

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1888.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, } EDITORS.
ALONZO T. JONES, }
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

WHAT has a purely religious institution to do with the claims of a political? This country in its government knows no creed. As a people we disclaim religious tests. The observance of the Sabbath and the mode of that observance are matters of the individual conscience. This is the measure of our religious freedom, that we may believe or otherwise,—we may observe or otherwise,—just as seems to us good. Under what pretext, then, does a political party interfere with religious beliefs and observances? The fullest personal freedom is the proper condition for the existence of genuine religion.—*Washington Post.*

LIBERTY of conscience means non-interference by the State with private convictions. It means that so far as the State is concerned the individual has the right to his own private judgment in religious affairs. It means that neither shall preference be shown, nor punishment inflicted, by State authority, because of individual religious belief. It does not mean classification and preservation of the wards of the State for purposes of indoctrination by the Roman Catholic or any other church.

Religious worship is not a civil ordinance, any more than religious profession is a civil qualification. The obvious intent of the language of the Constitution is that the State shall be impartial, colorless, and unconscious in all that relates to individual religious opinions.

The moment the State, by legislative act, takes official cognizance of the distinctive claims of any sect,—the moment it admits, no matter how indirectly, as a civil incident, the fact of religious differences of opinion, that moment the spirit of our fundamental law is violated, and we cannot escape the danger of sectarian discrimination, preference, and consequent injustice, with the certainty that such distinction will also be applied to our public schools.

Any classification whatever on religious grounds, by State authority, will inevitably lead to bitter and acrimonious sectarian controversies, to social disorder, and would seriously imperil the peace of the community.

—Selected.

A Reply to "An Open Letter."

In the *Christian Nation* of December 14, 1887, there came to us "an open letter" from Mr. W. T. McConnell. Mr. McConnell lives in Youngstown, Ohio. He is a preacher of National Reform politics, and the president of the National Reform Prayer League. Somebody sent him a copy of the *SENTINEL*, and it caused him to have "some reflections," of which he gives us the benefit in his "open letter." He proposes to comfort us by an endeavor to make it appear that the troubles are only "imaginary," which we point out as certain to come upon the Nation in the train of the success of the National Reform movement.

He starts out with the usual National Reform compliment to an opponent—that of naming us along with "Liberal Leagues," "the Freiheits Bund," "and the Liquor Leagues." But this is not enough relief to the pent-up charity of the Rev. W. T. McConnell; he graciously puts us in the fellowship of king Ahab in his murder of Naboth and the confiscation of Naboth's vineyard; taking good care of course to give himself and his associates the companionship of Elijah, in the controversy, and even making Elijah to be "the General Secretary of the National Reform Association of his day." Upon all this we shall offer no comment at all. Such transcendent modesty, and such benignant charity, as is displayed in this, we have not the heart to disturb by offering the slightest criticism.

Then he clothes the National Reformers with this rendition of Elijah's answer to Ahab about who was the troubler of Israel:—

"I have not troubled Israel, said he, but you and the others who run this Government have made the trouble in that 'ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord.'"

Now as the National Reformers set themselves up as the special champions of the commandments of God, and as the enforced observance of Sunday is the grand aim of the National Reform project, we here ask Mr. McConnell, or any other National Reformer, or all of them put together, to show *any commandment of God for keeping Sunday*, or the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. Come now, Mr. McConnell, Elijah could quote a plain commandment of God, in support of his opposition to Baal, and Ahab's worship of him. You take it upon yourself to fill Elijah's place in our day, in rebuking the Nation for desecrating Sunday, so please fill his place also in this, and cite us to a commandment of God for keeping Sunday.

You take it upon yourself to rebuke this Nation for its *sin* against God in not keeping Sunday. Sin against God, is transgression of the law of God. Now please show the law of God that commands the keeping of Sunday. You may show it in the form of "an open letter" or in that of a sealed letter; in a public letter or in a private letter, just as you choose; but we insist that you show it. Come now, don't dodge.

Then to give proof that our fears of trouble, in the event of the success of the National Reform, are wholly imaginary, Mr. McConnell tells us this:—

"You look for trouble in this land in the future, if these principles are applied. I think it will come to you if you maintain your present position. The foolhardy fellow who persists in standing on a railroad track may well anticipate trouble when he hears the rumble of the coming train. If he shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming headlight, he may change his position and avoid the danger, but if he won't be influenced by these, his most gloomy forebodings of trouble will be realized when the express strikes him. So you, neighbors, if, through prejudice or the enmity of unregenerate hearts, you have determined to oppose the progress of this Nation in fulfilling its vocation as an instrument in the divine work of regenerating human society, may rightly expect trouble. It will be sure to come to you."

Of course it will. That is precisely what we are trying to get the people to see. We are doing our very best to have the American people understand that the National Reform movement is nothing but a Satanic car of Juggernaut that proposes to relentlessly crush every person who chooses to think for himself, every person who refuses to submit to the *dictum* of its managers, every person who chooses to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience;—this we know will be, as surely as these men secure the power to enforce by law what *they* choose to call the will of God.

See again how sweetly he manifests the grace of Christian charity, in his attributing to us "the enmity of unregenerate hearts." How do you know, Mr. McConnell, that our hearts are unregenerate? By what right do you mount the throne, and arrogate to yourself the prerogative of God, and pass judgment upon men's hearts?

And if this "fool-hardy fellow" "shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming headlight, he may change his position and avoid the danger." Oh yes, that is all that John Huss needed to do. If he had only read the signs in the "scream-

ing whistle" of the Bishop of Lodi, and the "flaming headlight" of the Pope, he might have changed his position and avoided the danger. But "fool-hardy fellow" that he was, he wouldn't be influenced by these, and so his most gloomy forebodings of trouble were realized when the Papal express struck him. His was "the enmity of an unregenerate heart" too. Devils were painted all round about him to prove that it was so, and he demonstrated it himself when he publicly refused to kiss the crucifix, and submit to the Papacy. He too, determined to resist the progress of that Nation in the worship of the Papacy. He too, rightly expected trouble, and it surely came to him, as it likewise came to multitudes beside him. And now these National Reformers are about to set up in this Nation the living image of the Papacy, and to compel all men to worship both it and the Papacy, and whoever lifts up his voice against such iniquitous "progress," thereby shows "the enmity of an unregenerate heart," and all such "may rightly expect trouble" for "it will surely come." All these are their own words, and yet many men think the SENTINEL is performing a useless task in telling the people about it. Well, they may think so if they want to, but they shall not cause us to cease to tell of it; and when they find themselves fallen into the power of these men, they will wish they had believed the warning. We only wish and pray that they may believe it now.

Mr. McConnell closes his letter with an invitation to come over and join with them. He says:—

"We also have an invitation for all men of energy and power. There is room here for you, and a demand for all your talents. You may now be opposing this cause, but we frankly extend to you the invitation, 'Come with us and we will do you good,' for good is written concerning the work of our Reform Associations."

Thank you, for the compliment, Mr. McConnell, but we are not going to "come." There is plenty of room for us where we are, and there is urgent demand for all our talents in the work in which we are now engaged. Can't you come over and join us, Mr. McConnell? There is room here for you. You could not do us good if we should go with you, for good is *not* written concerning the work of your Reform Associations; at least there is no good written of it by any authority that can do anybody any good. The best that the Scripture has written concerning it is that those who follow its pernicious ways "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Rev. 14:9, 10. Yes, we are now opposing that cause. And we intend by the grace of God, to continue to oppose it, with all our talents, all our energy, and all our power, till the day that Christ gives us the victory over it. Rev. 15:2.

We shall be glad to hear from you again, Mr. McConnell, especially in regard to that commandment about which we have asked. Please write soon.

A. T. J.

What We Are Opposed To.

At various times the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been referred to in the columns of the SENTINEL, and the statement has been made that the principles of the National Reform Association are those of that church, and that if the National Reform movement becomes a success, the Government of the United States will virtually be a Reformed Presbyterian Government. A worthy member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church has taken exception to this statement, and thinks that we are doing an injustice to that church, by making such statements. Certainly no injustice was intended, and the SENTINEL has never designed to cast any reflections on that church. The statements were made simply for the purpose of showing that the success of the National Reform movement will effect a virtual union of Church and State.

These statements were not made at random, nor were they unfortified by proofs. For proof that National Reform and Reformed Presbyterianism are the same in principle, we have the following explicit declaration of Rev. James Wallace, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870—

"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.*"

The italics are Mr. Wallace's. Now we submit to the candid reader that we cannot justly be accused of false witness in saying that National Reform is nothing but Reformed Presbyterianism, when we but quote the words of a minister of that denomination, as published in the church organ. Other evidence has been given to the same effect, but this is sufficient. Until the Reformed Presbyterian Synod shall declare that Rev. James Wallace did not correctly represent that church, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870, we cannot retract anything on that score.

Now as to the statement that the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian Church was founded upon the principles of Church and State union. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says:—

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name applied to a party, embracing the great majority of the people, who, during the seventeenth century, bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of prelacy and popery."

But there is still stronger testimony, namely, that of the Covenanters themselves. Before giving it, we will quote, as an introduction, the following brief statements of history:—

"In 1581 the General Assembly of Scotland adopted a confession of faith, or national covenant, drawn up by John Craig, condemning episcopal government, under the name of hierarchy. This covenant was signed by James I., and enjoined on all his subjects. It was again subscribed in 1590 and 1596. The subscription was renewed in 1638, and the subscribers engaged by oath to maintain religion in the same state in which it existed in 1580, and to reject all innovations introduced since that time. This oath annexed to

the confession of faith of 1581, received the name of the National Covenant."—*Art. Covenanters.*

Now read the following act which was passed with reference to the above-mentioned National Covenant:—

"ASSEMBLY AT EDINBURG, AUGUST 30, 1639, SESS. 23."

"Act Ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration.

"The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King's Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty's honorable Privy Council, to enjoin, by act of Council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty's honorable Privy Council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty's lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: *that our union may be the more full and perfect*, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure, That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, or any other error; and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription, 'The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; we subscribe according to the determination foresaid.' And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be insert in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and presbyterial, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam.* And in all humility supplicate his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and enjoin the same, *under all civil pains*; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom."

This will suffice to show that we have not erred in saying that the principles of National Reform and those of Reformed Presbyterianism are the same, that Reformed Presbyterianism was founded upon the principles of Church and State union, and that as a consequence the real end of the National Reform movement must be a union of Church and State. And this is the sole object that we had in view. Our reference to the Reformed Presbyterian Church was only incidental to the argument that National Reform success must be Church and State union. In nothing that has been said in these columns has there been any design to cast reflections upon the Reformed Presbyterian Church. The SENTINEL has no quarrel with any religious body; it is

no part of its work to oppose even what seem to be errors of doctrine. It has no time nor space to devote to the discussion of creeds and confessions of faith. Its sole object is to oppose "anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact," and to work for the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious,—including the rights of infidels as well as of Christians, realizing that both are human.

This being the case, it would manifestly be turning aside from our legitimate work to discuss denominational matters. The SENTINEL freely grants that the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been active in reforms in this country. We believe the members of that church to be as pious and God-fearing as those of any other; and for those whose intimate acquaintance we have formed, we have the most sincere respect. But this does not in the least abate our opposition to its principles being incorporated into this Government.

The Covenanters did indeed protest against union of Church and State, but it was only the union of the State with the Catholic Church. They, honestly enough, supposed that the evils of Church and State union arose from the corruption of the church which was a party to that union, and that if the church were only pure, and its polity correct, no evil, but only good, could come from its union with the State. They did not perceive that union of Church and State to any degree whatever is in itself an evil, no matter how pure the church may be, and that, in fact, a union of the purest church with the State, must, if long continued, result in the deterioration of that church; but such is the case.

Moreover such union cannot but result in the oppression of those who dissent from the principles of the church. This oppression is not due to the fact that those who are instrumental in bringing it about are worse than other people, but from the necessities of the situation. In fact, men who are personally upright are more apt than any other class to start such oppression, for they are the ones who are zealous for the enforcement of the law. Now when ecclesiastical usages are enjoined by civil law, and those usages are disregarded, such disregard becomes a crime, and the offenders must be punished. Thus religious persecution is started simply from a desire to see the Government honored by the enforcement of its laws. If the offenders would at once submit, there would be no persecution, and the good men (and women) who seek to enforce such laws, do not design that there shall be any. But the trouble is, many of these dissenters will be so stubborn as to persist in disregarding the ecclesiastico-civil laws, and so more severe measures than were at first contemplated are found necessary, and there will be enough "lewd fellows of the baser sort" to carry out through innate malice, what was conscientiously begun. And no matter how severely the persecution may rage, it will be only the simple execution of the laws.

For the benefit of any who may think that our opposition to National Reform is due to

antagonism to religion, we will say that the editors of the SENTINEL are all members of an evangelical church, but if there should arise a species of National Reform proposing to enforce the usages of their church, they would oppose it as strenuously as they do the present movement. We honor Christ as the divine Word by whom the worlds were made, and the Redeemer of mankind; but we would oppose a movement to make such an acknowledgement a test of citizenship, just as strongly as we would oppose a law enjoining a belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or making auricular confession obligatory. In short, we are opposed to any union of the State with a corrupt church, because such union would result in religious persecution; and we are opposed to any union with a pure church, because in addition to religious persecution there would result a corruption of the church.

E. J. W.

Religious Instruction in the Public Schools.

In a recent paper read before the St. Louis Pedagogical Society, the president of the Illinois State Normal School took the position that not morality only, but religion as well—not sectarianism—should be daily taught in the public schools. And we are told "by far the greater number present assented to the principles enumerated by the speaker." No doubt underlying this view is a strong feeling of the necessity of religious instruction; we have schools where the three R's and the more advanced secular studies are pursued; why should not religion, which above everything else must concern man's present and future happiness, be also inculcated? Touching this matter we have a few words to say.

In the first place it should be brought to mind that teachers are not selected with reference to their qualifications as religious instructors. Many of our teachers, especially many women teachers, are admirably qualified for such work, which they so efficiently carry on in Sunday-schools. On the other hand, many teachers, we regret to know, are agnostics pure and simple. They claim not to know if there be any immortality; least of all do they consent to any need of salvation through Jesus Christ. Then in many places—not only in the city—the teachers in our schools are Roman Catholics. They do not teach religion now, for they are not allowed to. But were they to do this, what sort of religion would they teach? Obviously there is but one religion that the Romanist can teach, or would be allowed by his church to teach, and that is Roman Catholic sectarianism. Between this and Protestantism and Judaism no compromise seems possible; so that if religion is to be taught, we must have distinctively Protestant schools, Roman Catholic schools, Jewish schools—and why not Unitarian schools? Where shall we stop?

Again, we need to recall the fact that religion is not a catechism—a thing of question and answer. It is a matter of life and of love; it must be preached by example, and

the religious teacher must get at the heart of his pupils, as is often, not always, the case in the Sunday-school, where the relationship of teacher and pupil is one of affection, with no particle of compulsion. Teach the Bible as you teach arithmetic, and the result would rather be hatred than love of the Bible. The proposition made by the Normal School principal noted above to teach "not sectarianism, but a sense of responsibility to God,"—this is ethics of a somewhat uncertain kind; but an eviscerated, unsectarian doctrine, with no personal love to the Saviour awakened, would be a very poor substitute for a throbbing, personal religion; it would rest the young soul in a dead formalism, and would leave the last state of that soul worse than the first. One of our correspondents sees no objection to reading a part of the Scriptures in the school. But this is far from carrying religious instruction with it. The Bible is read in our city schools, but the whole New Testament is expurgated out of deference to our Jewish friends; how much religion is secured to the children in this way? A little inquiry made of the teachers in our schools would elicit the answer which we have heard them repeatedly make,—none at all.

But there is another and even more dangerous point to be pressed home, and it is this. This matter of religious instruction in the public schools is the one which is most strongly emphasized by the Roman Catholics. Why? Simply because they are determined, if they can, to make the State supply Roman Catholic instruction to the thousands of non-descript waifs and poor children of Catholic Churches, and so save to the church the expense of the religious instruction of their children. There is not a Roman Catholic prelate in the country who will have anything else than distinctively Roman Catholic doctrine declared to the children of Roman Catholics; and this instruction must be inculcated by a priest—this is the Roman Catholic position all through.

Disestablish the non-sectarian school, and it is not difficult to forecast the result: we shall have Trinitarian and Unitarian, Protestant and Jewish teachers inculcating their respective doctrines, just as the three R's are now taught. Small will be the gain in that quarter, but great will be the loss where the loss has already fallen most heavily—in the domain of home instruction. But our Roman Catholic friends will do their work differently. They will secure as teachers priests of their own sect, to be paid by the State, and so the State will be devoting its public moneys to the support of a large part of the Roman Catholic clergy, and to the instruction of coming generations in Roman Catholic sectarianism with no cost to the Roman Church. Indeed, the Roman Catholics in this State are already moving in this direction. Last winter they caused a bill to be introduced in the Senate of this State, the object being to facilitate the commitment of idle, truant, vicious, or homeless children to the Roman Catholic Protectorate, and to enable the schools of this Roman Catholic institution to "participate in the dis-

tribution of the Common School Fund." It is understood the same bill is to be introduced this coming winter.

Now for ourselves we do not want to see anything of the kind; and it does seem strange that Protestants, whose good intentions and conscientiousness of conviction cannot be questioned, do not see the danger that lies in the direction of converting our schools into theological seminaries—we use the term advisedly, for there can be no religion taught without theology, although a great deal of theology may be inculcated carrying with it not one particle of soul-saving religion.

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter:—

1. *Stand by our schools as they are.* Any different course is fraught with danger to the State and the cause of religion. We want no open door through which theological animosities and burning controversies over pedagogical fitness to instruct religiously, can enter; there are enough of these disturbing the church councils, conventions, and missionary societies to-day!

2. *Develop religion in the home.* We need to get back to first principles and first practices, when the Scriptures were committed by the young, and read by all. We need to return to the earlier days of the republic, when religion was imbibed with the mother's milk, and when the "Cotter's Saturday Night" was not less a beautiful poem than a living fact, transplanted to the earlier homes of the American colonies. To this work the church should and must address itself. And when this result is reached we shall hear no more pleas made for theological instruction in the schools, for the religious truth will have been received through the religious life, as exemplified and inculcated and imparted in the hallowed, enduring precincts of the home.—*Christian at Work.*

Never a State Religion.

A RECENT Monday issue of the New York *Herald* contained the following report:—

The Rev. Dr. Armitage, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, preached to a large congregation yesterday morning upon "Divine Dealings with our Country." He reviewed the formation of the Constitution and congratulated his hearers that the members of the convention had been divinely led to omit from the Constitution any reference to God, and instead to make one of its clauses read, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." But even this language, explicit as it is, did not seem to the Baptists of Virginia in 1788 a sufficient guarantee of religious liberty. They feared that, in spite of it, a State religion might be established by Congress, and they wrote to Washington complaining that the convention had not taken a more decided stand. Washington replied that he deeply regretted that the Baptists, whose courageous patriotism had been shown in many a battle during the Revolution, should have grounds for any

such fears, and that he would recommend that Congress should consider the matter. This led to the first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free use thereof," which settled the question of religious liberty in this country for all time to come.

It was ridiculous for anyone to say that the fathers of the Constitution had any idea of establishing an atheistic nation. Almost all of them were professing Christians, but they felt that their business was to construct a civil government—a republic, not a theocracy. To have introduced the name of God into the Constitution as the head of the Nation and then to have left his relations and his honors undefined, nor provisions made for his worship and his support on the part of the Nation, would have introduced a subject of perpetual contention into the body politic, because it would have stood as an anomaly in the great instrument. The logical sequence must have been the establishment of a State religion of some sort as a legacy of perpetual strife.

Misdirected "Enthusiasm."

THE annual address of the president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is an important document. Not for any particular views of temperance or temperance methods, but because of its views of religion and politics and of religio-political methods. We shall here note some of them. We could not attempt to notice the address in detail for it occupies more than seven solid pages of the *Union Signal*. We shall only quote the most striking passages. Addressing her beloved comrades, the president said:—

"The marshaling hosts of which you are the vanguard, represent the downfall of sectarianism in religion, and the death of sectionalism in politics. The bugle of your advance strikes the key-note of the church universal. . . . The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that *Christ shall be this world's king*. Yea, verily, **THIS WORLD'S** king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions."

The "undying enthusiasm" of these enthusiastic ladies will be dead more than a thousand and one years before ever they see any such thing as that. For it is "**THIS WORLD**," mark it, not the world to come, of which they have so enthusiastically set themselves to make Him the King—king of its courts, camps, cloisters, commerce, etc., etc.—and no such thing as that will ever be. The word of God says that when Christ comes to "**THIS WORLD**" as King of kings, and Lord of lords, "Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. . . . And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their ARMIES, gathered together to make war against

him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." See Rev. 19:11-21.

Again:—

"The kingdom of Christ 'must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.' . . . There are enough temperance men in both [the Democratic and Republican parties] to take possession of the Government and give us national prohibition in the party of the near future, which is to be the party of God. . . . We pray Heaven to give them no rest . . . until they shall . . . swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army 'up to the polls to worship God.' . . . I firmly believe that the patient, steadfast work of Christian women will so react upon politics within the next generation that the party of God will be at the front."

And this maps out the result:—

"Concerning the platform of our next National Prohibition Convention, I am content to leave it substantially where it is, save that it should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual life. I greatly desire and hope that we may use our influence to secure this end. Such a declaration must be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, to which all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed, but must as explicitly recognize Christ as the great world-force for righteousness and purity, and enthrone him King of nations in faith, as he will one day be in fact, through Christian politics and laws, no less than Christian living."

But how such a declaration as that is to be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, is what we should like to know. We wish the worthy president of the National W. C. T. U. had given some instruction or at least some hint as to how it is to be done. Notice, "It should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual life;" it must explicitly recognize Christ, "and enthrone him King of nations in faith." Now Christ is the head of the church, and the church is his body. Gal. 1:18. Therefore if Christ be enthroned in national affairs it is only the enthronement of the church in national affairs; if Christ be enthroned in the State, the church is thereby enthroned in the State, for the church is his body. To declare Christ and his law to be the supreme authority in national life, is inevitably to declare the church and its law to be the supreme authority in national life; and that is the most perfect union of Church and State; because the church is Christ's body, and you can't enthrone him without enthroning his body. This is the Scripture truth of the matter, and when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to do what they here announce, and

then at the same time proposes to divest it of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, they are simply proposing to *divest Christ's body of its head.*

But that they can't do. And in truth they do not intend to try to do it. They fully purpose to enthrone the church with their enthronement of its Head. It is impossible to do otherwise. And the veil, of their being "thoroughly opposed" to a union of Church and State, under which they, and the National Reformers, altogether, endeavor to hide it, is exceedingly thin. It is said of Augustus that he "was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation, that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoy their ancient freedom." These workers for political power in religious things, seem not to have forgotten the opinion nor the tactics of Augustus. They too seem to be fully sensible that mankind is still governed by names; and their expectation seems to be that the people of this Nation will submit to the slavery of a union of Church and State, provided that they are repeatedly told that there is no union of Church and State, and that "all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed" to it. The danger is that these aspirants to such illegitimate power will not be deceived in *their* expectation, any more than was Augustus in his.

Again we read:—

"To meet the new creation, how grandly men themselves are growing; how considerate and brotherly, how pure in word and deed."

Yes indeed! And if you want to see the proof of it, just read the dispatches in any principal daily, any day, in any part of the land.

This also we read in the address:—

"The W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Party must join forces to stand for nationalism as against sectionalism; the future in politics as against the past; . . . and the everlasting prohibition of sin as against any alliance between sin and the Government."

Let "the W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Party" be told that no political power nor any civil government, can ever of right have anything whatever to do with the prohibition of sin. For further comment on this read the selection from Professor Harris on "Church and State," page 15, of this paper.

In her suggestions for 1888, under the heading of "Legal" is this:—

"Respectfully to request our brothers of the Prohibition Party when the time shall come to consider names for the greater political movement into which that party is to merge itself, to consider carefully the merits of the name 'Home Protection Party' as embodying its purpose and as educational to the people; also request them to continue to stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath; the Bible in our public schools; the enfranchisement of women as a means to prohibition; and make an open declaration that Christ and his law are the supreme authority in such government as they seek to establish in this Republic.

"Designate a commission representative of the whole country, which shall bear these re-

quests to our friends and allies, the men of the Prohibition Party."

"To stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath," as she says in another place, "as a sacred institution." What is the American Christian Sabbath? and how did it become so? If it is Christian, how can it be American? And if it is American, what made it sacred? The Bible tells about the Sabbath of the Lord, but it nowhere speaks of any such thing as a "Christian" Sabbath, much less does it say anything about an "American Christian" Sabbath. That must be an institution that is found outside of the Bible; and the question again arises how did it become sacred?

"Stand firm for the Bible in our public schools." Which Bible? The Protestant Bible, or the Catholic Bible? which? Your "brothers" of the National Reform Party proposes to put the Catholic Bible into our public schools, even into the hands of the children of Protestants, wherever the Catholics are in the majority—that is in New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and a number of other States. Ladies, please define your position.

Of all this and a good deal more after the same sort, "the audience manifested its appreciation by universal hand-clapping and waving of handkerchiefs." And "upon motion, it was accepted by almost unanimous vote as expressing the principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union." And by the same token it is abundantly shown that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to carry civil government into the realms of conscience in this Nation.

A. T. J.

Some "Clashing Voices."

At the celebration of the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States, in Philadelphia, President Cleveland said:—

"Does anyone doubt to-day that the Constitution of one hundred years ago was well made, and that the work was well done?"

Against this, Mr. Gault, whose special *forte* seem to be to come in conflict with everything that is reasonable and true, makes his voice to clash as follows:—

"We not only doubt, but in the light of past history we are sure that work was not well done. At least two very serious mistakes our fathers made in that Constitution. One was the enslavement of one-sixth of our population, because they had black skin. The other was the substitution of the popular will for the will of God. At the cost of the civil war we have corrected the first, and the signs of the times indicate that we may be compelled to correct the second at even a dearer price."

One would expect that a man occupying so prominent a position as Mr. Gault does in an association whose sole object is to patch up the Constitution of the United States, would be well acquainted with that document; but we have never seen any evidence that he has ever read it. If he can find in that document, as it was adopted in 1787, anything favoring the enslavement of anybody, he will find what the framers of it could not.

But a little thing like that amounts to nothing in comparison with the cool manner in which this representative of National Reform declares the expectations of that association to plunge this country into a war greater than our civil war, if their ideas are not complied with otherwise. We don't suppose that they have the *power* to do anything of the kind, but that they have the *will* is evident enough. And yet they have the assurance to try to make us believe that if they once got the Constitution and laws fixed to suit themselves, they would not persecute any who might not agree with them. If they are willing to stir up a civil war involving the Nation, in order to secure their religious amendment, would they tolerate opposition by a handful of men after it was secured? The question answers itself.

In the same number of the *Statesman*, that of December 22, 1887, there is the following statement by Wm. Smith, a lawyer of Janesville, Wis.:—

"By putting a 'God in the Constitution' plank in the Prohibition platform, you rule me out of that party. I am not opposed to prohibition, but I am opposed to God in the Constitution."

With this Mr. Gault makes his voice to clash in the following strain:—

"How can you be an honest prohibitionist when you want a law with only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people behind it, in preference to a law having behind it, first, divine authority, next human, next the fear of hell. That is the only kind of a law that will bind the conscience. Prohibition legislation, or any other legislation, will have little force until we base it on a law that is the will of an unchanging Law-giver."

Well, what next? "Upon what meat hath this our Caesar fed, that he hath grown so great?" We have heard of some pretty rigid enforcement of the prohibitory laws of Iowa and Kansas, that have behind them "only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people;" but such enforcement will not satisfy National Reformers. Nothing will do but they must have laws that will send a man to hell if he violates them! This is just what Mr. Gault's language implies; for how could there be "the fear of hell" behind a law, if that law did not threaten to send its violators to hell? Mr. Gault doesn't say who he expects will execute this penalty in the National Reform Government; but since the makers of a law have the power to execute, we suppose that the National Reformers themselves will consider themselves the duly appointed ministers of divine wrath. And yet they tell us that they never could think of persecuting anybody.

Perhaps someone may think that we are extravagant in our conclusions. We know that we are not. It may be that Mr. Gault is an irresponsible person, not competent to speak for National Reformers as a class; if so we hope the *Statesman* will let us know, and we will never again pay the slightest attention to any statement that he may make. But leaving Mr. Gault out of the question, National Reform teaching does actually place in the hands of the rulers of the proposed Na-

tional Reform Government, the power, not only to kill the body, but to consign the soul to hell. Here is the proof.

They claim that the triumph of their movement, will be the setting up of the kingdom of Christ on earth. They apply the Scriptures that speak of the glorious reign of Christ over his enemies, to the time when God is acknowledged in the Constitution. They do not expect that Christ will come and reign personally, and in that case the men at the head of affairs will be his vicegerents. Thus we shall have an American Papacy, and everybody knows, that the Pope of Rome claims power to open and shut Heaven, and to consign souls to hell.

Whether they expect Christ to reign personally or not, the result will be the same. We have already quoted from the *Statesman* the statement that the time is coming when those who will not have Christ to rule over them shall be slain before him; and this statement was made with direct reference to those who refuse to accept the National Reform régime. We say in all seriousness the day that marks the success of the National Reform movement, will mark the inauguration of a period of grievous persecution. We may be called alarmists. That is all right; it is just what we are. It is the sentinel's duty to sound an alarm when danger is near. If people will only prepare to meet the danger, we care not by what name we may be called.

E. J. W.

Is It Infidelity?

LAST fall one of the editors of the *SENTINEL* made a speech in Oakland, on the coming union of Church and State in this country. A National Reformer was present and heard it, and he has written in reply and sent to us manuscript copy sufficient to make more than two full pages of the *SENTINEL*, and asks that it may all be printed. But it is almost wholly made up of arguments for National Reform, which have been quite largely discussed already in the columns of the *SENTINEL*, from both sides of the question, and we do not deem it just to our subscribers to devote so much space to mere repetitions. There is, however, one point which demands notice in our own defense as well as for the principle involved.

This point our correspondent throws into the form of a question, as follows:—

"Are you aware, or being aware do you not care, that the 'Demands of Liberalism,' and of the 'National Liberal League,' are now clamoring for the abolition of these very things which National Reformers wish continued? And do you not know that these Liberalists oppose the amendment with great vehemence? so that in this controversy you are identifying yourselves with the infidel Liberalists. The third article of the National Liberal League states the specific objects of the association. Among these are the following: 'The total discontinuance of religious instruction and worship in the public schools;' 'the abolition of State-paid chaplaincies;' 'the abolition of the judicial oath; the non-appointment of religious fasts, and holidays, etc. In like manner the Liberalists demand that all laws look-

ing to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated. And all these people are furiously opposed to the amendment which we seek. They know that so long as the Constitution remains as it is, so long they and their cause are safe in case an appeal be made to the courts, whose decisions must be in accordance with the Constitution."

We are perfectly aware that the National Reformers are ready on the instant to raise the cry of "infidel" or "atheist" against all who choose to oppose the religious amendment to the Constitution, even though they know that the opponents are avowed Christians. And being aware, we do not care. They may call us infidels, they may call us atheists, or may apply to us any other term of reproach that they please, and that to their hearts' content, but it shall not make a particle of difference with us, in our attitude toward the religious amendment to the Constitution. We know that in His day they called our Master, Beelzebub; and we, doing our utmost to be counted worthy to be of his household, expect that much more they will call us of his household. Besides this we know that "it is only in the absence of argument that recourse is had to ridicule;" and as the worthy National Reformers cannot answer our arguments, we expect them to, call us names. We derive our principles from the word of Christ; the principles which we advocate are those established by Christ; and when infidels advocate those principles, then we are perfectly willing to be classed with infidels. We would rather be classed with infidels in opposition to the tyranny of a religious despotism, than to be found on the side of those who call themselves Christians while promoting it. We know exactly where we stand, we know precisely what we are doing, in our opposition to the religious amendment to the United States Constitution, and to any sort of religious legislation under any Constitution. We know whom we believe, and for the National Reformers to call us infidels or atheists or anarchists, or to class us with all these, does not make us so, nor does it frighten us.

As for the "Demands of Liberalism," and of the "National Liberal League," we have never made them a subject of study; we have never seen a copy of them except as given in National Reform literature. But there is one thing which we know to be a fact, and that is, there was never any such thing heard of as the "Demands of Liberalism" until after the National Reformers had set on foot their movement to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution, endangering the civil and natural rights of men. Then it was that the Liberal League was formed, and their "Demands" were framed in direct opposition to the National Reform demands, and in defense of their own rights. We say "in defense of their own rights," because we utterly refuse assent to the National Reform proposition, that if a man be an infidel he has no rights. And that then it was high time for them to do something in defense of their rights is shown by the words of our correspondent above quoted. He says:—

"They know that so long as the Constitution remains as it is, so long they and their cause are safe."

Of course they are, and they ought to be safe. They ought to be just as safe as anybody else in the Nation. But they know, and we know, and the National Reformers know, that just as soon as the religious amendment to the Constitution is adopted, or religious legislation is sanctioned, just so soon they will not be safe. In view of this it is certainly time that somebody was maintaining the principles of the Constitution as it is, under which is their safety. But according to the charitable decision of the National Reformers, for even a Christian to do this it lands him at once into infidelity.

Anybody who will take the time to compare the "Demands of Liberalism," as given by our correspondent, with the National Reform Constitution, will see at once that these "Demands" are aimed at that document, and that they are wholly defensive. And it is perfectly safe to say that if now there was no such thing in existence as the National Reform Association, there would likewise be no such thing as the "Demands of Liberalism."

Taking these "Demands" as given by our correspondent, there are some of them that are perfectly proper in themselves. On the subject of the "discontinuance of religious instruction and worship in the public schools," the position of the *SENTINEL* is well known to be in favor of it, because it is right. As for the abolition of State-paid chaplaincies, the *SENTINEL* is heartily in favor of that also; nor are we speaking at random on this subject. The writer of this article spent five full years in the United States army. He has seen State-paid chaplains in the East and in the West. He has attended their services. He has heard them pray, he has heard them preach, and has seen them about the garrisons. And he states it as his honest conviction that unless the State-paid chaplains whom he did not see, far surpass in efficiency those whom he did see, the whole lot of them put together, do not do either the Government or the soldiers as much good as would a bag of white beans.

And as for the abrogation of all laws "looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality," we also heartily favor that because it is right. Any law or any proposition that looks to the enforcement of Christian morality, or anything else that is Christian, is contrary to every principle of the doctrine of Christ. And to advocate any such proposition is logically to advocate the Inquisition. The tyranny of the Papacy and the iniquity of the Inquisition, are the logical conclusions from the National Reform propositions throughout. And therefore the *SENTINEL* now is, and forever more shall be, outspokenly opposed to the whole National Reform scheme. If that be infidelity the National Reformers may make the most of it, while we continue to do our best to form our lives upon the model that God has set before the world in the life of Jesus Christ.

A. T. J.

"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world."

The Church and State.

WHENCE has come about in modern history the great doctrine of the separation of the Church and State, for the purification of religion and the security of civil freedom?

This is the central question before us, and we are prepared to consider the relation of the church toward the realm of secularity as embodied in the institutions of the family, the school, the civil community, and the State. We must first inquire for the characteristic distinctions of the church and the State. The final object of the church is holiness, the assumption by man of the form of the Divine; the final object of the State is the production of justice, the form of freedom. The negative of justice is defined as crime; the negative of holiness is defined as sin.

Sin and crime furnish the two categories which these institutions, the church and the State, respectively deal with. Let us note the consequences of confounding them. If the State undertakes to preform the functions of the church, it will deal with crimes in their character of sin as well as in their character of injustice. If the church, on the other hand, usurps the functions of the State, it will attempt to carry sin over into the category of crime and punish it by temporal penalties. For the church or the State to attempt to perform one another's functions is to destroy both functions. A crime or breach of justice is a deed of the individual which the State by its judicial acts returns on the individual. The State furnishes a measure for crime and punishes each criminal according to his deserts. The judicial mind is a measuring mind, a retributive mind, because trained in the forms of justice which sees to it that every man's deed shall be returned to him to bless him or to curse him with pain. Now, a sin is a breach of the law of holiness, a lapse out of the likeness to the divine form, and as such it utterly refuses to be measured. It is infinite death to lapse out of the form of the Divine. A sin cannot be atoned for by any finite punishment, but only (as Revelation teaches) by a divine act of sacrifice. The church cannot decree a finite measure of penance for sin; therefore it can only pronounce eternal doom on the sinner unless he repents. Religion says that the sinner must repent and return to holiness, and then his sin has been forgiven. The church meets sincere repentance with unreserved forgiveness.

It would destroy the State to attempt to treat crimes as sins and to forgive them in case of repentance. It would impose on the judiciary the business of going behind the overt act to the disposition or frame of mind within the depths of personality. But so long as the deed is not uttered in the act, it does not belong to society, but only to the individual and to God. No human institution can go behind the overt act and attempt to deal absolutely with the substance of man's spiritual freedom.

If the church attempts to administer civil functions, it falls into the habit of weighing sin in finite scales, and by and by it comes to indulging mortal sin for the sake of mere sec-

ular penances and even for money paid in advance. If a noble ecclesiastic attempts to reform the civil magistracy under a theocracy, he is apt to fall into the use of the severe code of Draco, who punished all crimes with death, or else, in the careful weighing of the deed in order to award just penalties, the church official comes to lose his sense of the enormity of sin.

Sin and crime must not be confounded, nor must the same deed be treated as crime and sin by the same authority. Look at it as crime, and it is capable of measured retribution. The law does not pursue the murderer beyond the gallows. He has expiated his crime with his life. But the slightest sin, even if it is no crime at all, as for example the anger of a man against his brother, an anger which does not utter itself in the form of violent deeds, but is pent up in the heart—such non-criminal sin will banish the soul forever from Heaven, unless it is made naught by sincere repentance.

The divine and secular must be separately organized as institutions; but this does not imply that they may be organized in antagonism. It is of the nature of Christianity to encourage independence of church control on the part of all other institutions when they are once in harmony with its divine ideal. For it is the principle of Christianity in its innermost essence to teach the nature of God as one of infinite grace—a God who sacrifices himself in order that imperfection may have the opportunity to put on the divine form of holiness and enjoy independent personality forever, always growing from more to more in intellect and will. The form of holiness is simply the form in which the individual may grow in personality without ever contradicting and annulling his true being.

What we here see in these general terms to be the relation of the church to the State is also the relation of the church to the secular, specifically, in all details.—*W. T. Harris.*

SACRED CHRONOLOGY, AND THE PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

"SACRED CHRONOLOGY" is a new and revised edition of a little work published by S. Bliss about forty years ago, giving the chronology from creation till the death of the apostle John. The peculiar and valuable feature of this work is that the chronology is established by the words of the Scripture itself. This is a most valuable little work. The chronology of the history of the kings of Israel and Judah, as given in Kings and Chronicles, is often a perplexity to the Bible student. In this work the subject is relieved of all difficulty. Beside the connection as given in the words of Scripture, there are tables given which show at a glance the successive kings of Israel and Judah, and which of them reigned at the same time. Thus the subject is made so plain that it can be very easily understood.

"The Peopling of the Earth" is a series of historical notes on the tenth chapter of Genesis. It gives an outline of the origin and descent of all the principal nations of the earth—the Greeks, the Romans, the Scotch, the Irish, the Welsh, the English, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Russians, the Chinese, etc., etc. It forms an excellent introduction to universal history.

This little book is just the thing for Bible students everywhere—in college, in Sabbath-school, and in the home. Send for a copy; you will find it invaluable. Cloth binding, 300 pages, sent post-paid for \$1.00. Address, Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.

THE FIRESIDE TEACHER.
A 28-PAGE MONTHLY.

NEAT, CLEAN, PURE, ENTERTAINING, INSTRUCTIVE.

THE object of this journal is to create and encourage a love for learning; to promote correct habits of thought, and a truer appreciation of the things which the Creator has made and placed all around us for our instruction; to cultivate a pure and refined taste in literature. It also affords a most valuable help to all who are engaged in literary study. It contains general articles on Plant Life, Animal Life, Natural Scenery, Oceanic Wonders, Strange Peoples and Countries, Literature, the World's Really Great Men, and among other Useful as well as Interesting Topics.

TRUE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF EDUCATION.

The School Room Department contains thorough instruction on several important studies, such as Grammar, Arithmetic, and Rhetoric.

The whole work is elegantly illustrated with fine engravings. As a literary and educational journal it has no equal for its size. It is neat in execution; entertaining, instructive, and moral, in its character. It is highly appreciated by all lovers of good literature.

EXTRAORDINARY OFFER.—For \$1.25 we will send to the address of anyone in the United States or Canada, who is not already a subscriber for the magazine, the *Fireside Teacher*, and the *Pacific Health Journal*, monthly, for one year. Single subscription price for *Fireside Teacher* alone, 75 cents.

Address, THE FIRESIDE TEACHER CO.,
71 College Ave., Battle Creek, Mich.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL
AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

THE UNITED STATES
IN PROPHECY.

BY ELD. U. SMITH.

THIS is a full exposition of a portion of prophecy which applies to our own Government, showing the position the United States holds in prophecy, and the part it has to act in the closing scenes of time.

THE SUNDAY MOVEMENT,

Which is now attracting such general attention, is thoroughly canvassed, and abundant testimony is given to prove that it is fast coming to be the ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION in this country. Dealing with our own land and applying to our own time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. New editions revised and enlarged. Cloth, 225 pp., 75 cents. Paper covers, new edition, condensed, 186 pp., 25 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

THIS package contains thirteen tracts treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

NO.	PAGES.
1. Religious Legislation,.....	8
2. Religious Liberty,.....	8
3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, . . .	16
4. The American Papacy,	16
5. Bold and Base Avowal,.....	16
6. National Reform is Church and State,.....	16
7. Purity of National Religion,.....	8
8. The Salem Witchcraft,.....	8
9. What Think Ye of Christ?.....	8
10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,	24
11. The Republic of Israel,.....	8
12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,	32
13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,.....	16

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

A TRACT of 24 pages, which fully answers this question, and shows how Sunday displaced the Bible Sabbath. Extracts given from Catholic writers. Price, 8 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1888.

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

A MAN is not always known by the company he keeps. He may have bad fellowship in a good cause. Nevertheless it is a fact worth a thought or two on the part of those Protestants who insist upon introducing religious teaching in the public schools,—that the Roman hierarchy are with them in emphasizing this demand, from the humblest priest to the Pope in the Vatican.—*Christian at Work.*

ABOUT two months ago we made the statement and proved it that the National Reform Association is running in its list of Vice-Presidents the names of men who are dead and who have been dead for years. Since writing that we have received additional evidence in proof of this statement. We have these proofs in writing and signed by disinterested and authoritative persons. But, anything at all to win, is the principle upon which these National "Reformers" work.

It is with pain that the *Congregationalist* notices an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctity of Sunday. It cites "for example" an account of "a great train load of the Grand Army which drew out of one of the Chicago stations on a Sunday morning, on its way to St Louis;" and then says:—

"Doubtless there was a considerable sprinkling of church members among these Sunday travelers, whose consciences were not quite at ease over what they were doing."

Yes, "doubtless" that is so. Therefore, by all means, let the civil authority of the Nation come to the rescue, and entirely ease the consciences of these Sunday Christians by the enforcement of a rigid, uncompromising Sunday law, that shall compel these church members to do, as church members, what they have not conscience enough to do otherwise. Only let the civil law supply the place of conscience in all these people, then they will all serve the Lord.

LET it be understood that it is not the man who talks the most about honoring Christ, who really does honor him. Said Jesus, to some who were profuse in their professions, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" A humble life of self-denial, patterned after the divine model, and filled, like his, with good deeds, is the only way that Christ can be honored. When Christ was on earth, he resisted every attempt to bestow upon him political honors; and he is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Those who loudly proclaim their loyalty to Christ, and long for power to cut off those who do not acknowledge him, are in

the same condition that Peter was on the night when he cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, or of the two disciples who wished to call down fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans. Our desire for them is that, like those disciples, they may see the manner of spirit that they are of, and may become true followers of Jesus.

SPEAKING of that political preachers' committee that was lately appointed in New York, the *Christian Nation* says that "Archbishop Corrigan will be invited to serve on it." We can inform the *Christian Nation* now and even at this distance that Archbishop Corrigan will not "serve" on the committee. Catholic Archbishops don't serve Protestants in any capacity whatever. In fact they don't serve anything or anybody but the Cardinals and the Pope. They may get Archbishop Corrigan to *rule* on the committee, but it is a settled thing that he will never *serve* there. There is another reason for this too. No Catholic Archbishop in Christendom would ever consent to receive, from Protestant preachers, instruction or guidance in political workings; and this for the simple reason that there is not one of them who does not know more on that subject than all the Protestant preachers together ever knew. There is not a Catholic priest in New York City who could not at a moment's notice give those preachers more "pointers" in their political scheme than they ever dreamed of. The Archbishop may consent to help them along, but it is certain that he will never do it in the form of a servant.

Protestant Praise of Catholicism.

THE New York *Independent*, one of the most well-known and influential religious journals in the world, gushes after the following style over the Pope's Jubilee:—

"To Joachim Vincent Pecci, Bishop of Rome, and Pope of the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Catholic Church, health and an evangelical benediction! A priest of blameless life for fifty years, wise, moderate, successful as priest, governor, archbishop, nuncio, cardinal, Pope, we send him our Christian salutation. Prelates, priests, and peoples of his own communion, gladly pay him homage. We simply offer him kindly greetings in the name of Christ, to whom both Pope and Protestant bow in reverent adoration. Gifts and congratulations pour in upon him from Christian, Turk, and pagan, in honor of the jubilee of his priesthood. . . . The time was when Popes hurled their unapostolic anathemas against followers of Christ, and Protestants hurled them back with access of intensity, if possible. But Leo XIII. is a kindly Christian gentleman, who loves light and peace and purity and progress. *Lumen in Caelo* is his motto; and that his reign will be as a light in the Catholic heavens, is in no wise improbable. He has been Pope just ten years, and these years have been so many years of progress for his church, . . . He has made peace with France and Germany and Switzerland; he has brought about an era of better feeling in Italy, he has reformed many abuses, raised the tone of the church, and gained a strong influence in the councils of Europe. . . . And so we wish Pope Leo, of that name, the thirteenth, continued health,

a long reign; and God-speed in his liberalizing policy."

Can our readers believe that the above, and considerable more of the same, is from a professedly Protestant journal? Where is the Protestantism? What is said about the prosperity of the church, and the progress of its influence, under Leo XIII., is all true; but is that something to rejoice over? If in time of war, a leader on one side should report with every appearance of joy, that since General X had taken command of the enemy's forces, they had made rapid and continual progress, would he not be considered as harboring traitorous feelings toward his own country? Let it be remembered that the liberties of the people have never been more trampled upon than when wise, learned, and personally upright Popes have ruled, and that the triumph of Catholicism always means death to civil and religious liberty.

We have no fear that the Pope will ever be regarded in this country as he is in Europe, or that the Catholic Church, as such, will ever gain the supremacy in the United States; but what we do fear, and with good reason, is that Protestantism will become so saturated with the principles of Catholicism as to overthrow the liberties of the American people. We do not mean that Protestantism will ever pray to the virgin Mary, or adopt the confessional, or any other Romish dogma that it has not now, but that it will become intoxicated with the lust for power, which is the distinguishing characteristic of Romanism. Catholicism, stripped of its belief that the church should be recognized as supreme in politics, as well as in religion, would be nothing to be feared. If there is to be a union of religion and State, as the National Reformers now put it, we would just as willingly see the Catholic religion elevated to that position as the Protestant. The American people do well to look out for the encroachments of the Papacy; but we fear lest while they are watching the enemy that is approaching from Rome, degenerate Protestantism will steal a march on them and gain the citadel of their liberties.

Bound Volumes of the Sentinel.

We can furnish Volume 1, 1886, and Volume 2, 1887, of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, with Index, bound in strong paper covers, at 60 cents per volume post-paid. Either volume in cloth binding for \$1.00 post-paid. The two volumes bound in one, in cloth, with gilt title, for \$1.75 post-paid, or for \$1.50 if taken at the Office or sent with other books by freight where we do not have to pay the 25 cents postage.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - 50c.

In clubs of five or more copies, per year, each, - - 30c.

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

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