” of Christianity are placed on “a legal basis,” must of necessity be “a corrector of heretics.” It is useless for the Amendmentists to say that they “will not interfere with the religion of any as long as their actions are not contrary to the law,” for if a man's religion does not regulate his actions and show itself in his life, it is not worth defending or possessing.

There is a law in the Scriptures which reads as follows: “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.” Ex. 22:18. And again: “A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones.” Lev. 20:27. It may not be said that this is obsolete if it be that we are to take the Scripture regulations in full as our guide in *civil government*; for witchcraft is declared to be an abomination to the Lord in both the Old and the New Testament. Compare Deut. 18:9-12; Gal. 5:19-21, and Rev. 22:14, 15. It was in obedience to this law that Saul “put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land.” 1 Sam. 28:3.

And now the question arises, If witchcraft is an abomination to the Lord, and if he required that witches and wizards be put to death, and if the rulers of the people were required to carry out this order of the Lord, why should not the rulers of the people *now* put this order into effect? “The powers that be” are ordained of God at this time as truly as in any other. God does not change; and the rulers of to-day bear the same responsibility to do the will of God that they did in olden time. If, then, the rulers acknowledge their responsibility to God, and if they desire to put the expressed will of God into effect, as our rulers ought to do, will they not obey this order, and destroy out of the land all them that have familiar spirits?

These statements and queries are based upon the position assumed by the Religious Amend-

ment Party; and if their positions are tenable, then these questions must be answered in the affirmative; no other answer is admissible. And this is precisely the manner in which the Puritans of New England reasoned two centuries ago. But all history attests that they made a most miserable failure in their efforts to act upon the principles which they laid down. They verily thought they were doing God service, but they stand condemned for their folly, and for the wanton violence which they did to the plainest principles of morality. If God holds the movers in those terrible scenes responsible for the lives that were sacrificed, then indeed are they to be pitied.

But what was the cause of their sad failure? And what is the defect in the reasonings and conclusions of the Religious Amendmentists? The answer to one of these questions is the answer to the other. Cotton Mather and his bigoted associates taught that the “interests of the church,” and the maintenance of “the true religion,” demanded that these rulers should put the accused persons to death. For this demand they pleaded the warrant of a law of the Bible, and the precedent of Saul and other rulers of the theocracy or kingdom of Israel.

The answer to the above questions is found in the fact which we have repeatedly urged upon the attention of the National Reformers, namely, that we are in a different dispensation, and that there has not been, is not, and never will be upon earth, by divine sanction, a human or civil government the counterpart of that of Israel. That was a theocracy, and afterward a theocratic kingdom, such as cannot exist under the gospel. The antitype of that will be the kingdom of Christ which the God of Heaven will set up, but which will not be set up during the Saviour's priesthood, but when the time comes for him to take vengeance on his foes (2 Thess. 1:7, 8), and destroy all the kingdoms of this world. Dan. 2:44. The error into which Mr. Leiper ran in his strictures, and into which all his associates run, in referring to the action of Nehemiah and others, is in confounding things utterly unlike. It is not enough in a theocracy that the laws be given to the people, and that kings and governors be required to rule in accordance therewith, but divinely-appointed and inspired teachers must be sent from time to time, to instruct them in the laws, to reprove them for their departures from the laws—sometimes unintentional—and to lead them in emergencies where all human wisdom is at fault. But such a state of things cannot exist in a republic. A theocratic and republican government in one is an impossibility. In

a republic the people elect all their rulers, and the rulers are responsible to the people who elect them. Even if the people err in their judgment, and the ideas of the rulers are correct, the people must learn their errors by their own experience; to deprive them of their right of choice is to subvert the republic.

In the Government of Israel no such choice existed. Moses was chosen for their leader, not by the people, but by the Lord. Over and over they essayed to reject Moses, but the Lord interposed by his power. Once they decided to choose a leader in his stead, with the avowed purpose of having one who would carry out their will. And this they would have done if they had had a republican form of government. If the Lord had given them the right to choose their rulers, they could have elected a leader in the place of Moses without incurring any guilt—without rebelling against God's authority. Nehemiah was divinely appointed to his office, and divinely inspired to his work, as were all the rulers and prophets of Israel.

The disastrous failure of the Puritans of Salem, in their efforts to enforce the law for the suppression of witchcraft, was owing to the fact that they had no Heaven-appointed and divinely-inspired leader to direct them. They judged according to their own judgment—according to human wisdom. They were led by their own feelings and impressions, and mistook these for the mind of the Lord. They thought to bring the land under subjection to the will of God, but instead they brought upon it a lasting reproach. They essayed to model their Government after the theocracy of Israel, when God had neither instituted nor given any warrant for a theocracy.

And just so in the efforts of the National Reformers. They point to the example of prophets, priests, and kings as the precedent for their proposed action, when they have no prophets, priests, nor kings to follow the example. But without these they have no right to act as they propose, for none but prophets, priests, and kings have any right or authority to fill the offices and endeavor to discharge the duties which the Lord assigned to prophets, priests, and kings. If men without any special ordination or inspiration essay to fill these offices, they become guilty of the foulest usurpation. Here is a sufficient reason why every Christian should oppose the machinations of these self-styled reformers.

And, as if purposely to give the most full proof of their duplicity, or of their ignorance of the principles of government, they assert that they do not propose to make any radical change in the form of our Government; that they desire to retain its republican form of representation; yet they propose to take for their pattern a Government which had not a single feature of a republic, and copy the acts of those who did not represent the people, who were not in any wise responsible to the people for their official acts. But their plans are chimerical. It is impossible, as every one must own, to follow the precedents presented in the theocracy or kingdom of Israel and still retain our republican form of government. And their own writings show that they do not expect to have

leaders of the same order as those who declared the will of God to Israel, or who will receive their messages from Heaven in the same manner that those did. Thus it was said in the *Christian Statesman*:—

"The churches and the pulpits have much to do in shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points. And it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decisions of most points will be developed there."

Mark this well. The final decisions on civil and moral points, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, will be made in the churches and the pulpits. But the final decisions are not made at the beginning of discussions and agitations. How do they propose to reach the desired point? Hear the *Statesman* again:—

"But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

And thus the "final decisions" will be developed in the churches after the "framework of Bible legislation" has been canvassed by Congress, by Legislatures, in the civil courts, and by lawyers and citizens generally, which will carry the discussions of Bible legislation into party caucuses, beer halls, and dram-shops! for the *habitués* of the dens of vice will each have a vote on the settlement of questions of Bible legislation; and at the polls each such vote will carry as much weight as that of the president of the National Reform Association. And when the will of the majority—good, bad, or indifferent—is expressed, and their decisions are legally enforced, then our model "reformers" will justify such transactions by pointing us to the example of Nehemiah and other inspired teachers and rulers! Was ever arrogance so arrogant, or self-conceit so assuming?

And why will there be an "almost universal gathering" of the people around the churches? Because religious tests will then be required as qualifications for office, and as Dr. Browne said in their Pittsburg National Convention, the office-seekers will be the firm friends of this movement as soon as they are assured of its success. And as Dr. Hays said in the same Convention, politicians who are now afraid of it, "will bawl themselves hoarse in applause" when they become convinced that it must succeed. Ah, yes; this is the very thing to look for when the way to office is through the church! And such is the means by which they propose to elevate "the true religion," and to honor the institutions of Christianity.

Here we will reproduce a short extract which was published in the July number of the *SENTINEL*. The editor of the *Cincinnati Gazette* is a Christian, and a man of acknowledged ability. In an article on the subject of the proposed amendment he said:—

"The Government will continue to be administered by men of ordinary passions, such as are elected by the average intelligence and virtue, and the average ignorance and corruption of the voting population. Viciousness, and ignorance, and corruption will continue to

be powers in the body politic the same as before, and these will continue to elect legislators, executives, and judges of their own sort."

This must be so if our republican form of government is retained; and any effort to enforce the laws, usages, and institutions of religion in such a Government, will reproduce the horrors enacted at Salem. It will arouse and intensify all the passions of the people. The rights of the minority will be trampled under foot, because bigotry and misguided zeal will pervert the judgment and drown the reason of those who may for the time have power in their hands.

Religious usages and institutions are for the church, and not at all for the civil Government. It is the duty of the church to keep witchcraft and every other abomination from its midst; but the civil Government has no right to act in such matters. Had the Puritans regarded this distinction, they would not have stained their hands with blood. And if our modern "National Reformers" would regard this distinction, they would not strive to so change our Government as to cause the follies and crimes of Salem to be re-enacted throughout our land. "We are not better than our fathers." They who clamor for power which they have no right to use, will be sure to use it when it is obtained. And when the flood-gates of persecution are once opened, no power can stay the current until it has left desolation and ruin in its course.

From the course pursued by the Amendmentists, and their unwillingness to candidly examine reasons, and weigh the consequences which must follow their schemes, we fear they will not be warned to desist from their work. But if they do succeed, we are fully determined that the wrong shall not lie at our door. We shall continue to sound the alarm whether they will hear or forbear.

J. H. W.

#### A Political Gospel.

MRS. MARY A. WOODBRIDGE, recording secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and vice-president of the National Reform Association, made the principal National Reform speech, at Chautauqua Assembly on National Reform Day, July 23. Among many other such like things in her speech we find the following:—

"Shall we not amend our National Constitution, that the world shall know that we acknowledge Christ as Ruler? as the Head of our Nation? and in his name, and for his glory, shall not 'We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union, thus 'ordain'? While we render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, shall we not render unto God the things that are God's?"

To render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's, is eminently sound and practical Christian doctrine. But the practice of that principle is not at all what the National Reformers want the people of this Nation to do. The National Reformers not only want us to render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, but they want to compel us to render to Cæsar that which is God's. This we, under Christ, deny their right to do; and by his help, it is what we will never submit to do.

In these words Christ established a clear dis-

inction between Cæsar and God, between that which is Cæsar's and that which is God's; that is, between the civil and the religious power, and between what we owe to the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. We owe to Cæsar, the civil power, that which is civil: we owe to God, the religious power, that which is religious. This is the distinction which God, in Christ, has absolutely fixed. Whoever seeks to confound this distinction is against God and against Christ; to join, or to seek to join, the religious with the civil power is to confound the distinction; and to join the religious with the civil power is precisely what the National Reform party proposes to do. The logical conclusion from this is clear, and we do not hesitate to say that it is strictly according to Scripture and, therefore, perfectly true.

For the State to enforce religious duties it thereby demands that to Cæsar shall be rendered that which is God's, and therefore it usurps the place of God, and so far as it is obeyed, it destroys the true worship of God. We know the claim that these men make, as of all of their kind in the dreadful history of persecution everywhere, that is, that it is the true worship of God and of Christ which they ask that the civil power shall enforce, and this according to the Bible. But no such thing can be done. Christ did not say that we should render to Cæsar that which is God's; neither did he say that we should render to God *by Cæsar* that which is God's. That which is God's is his, and we are to render it to him direct, without any of the meddling mediumship of Cæsar. When we have rendered to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, we have rendered to Cæsar all his due and he has no right to demand any more. And when he has so received his just due on all his proper claims, then what business is it of Cæsar's how we render to God that which is God's or whether we render it at all or not?—It is just none of his business. And when he seeks to make it his business he is meddling with that which in no wise concerns him. One of the unbecoming and irreverent results of such action is well expressed by Gibbon, in speaking of Constantine and his sons:—

“Those princes presumed to extend their despotism over the faith, as well as over the lives and fortunes of their subjects; and the prerogatives of the King of Heaven were settled, or changed, or modified, in the cabinet of an earthly monarch.”—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 21, par. 16.

Could anything possibly be more incongruous! It is just such incongruity that these words of Christ are intended forever to prevent. Yet history is full of it, and, while our own Government has escaped it so far, now the National Reform party seeks by the subversion of the Constitution to inflict it upon this great Nation.

Whenever the civil power steps between a man and God and proposes to regulate just what shall be rendered to God and just how it shall be rendered, then Cæsar is entirely out of his place. George Washington was a man for whose opinions we suppose there is yet remaining some respect on the part of Americans, and he said:—

“I have often expressed my opinion, that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience.”

We say again, that in the words, “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's,” Matt. 22:21, Christ separated forever the civil from the religious power. And the National Reform party in its endeavor to join them, clearly sets itself against the word of Christ.

But the National Reform idea of the work of the gospel is as crude as its idea of the relation of the civil and the religious power. Mrs. Woodbridge says further:—

“An amendment to the National Constitution requires the endorsement of two-thirds of the States, to become law. Although the action must be taken by State Legislative bodies, let such an amendment be submitted, and it would become the paramount issue at the election of legislators, and thus God would be in the thought, and his name upon the lip of every man. May not this be the way opened to us? How to bring the gospel of Christ to the masses, has been, and is, the vexing problem of the church. Would not the problem be solved? . . . In considering the submission of such an amendment, we may use the very argument used by Moses, in his song containing these words of Jehovah, ‘For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life; and through this thing ye shall prolong your days in the land.’ How prayerfulness would be stimulated! Conscience would press the words, ‘If the Lord be God, follow him, but if Baal, then follow him.’ Then would there be searchings of heart, as David's, of which we learn in the fifty-first Psalm. Prayer would bring faith and the power of the Spirit: and when such power shall rest upon the children of God, there *will* be added to the church daily such as shall be saved.”

Oh yes! to be sure! What a most excellent method of bringing the gospel (?) to the masses! Most assuredly the problem would be solved. This scheme has been tried, and the problem solved, before, and in much the same way. By making the subject of the Trinitarian controversy a national and governmental issue the name of God and of Christ was “upon every lip,” clubs, stones, or military weapons, in the hands, and murder in the heart, of every man. Thus the gospel was brought to the masses, and so there *was* added to the church daily such as should be ———. Especially in the city of Rome, by this means, the masses became so devout, that in the most exciting and decisive moment of a horse-race, the whole multitude in the vast circus could in an instant turn their minds to the gospel (?) and shout “One God, One Christ, One Bishop.” And, by the way, the women were among the leaders, and were the main help in bringing about this triumph of the gospel among the masses at a horse-race in the Roman circus. Thus, in that age, was the gospel brought to the masses; thus, then, was the problem solved. And “history repeats itself,” even to the part the women play in the political project of bringing the gospel to the masses.—See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. 21, par. 35.

But illustrations are hardly needed to show how entirely foreign to the gospel of Christ are

such propositions and such arguments as we here present from the Chautauqua National Reform Speech.

Such stuff needs but to be read to be condemned utterly by every one who has any respect for the gospel or for its Author. But if the reading of this is not enough to condemn both it and the cause in behalf of which it must be used, then we shall insert just one more sentence from the very midst of whence these are copied. Immediately following the words, “Would not the problem be solved?” are these:—

“Yea, Christ would then be lifted up, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and would we not have right to claim the fulfillment of the promise, that ‘He will draw all men unto himself?’”

To think of a political campaign managed by ambitious clerics, political hypocrites, ward politicians, and city bosses, and call that bringing the gospel of Christ to the masses, and the means of adding to the church daily such as shall be saved, is certainly a conception of the gospel of Christ which is degrading enough in all conscience. But when to cap such a conception, it is avowed that such would be the lifting up of Christ, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and the fulfillment of the promise that he will draw all men unto him, the whole idea becomes one that is vastly nearer to open blasphemy than it is to the proper conception of the gospel of Christ. But such, and of such, is the gospel of National Reform. A. T. J.

#### The American Constitution.

THE following magnificent tribute to the Constitution of our country is from Bancroft's “History of the Formation of the Constitution.” And this is the charter of human liberty and natural right with which the National Reformers are displeased, and which they are determined to subvert. Such a wish can spring from nothing else than a desire to exercise a power that is in violation of the natural rights of mankind:—

“The Constitution establishes nothing that interferes with equality and individuality. It knows nothing of differences by descent, or opinions of favored classes, or legalized religion, or the political power of property. It leaves the individual alongside of the individual. No nationality of character could take form, except on the principle of individuality, so that the mind might be free, and every faculty have the unlimited opportunity for its development and culture. As the sea is made up of drops, American society is composed of separate, free, and constantly moving atoms, ever in reciprocal action, advancing, receding, crossing, struggling against each other and with each other; so that the institutions and laws of the country rise out of the masses of individual thought, which, like the waters of the ocean, are rolling evermore.

“The rule of individuality was extended as never before. The Synod of the Presbyterians of New York and Philadelphia, a denomination inflexibly devoted to its own creed, in their

pastoral letter of May, 1783, published their joy that "the rights of conscience are inalienably secured and interwoven with the very Constitutions of the several States." Religion was become avowedly the attribute of man and not of a corporation. In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and of these protectors one after another might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian war grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation—the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest form—when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."

THE word God was not accidentally left out of the Constitution. It was most reverentially left out of it by the God-fearing men who drew the instrument, because it had no business there. It was the purpose of the founders of our Government to make it purely secular. It was a mere federation or union of States for purely worldly purposes. It did not claim to have any divine authority or sanction, but only the consent of the people. It did not establish any religion, because it guaranteed entire religious freedom. The word God has no more business in the Constitution than it has in articles of co-partnership, or in a promissory note. A promissory note would not be a whit more negotiable if it should contain a "recognition of God." This should be equally true of the State Government or of the United States Government. Entire religious freedom requires it; for as soon as the word God enters the organic law of a State, there is the necessary implica-

tion that the State has religious authority, and this is incompatible with absolute freedom of conscience.—*Baltimore American.*

### State Recognition of Christianity.

THE advocates of the so-called "National Reform" claim that we do them injustice by asserting that they are working for a union of Church and State, and that if their movement shall succeed they will persecute people for conscience' sake. They say that we either misunderstand the principles of "National Reform" or else we willfully misrepresent them. We claim that we do neither. We get our ideas of the "National Reform" movement from its official organs, and give the people the utterances of its advocates just as we find them published. True, they deny that they are working for a union of Church and State, and we publish their denial; but unfortunately for them their arguments go to show that Church and State union is the real object of their ambition.

In the *Christian Nation* for July 7 and 14, 1886, we find an article bearing the same title as the one at the head of this article. It is by the late Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and is edited from the original manuscript by the Rev. R. M. Sommerville, New York. The *Christian Nation* is devoted to the interests of the "National Reform" movement, and was endorsed by the Annual Convention of the National Reform Association, Pittsburg, Pa., April, 1885; consequently whatever we find in it may be regarded as official.

The article in question starts out with the statements that the Bible is a revelation from God; that it will make wise unto salvation all who receive it; that no one can know by intuition what the Scriptures teach, but that they must be searched, and that the obligation to search the Scriptures rests upon all men. To these propositions we give a most hearty assent. We also agree with Mr. Sommerville that there are "great difficulties to be encountered in the study of the divine word," and that for these difficulties the word itself is not responsible, but that they arise from education, from the current of public sentiment, from its bearing on our worldly interests and prospects, and from a determination to find in it what it was never intended to teach. We also believe that "the great difficulty, and that from which all others derive their existence or their force, is the depravity of the human heart, and our natural enmity to God. There is the reluctance to submit the judgment, the every thought, to the teachings of the Spirit. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

These propositions are sound, but the conclusion which Mr. Sommerville presumes to draw from them is unsound to the same degree. He says:—

"This consideration suggests the imperative obligation to place men who have the Spirit at the political helm. Those who are expected correctly to apply the word of the Spirit are such as have the Spirit. The seventy elders

who are called to assist Moses in the government of Israel, are made partakers of the Spirit of the Lord, by whose directions they are brought forward. When Moses asks a successor, he is directed to take Joshua, a man in whom was the Spirit, and to lay his hands upon him, and to set him before all the people. Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.' The recognized minister of God must, in all cases, be one who has the Spirit of God."

Let us be sure that we do not misunderstand this matter. It is imperatively necessary that only men who have the Spirit should be placed at the political helm. If this were carried out, it would involve the striking out of the last clause of Article Six of the United States Constitution, which reads, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Now since religion and the church are inseparable it follows that what Mr. Sommerville considers an "imperative obligation" is nothing less than the union of Church and State.

Indeed, the latter part of the paragraph which we have quoted would indicate so close a union of Church and State that they will be identical. He would have the civil rulers correspond to the seventy leaders appointed to assist Moses in the government of Israel. But the Government of Israel was a theocracy, and in a theocracy the Government is the church. Among the Jews there were not two distinct organizations, the Church and the State, but every circumcised Jew was a member of the church, and circumcision was the badge of nationality. What Mr. Sommerville here implies, other national reformers openly assert, namely, that this Government ought to be modeled after the Jewish Government, and that this will be the case when their movement succeeds. Mr. Sommerville says, "Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.'" Remember that he is not giving a homily on the early Christian church, but is writing about State recognition of Christianity; and if the sentence which we have just quoted has anything to do with his subject, it means that the civil rulers of the United States should be regarded simply as ministers to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. And this agrees exactly with what Mr. Foster says in a *Statesman* of March, 1884: "The State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church." If this does not imply union of Church and State we would like to have the National Reformers tell us what in their estimation would constitute such a union.

We would not be understood as implying that there was anything wrong in the Government of Israel. That form of government was instituted by the Lord himself. He chose the Jews as his peculiar people, and constituted himself their sole ruler. The men who were directly over the people were not chosen by the people, but were appointed by the Lord, and they received directly from the mouth of the Lord instruction as to how the people should be governed. But none of these things can be paralleled in the United States, even though the

National Reformers succeed in changing the Constitution to suit their own ideas; for the Lord has nowhere stated that he has chosen the people of the United States as his own peculiar people. On the contrary, we are told that he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Moreover the National Reformers themselves do not claim that in the proposed new order of government God will himself appoint the rulers, for they expect that the rulers will be elected by the people, just as they are now. And they certainly are not so wild as to suppose that the rulers whom they may elect will be in personal connection with Heaven. Therefore while their proposed amendment will indeed be a union of Church and State, the union will not have the sanction of God, but will be an unlawful union. It will be in his sight adultery. By that unlawful union the church will be in the condition described in Rev. 18: 1-3.

But Mr. Sommerville continues:—

"Civil rulers, then, are not sent to Rome or to Geneva, to Canterbury or Edinburgh, for information whether an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws, is to be accepted; but, with all confidence, to the Word. There is no more difficulty pressing on the magistrate than on any other individual in determining what is to be his course, that he may honor the Sovereign at the head of his body, the church."

This is in perfect accord with his idea that the State and the Church are to be identical, for he would have "an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws" accepted by the civil rulers. True he says that the rulers should go to the Bible to determine the proper creed, form of worship, and laws of the church that should be accepted by them, and says that the magistrate would have no more difficulty in determining his course in such a matter than any other individual; but when we consider how many differences of opinion there are on these points, even among those who profess to be led by the Spirit; we can see only one way in which a magistrate could solve the problem with ease, and that would be to accept and uphold the creed, form of worship, and laws of that association which elected him to his position.

Mr. Sommerville proceeds: "Knowing then, the church, what is his [the magistrate's] duty respecting it?" and answers his question as follows:—

"It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the Nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its Constitution and object."

This answer is plain enough even if it is not grammatically expressed. Civil rulers are to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. This recognition, moreover, is not simply an acknowledgement of the church's existence, but is to take the form of a statutory arrangement to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church "in conformity with its Constitution and object." The meaning of this is

made still more clear by the writer. He says further in the same article:—

"Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to 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."

And then he adds:—

"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."

The latter part of this last paragraph is eminently true. The gospel is indeed designed to purify corrupted, disorderly, and degraded human nature, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And the church is the channel through which the design of the gospel is to be effected. But Mr. Sommerville says, as quoted above, that it is the duty of civil rulers to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church in conformity with its Constitution and object; which is equivalent to saying that it is the duty of the State to compel men to accept the gospel. In other words, what the church ought to do by persuasion, Mr. Sommerville would have the State do by force.

Note carefully the first part of the paragraph last quoted. Mr. Sommerville says that it is most certainly right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed. This can mean nothing less than that according to National Reform principles it is right to compel people to accept customs to which they are conscientiously opposed, and to make them contribute the means for this purpose. For he does not say simply, that it is right to take public money to teach principles to which many members of the community may be conscientiously opposed; that might be endured; but he says that the State may enforce church laws and customs, in opposition to the conscientious convictions of some of the citizens, provided, of course, it is only the minority that are thus opposed. But in any government the laws are enforced not upon one class of citizens but upon all; the law knows no difference in persons. Therefore we are justified in concluding that if Mr. Sommerville and the *Christian Nation* are competent exponents of National Reform doctrine, that doctrine contemplates nothing less than the compelling of every individual in the United States to conform to one certain set of religious laws, customs, and usages. This cannot be endured by freemen.

If in this article we have in any way misrepresented "National Reform" we shall esteem it a favor if some of its devotees will tell us wherein. If we have not, then it is as clear as the noonday sun that "National Reform" means a union of Church and State. National Reformers cannot deny this conclusion without recalling their indorsement of the *Christian Nation*.

E. J. W.

### A Precursor of National Reform.

THE matter is stated in few words and is as follows: It seems that some Seventh-day Adventists were holding meetings in Chicago. One of their preachers, Elder R. M. Kilgore delivered a sermon on the National Reform movement, taking the same position in regard to it that the SENTINEL does—that persecution for conscience' sake will inevitably follow the success of National Reform. In proof of this Mr. Kilgore states that already in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, there has been persecution, even to fine and imprisonment, of members of that denomination for working on Sunday after having conscientiously and religiously observed the seventh day according to the commandment of God. The sermon was printed in the *Inter Ocean*.

Now the *Christian Cynosure* is also printed in Chicago, and its editor, President Blanchard, of Wheaton College, is one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. The *Cynosure* found the sermon in the *Inter Ocean*, and as the preacher, it seems, had struck pretty close to home, the *Cynosure*, making the slight mistake of thinking the preacher a Seventh-day Baptist, commented upon the subject as follows, under the title of "A Sad Mistake Somewhere":—

"Elder R. M. Kilgore (Seventh-day Baptist) is thus reported in the *Inter Ocean*, July 19: 'What is the significance of the National Reform movement which is agitating our country from center to circumference? What is the aim of this great party? It is to unite Church and State. It is to change our Constitution so as to restrict the rights of conscience.' And further on: 'Already persecution has broken out in Arkansas, Tennessee and Pennsylvania, and those who worship God according to the teachings of God's word are suffering under this [Sabbath] law.'

The president of the National Reform Association is Felix R. Brunot, understood to be an Episcopalian. There are some one hundred vice-presidents, more or less, of whom the editor of the *Cynosure* is one. Bishop Huntington is, and the late Bishop Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal church was another, and one hundred men could not be selected in the United States to whom the idea of 'Church and State,' the coercing of conscience by the civil law, would be more abhorrent than to the list of vice-presidents which have for years been published in the organ of that body, which seeks a recognition of God as the author of civil government. And if there are Seventh-day Baptists now in jail, or fined, because, having kept Saturday as their Sabbath, they have refused to keep Sunday also, their names and the jails where they are confined should be published at once.

"The American people have for years gone the length of tolerating Mormon Danites and polygamists, who practiced polygamy and assassination and called that religion; and will they punish, by fine and imprisonment, civil, orderly Christians who only differ from them as to the hours of Sabbath rest? Nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than such persecution."

When the *Cynosure* was issued which contained this, Mr. Kilgore happened to be in Arkansas, and he immediately answered the call of the *Cynosure* for names, etc., as follows, and his letter was printed in the *Cynosure* of August 12, 1886:—

"EDITOR *Christian Cynosure*: In your issue of

July 29, 1886, you refer to the sermon given by myself, as reported in the *Inter Ocean*, July 19, in which it was stated that 'the aim of the National Reform Association was to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States, thereby making our Nation a Christian nation, thus forming a union of Church and State, and restricting the rights of conscience; that already persecution has broken out in Arkansas, Tennessee, etc., and those who worship God according to the teachings of God's word, are suffering under this Sunday law.'

"This article is called forth in response to your statement, that 'if there are Seventh-day Baptists now in jail or fined because, having kept Saturday as their Sabbath, they have refused to keep Sunday also, their names and the jails where they are confined should be published at once.'

"We are Seventh-day Adventists not Seventh-day Baptists, and as I am now on the ground where our brethren are feeling the effects of this bitter spirit of persecution, I am glad to give you and your readers the desired information.

"Two years ago a church of Seventh-day Adventists was raised up in this place (Springdale, Ark.). Last fall they erected a house of worship, and for painting, one Sunday, on the rear of the house, unseen from the road, Elder J. W. Scoles was indicted by the Grand Jury at Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark., tried, convicted, and fined by the Circuit Court. An appeal was taken, and the case is now pending the action of the Supreme Court of the State. James Poole, of the same county, a conscientious Sabbath-keeper, for pulling weeds in his garden on Sunday morning, was indicted by the Grand Jury and fined by the same court, though he had attended public worship in the forenoon and afternoon, four miles from his home. William Martin was indicted by the same jury for sowing oats, and tried before the Circuit Court, but the jury disagreed. J. M. Davis was indicted by the Grand Jury for 'harrowing oats on the Christian Sabbath or Sunday,' and tried before the Circuit Court, but failing to sustain the charge, the court picked up a man who swore that he saw Mr. Davis hauling wood on Sunday, and without even an indictment for said offense, the court fined him and taxed him the costs. F. M. Elmore, for three minutes' labor on Sunday, was indicted, convicted, and fined in the Circuit Court of this county. The second arrest of J. A. Armstrong, of Springdale, was effected July 9, for digging potatoes on Sunday for the table. In four hours after his arrest he was on his way to jail at Fayetteville, where he was kept five days to commute the fine imposed upon him, which he refused to pay, and thus honor an unjust law and a partial administration which oppressed the conscientious observers of the Fourth Commandment, while others who observed neither day were permitted to go unmolested. The railroad cars could rumble, and carry their heavy burdens, and the loud voice of the locomotive could be heard more than once every Sunday, and yet go unrebuked. The factory could ply its vocation and keep its servants at work every Sunday; the hotels could send their runners to each train soliciting patronage and collect their fees for labor performed on Sunday without a word of censure from the authorities. Other citizens could drive their hogs to market; livery teams could be hired to pleasure-seekers and money exchanged for such service, and no one was disturbed enough to take cognizance of the matter, and report it to the Grand Jury; and when the jury was told of these breaches of the law, by a Sabbath-keeper who was summoned to testify against a brother, no notice was taken of them, while the brother was arrested and fined for wielding, quietly, a paint-

brush, after he had conscientiously observed the day before as the Sabbath, according to the commandment of God.

"Allen Meek, of Star of the West, Pike County, was indicted by the Grand Jury for planting potatoes on Sunday morning, on the testimony forced from a friend who was visiting him. While the case was pending in the court he was cited to appear on Monday morning twenty-five miles distant. The road being rough he was compelled to repair the break in his wagon on Sunday. He was again indicted and fined for that offense, on the testimony of a man who came to see him on business. The man who came on business could go home free after causing the arrest of the Sabbath-keeper. Others with whom I am personally acquainted in this same county, and whose names I could give, have also been arrested and fined in this same manner.

"Any one can see that it is not because the Sunday law is broken, or that these good and conscientious Sabbath-keepers make more noise or disturbance than others; but the strong arm of the law is the best argument that can be wielded against their faith and practice. However 'abhorrent to our Constitution such persecution' may appear to the editor of the *Cynosure*, we are now realizing its effects."

It is true that "nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution" than is such persecution; but it is the purpose of the National Reform party to *subvert our Constitution* so that such persecution, instead of being merely local and perhaps temporary, may be made national and permanent.

But see the infamous meanness of this Arkansas iniquity—even to the forcing from a guest, evidence by which to convict the one whose hospitality he had enjoyed. And all this not for any "matter of wrong or of wicked lewdness;"—if it were that, like Gallio of old, reason would that it should be borne with,—but for simply pulling a few weeds in the garden, or digging a few potatoes for dinner, and this too not only after having religiously kept one day, but after having attended public worship twice on the same day. If there is anybody in the United States who wants to see in free America anything more like to the Inquisition than is this, just let him work for National Reform.

If it be true, as the *Cynosure* says, that this persecution is "abhorrent" to President Brunot, the editor of the *Cynosure* and the one hundred or more other vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, then it is high time for them to take their names from the list of officers, and separate themselves from the work, of that Association. To force all people in these United States, without any distinction at all, to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, is the purpose of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution and the laws that shall be enacted under it. And that is simply to make possible in all this Nation the enactment of such scenes as these which have been enacted in Arkansas. That President Brunot and his associate officers in that association would abhor such persecution, does not help the matter a particle. They are doing their very best to establish a system of government and laws under which it will be possible for such persecution to be inflicted by those who do not abhor it, but who on the contrary are bigoted and fanatical enough to enjoy it.

Admit that these men are so humane that they would shrink from the enforcement of such laws, such consideration does not in the least relieve them from the responsibility so long as they persist in doing their utmost to make it possible for the fanatic or the savage to enforce the laws which they put into his hands. George Bancroft truly says: "As the humane ever decline to enforce the laws dictated by bigotry, the office devolves on the fanatic or the savage. Hence the severity of their execution usually surpasses the intention of their authors." Doubtless there are people in Arkansas who favored the enactment of these laws, who are now shocked at such an enforcement of them. But that does not relieve them of the responsibility, they had no business, much less had they any right, to enact such laws. So we say of these men who favor the National Reform movement. It matters not how humane, nor how eminent for Christian character, they may be, they are but playing into the hands of the fanatic and the man of savage disposition. If they so abhor persecution just let them withhold from such characters as these the power to persecute. It certainly is not too much to ask President Brunot and his associates to deny themselves this luxury, but we know it is more than they will deny themselves. Only a few years ago, there was introduced into the Pennsylvania Legislature a bill to exempt Seventh-day Baptists from the rigors of such laws as these in Arkansas, and the most active man in Pennsylvania for the defeat of that bill was Felix R. Brunot, in his official capacity as president of the National Reform Association: *and the bill was defeated*. So it would fairly seem that so far as he is concerned the statement of the *Cynosure* is entirely gratuitous, and we very much fear that it is so also, of the majority of the one hundred or more of his associate officers of the National Reform Association.

Again we say, It is true that nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than is such persecution. But it is the purpose of the National Reform party to subvert the Constitution so that such persecution shall become national. And that is why we abhor the principles and the work of the National Reform Association. And they ought to be abhorred by all men who love liberty and human right.

A. T. J.

To PRETEND to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God; by the nature of things the power of sovereigns is confined to practical government; they have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace; the most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.—*Theodoric the Ostrogoth, A. D. 500.*

RELIGION is essentially distinct from human government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both. There are causes in the human breast which insure the perpetuity of religion without the aid of the law.—*Madison.*

**Religious Teaching by the State.**

CONCEDE the principle that religion, either as an end or a means, falls properly within the administrative agency of the State, and the inference is irresistible that the State must have a religion to administer; that it must determine what that religion shall be; and that it must and should appoint suitable persons to do the executive part of the work. We have no difficulty with the natural and necessary modes of making the principle effective—none whatever—since they result from it by inevitable sequence. Nor have we any scruples about the so-called rights of dissentient minorities, since there are no such rights, provided the principle be a sound one. They have no right to be talking about the rights of conscience against the just exercise of the powers of the State. They are by the very terms of the case mere grumblers. The administration of religion being one of the functions of the State, then the State must, of course, follow its own conscience, just as it does when it hangs a murderer; and the individual who, on the score of his private conscience, gets in the way of the State conscience, must get out of the way or be crushed by it. He has no right to arrest or control the action of the State conscience with his private judgment, since the former is only exercising its legitimate powers and discharging its duty. It is a mere farce to talk about the rights of an individual and unofficial conscience against the operations of a government that is acting within the scope of its appropriate powers. There can be no such rights in consistency with the existence of government. Where a government has jurisdiction it must judge of its own duties. Grant that religion comes within this jurisdiction, and that is the end of the question. The procedures in asserting and exercising it follow as a matter of course.

Our great difficulty with the doctrine of those who demand that the State shall become a religious propagandist in its school system, is with the principle that lies at its bottom, and not at all with the details of its execution, however stringent or seemingly severe, provided they are necessary to the end. Their doctrine logically commits them to the principle of State jurisdiction and State duties in respect to things spiritual; and if they refuse to accept the consequences, no matter whether they are Protestants or Catholics, then they are afraid of their own creed. If, on the other hand, they carry out the principle and make it a living and operative power, and not a mere sham for the sake of appearances, then, alas! for the real rights of conscience and the liberties of men, they land us, body and soul, into the system of *State religion*—namely, religion defined by the State, taught by the State, supported as a charge upon its treasury, and, if necessary, penally enforced by the State. This is all very well for *them*, since they always assume their religion and that of the State to be identical. How would it be if the fact were just the reverse? This question, bigotry, whether in a Catholic or a Protestant bosom, seldom has time to consider. When Protestant and Puritan New England hung witches and persecuted Quakers, and when Roger Williams was ban-

ished from his home on pain of death, things moved along very finely for the religionists in power; but not as smoothly with the victims of their mistaken and maddened zeal. The principle upon which these religionists acted, being conceded and developed, with no limitations except those furnished by itself, sets the State to doing a thing which does not belong to it and which, if it be true to its own position, will be sure to make it a persecuting power.

Macaulay well says that "the experience of many ages proves that men may be ready to fight to the death and to persecute without pity for a religion whose creed they do not understand, and whose precepts they habitually disobey." Many a dark chapter in history confirms the truth of this remark. The moment religion is in any way armed with the civil power the fatal step is taken.

We deny the rightfulness of the power in this connection by entering a universal demurrer to its action. We deny that the State has the right to tax the Jew to propagate Christianity, or to make infidels help to liquidate the expense account of a religion which they repudiate. We place this denial on the broad ground that religion in itself, in its very nature, in the processes of its culture and promotion, in its relations to God and the interests of another life, lies above and beyond the jurisdiction of the State, unless God himself has constituted that State. The State is not an exhorter, or a persuader, or a debating club, but a positive law power for secular purposes; and, hence, when it attempts to administer religion it must of necessity give to it the law force, deciding what religion is true and by what methods it shall be promoted. There is no escape from this result if we admit the principle from which it springs; and, the principle being true, then the result is right. If religious teaching is really one of the proper functions of the State, then all that is necessary to the end, of which the State itself must be the judge, is included therein. Moreover, the implications of the function need only to be fully drawn out to cover the whole ground of State religion, with all its ways and means.

To the authority of the State when acting within its appropriate sphere every citizen should cheerfully bow, supporting it, if necessary, by the sword. If it be a democratic State, the will of the majority, legally expressed, should be the rule for the whole. But when the State engages in the work of religious teaching, whether in the public school or elsewhere, and does the things which must be done to realize the end, then it not only disowns the elementary principles of a democratic government, but is guilty of a legal usurpation, against which every lover of liberty, be he saint or sinner, Protestant or Catholic, ought to protest in thunder-notes.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

NATIONS have sincere piety only in those countries where one may love God and the Christian religion with one's whole soul without losing, and especially without obtaining, any worldly advantage by the manifestation of that sentiment.—*Madame De Staël.*

WHY do the people imagine a vain thing?

**OXFORD TEACHERS' BIBLES.**

PRICES AND STYLES OF BINDING.

**Pearl 16mo.** (Size 4x5½x1¼ inches.)

(Page for Page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
500.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.25
501.	French Morocco, circuit.....	1.40
502.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	1.35
509.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	2.15
513.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	2.50
514.	As No. 513, with round corners.....	2.60
510.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.20
511½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.35
512.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	2.70
515.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined.....	4.00
515½.	As No. 515, with round corners.....	4.15

Postage, 10 cents extra.

**Pearl 16mo.** India paper edition. (Size 4x5½x1 inches.)

(*The smallest Teachers' Bible in the World.*)

NOS.		
514x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$3.25
515½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	5.50

Postage, 8 cents extra.

**Ruby 16mo.** (Size 4¼x6½x1½ inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
550.	French Morocco, boards.....	\$1.90
551.	French Morocco, circuit.....	2.30
552.	French Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.20
559.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed.....	3.00
563.	As No. 563, with round corners.....	3.15
560.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	2.70
561½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	2.85
562.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	3.75
565.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	4.65
565½.	As No. 565, with round corners.....	4.80
566.	As No. 565½, Brown Levant.....	4.80
571.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	7.00

Postage, 12 cents extra.

**Ruby 16mo.** India paper edition. (Size 4¼x6½x1 inches.)

NOS.		
564x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$4.50
561½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	4.50
565½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	6.50
566x.	As No. 565½x, Brown Levant.....	6.50
571x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.50

Postage, 9 cents extra.

**Nonpareil 8vo.** (Size 4½x7x1¼ inches.)

(An entirely new edition. Page for page with the *Minion 8vo.*)

NOS.		
604.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, round corners.....	\$4.00
600.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.00
601½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.15
602.	Turkey Morocco, circuit.....	5.00
605.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.35
605½.	As No. 605, with round corners.....	5.50
606.	As No. 605½, Brown Levant.....	5.50
671.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	8.00

Postage, 16 cents extra.

**Nonpareil 8vo.** Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7x1¼ inches.)

NOS.		
604x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$5.75
601½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	5.50
605½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
606x.	As No. 605½x, Brown Levant.....	7.75
671x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.50

Postage, 11 cents extra.

**Minion 8vo.** (Size 5x7¾x1½ inches.)

NOS.		
707.	Persian Seal, limp, round corners.....	\$ 4.30
709.	Persian Seal, limp, solid covers, round corners.....	5.00
713.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit.....	4.70
714.	As No. 713, with round corners.....	4.85
710.	Turkey Morocco, boards.....	4.50
711½.	Turkey Morocco, limp, round corners.....	4.65
715.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed.....	5.70
715½.	As No. 715, with round corners.....	5.85
721.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	5.85
722.	Seal Skin, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold solid edges, round corners.....	11.00

Postage, 18 cents extra.

**Minion 8vo.** Thin paper edition. (Size 5x7¾x1 inches.)

*The S. S. Superintendents' Edition.*

NOS.		
714x.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	\$ 7.00
711½x.	Turkey Morocco, loose limp, round corners, silk sewed.....	6.75
715½x.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	9.00
716x.	As No. 715½x, Brown Levant.....	9.00
721x.	Best Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, red under gold edges, round corners.....	12.00

Postage, 13 cents extra.

**Minion small 4to.** (Size 7x3¾x1¼ inches.)

*With Wide Margin for MSS. Notes.*

NOS.		
905.	Persian Morocco, limp.....	\$ 7.50
911.	Turkey Morocco, limp.....	8.75
915½.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	12.50

Postage, 32 cents extra.

**Brevier 8vo.** (Size 5¼x8½x1½ inches.)

NOS.		
810.	Turkey Morocco, boards, family register.....	\$ 7.00
811.	Turkey Morocco, limp, family register.....	7.00
814.	Persian Seal, Divinity circuit, silk sewed, round corners.....	7.75
815½.	Levant, Divinity circuit, kid lined, silk sewed, round corners.....	10.25

Postage, 23 cents extra.

Any books from the foregoing list can be had with Denison's Patent Index. Price, \$1.25 extra.  
When ordering Bibles be sure to give the numbers of those you wish sent.

Address all orders to PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

# The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., OCTOBER, 1886.

SAYS REV. C. E. WALKER in the *Christian Nation*:—

"As a nation we have suffered judgments, and will suffer yet more, far more, unless the people return to God as directed by the *National Reform Association*."

We are to understand then, we suppose, that in the matter of the Nation's returning to God, the sole direction is committed to the National Reform Association. For our part we choose to follow the directions of the word of God.

## Enemies of Religious Liberty.

PRESIDENT BRUNOT says that the sixth article of the Constitution, which declares that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and the First Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," are "essential to the preservation of religious liberty, and with it, an effective guard against 'a union of Church and State.'"

Now the National Reform party proposes to change Article Six of the Constitution so that a religious test shall be required not only as a qualification to office or public trust, but to citizenship as well. That party likewise proposes to change the First Amendment to the Constitution so that Congress shall make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore the National Reformers in working for the destruction of that which is an effective guard against a union of Church and State, show themselves in favor of a union of Church and State; and in working for the destruction of that which is essential to the preservation of religious liberty, they show themselves the enemies of religious liberty.

## "Reformed" Political Methods.

THE National Reformers claim that the passage of the religious amendment will thoroughly reform politics; indeed, some have gone so far as to claim that its enforcement would solve the problem of how to reach the masses with the gospel, for at the polls every voter would learn of it. Accordingly we anxiously look for the indications of reform, and the first thing that comes to our notice is that in a convention recently held in Mattoon, Ill., to secure the passage of a Sunday law, one minister stated that he could "control" 700 votes, and two other ministers stated that they could each "control" 300 votes. We conclude that the man who is able to "control" the most votes will be accounted the most successful minister of the "gospel." If they can only imbue some New York politicians with National Reform ideas, what zealous evangelists they would make! Their experience in ward politics would prove such an aid to them in this new method of preaching the gospel, since they so well know how to "control" votes. This is the kind of

"reform" that "National Reform" will give. In any unholy alliance the union takes the character of the baser party. When the church adopts the methods of the world, it must necessarily become like the world. This "reform" is a backward one. The world reforms the church according to its own model. "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned? Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned?"

## Recognition of Christianity Demanded.

UNDER the above heading the *Watchman* (Baptist) of Boston, gives the following report of a National Reform meeting at Saratoga:—

"In spite of the hard rain on Monday evening, August 16, a large meeting was held at the First Presbyterian Church at Saratoga, N. Y., in the interest of the National Reform Association, the purpose of which is to extend the Christian features in our Government, and particularly to introduce the name of God and of Christ into the Constitution of the United States. Rev. W. R. Terrett, of Saratoga Springs, presided, and the vice-presidents included Rev. Drs. Herrick Johnson of Chicago; B. L. Agnew of Philadelphia, and other distinguished clergymen and laymen from all parts of the country. Addresses were made by Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, and Rev. Dr. J. P. Stevenson, of New Jersey. A letter was also read from Rev. Joseph Cook, expressing his strong sympathy with the movement, and quoting a passage from Daniel Webster's great argument in the Stephen Girard will case, in which he said that Christianity was a part of the common law of the land."

## An Epistle "in Love."

IN an article on another page of this paper, we have given some facts in relation to the way in which American citizens are treated in the State of Arkansas, when they choose to keep Saturday as the Sabbath. Much the same thing has been repeated in Tennessee, and as the following will show, certain persons in Alabama, are anxious that that State shall follow suit. There are some Seventh-day Baptists down there, who properly enough go quietly about their own business on Sunday after having kept what they conscientiously believe to be the Sabbath. This has stirred up a certain "Professor T. E. Hudson," to write to the *Pick and Shovel*, a weekly paper published at Attalla, Alabama. From Mr. Hudson's contribution we clip the following:—

"Remember you are guilty when you furnish land, stock, and work to a people who habitually violate this sacred day. If they conscientiously believe Saturday to be the day of rest, let them go where that day is observed. If they cannot conform to the decision of the large majority of this Christian people, I ask, in the name of all that is sacred and good, shall we conform to the wicked decision of this hopeless few?"

And then to this exhibition of Christian charity (?) he has the exceeding abundant grace to subscribe himself "In love." But then we remember that it was entirely "in love" to their souls that for ages the Inquisition tormented men to death.

The Editor of the *Pick and Shovel* heartily indorses the very loving "Professor" as follows:—

"Prof. T. E. Hudson, in the above article, expresses our sentiments in regard to giving employment to the two or three Sabbath-breakers in our community. The men who rent them land or give them other employment, and allow them to do that work on Sunday are in a measure responsible to God.—EDITOR."

And all this because "two or three" men in a large community, choose to conscientiously disagree with the majority in a matter entirely religious, and in which they infringe upon no civil right whatever. If there is any one who thinks the spirit of Romanism and the Inquisition is dead, they would do well to look into the current Protestant literature on the Sunday question.

## Study the Constitution.

A SHORT time ago the Young Men's Christian Association held a reception at their hall in San Francisco. Judge Sawyer of the United States Circuit Court "made a few introductory remarks in which he endeavored to impress upon the Bible students the necessity of studying the political creed of their country as summed up in the Constitution of the United States."

Now Judge Sawyer is one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, whose purpose it is to obtain such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall declare that this is a Christian nation, and which will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government upon an undeniable legal basis in this charter of our Government, and to introduce "into the body of the Constitution such changes with respect to the oath of office and all other matters as may be necessary to give effect to this amendment." Whether or not Judge Sawyer desired to impress upon his audience the necessity of studying the Constitution as it now is, for the purpose of discovering wherein it will have to be changed to conform to the National Reform idea which he supports, we cannot say. But if, as that party declares, our Constitution is atheistical and only represents the atheistical idea in government, it would scarcely be appropriate or consistent for Christians and Bible students to study it with any other end in view. We, too, would impress upon the people in this Nation the necessity of studying the practical creed of our country as summed up in the Constitution as it is, so far as religion is concerned. And we would also impress upon them the necessity of studying it with especial reference to the subversive doctrines of the National Reform party of which Judge Sawyer is an officer.

## 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 to a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

### TERMS.

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

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