

The American Sentinel 2 (1887)

January 1887

"The Arkansas 'Extravagance'" *The American Sentinel* 2, 1 , pp. 4, 5.

In the October SENTINEL, we commented upon an editorial, and an article, both from the *Christian Cynosure*. The article, copied entire from the columns of the *Cynosure*, was written to that paper by Elder R. M. Kilgore, from Arkansas, giving an account of the persecution of some Seventh-day Adventists in that State for working on Sunday after having conscientiously kept what they believed to be the Sabbath. The *Cynosure* correspondent gave a number of names and facts such as clearly showed the meanest kind of persecution.

It seems that the *Cynosure* got hold of a copy of the SENTINEL containing the matter mentioned above, and from the way in which it refers to us it would appear that the *Cynosure* does not recognize its own article, but attributes the thing all to the SENTINEL. In the *Cynosure* of November 25, 1886, in a short editorial we find the following:—

The AMERICAN SENTINEL, of Oakland, California, comes to us with a long reply to an editorial of this paper, in which the writer gives a long list of fines and imprisonments of Seventh-day Adventists for work on Sunday. One man is said to have been sent to jail from Springdale, Ark., for 'digging potatoes for his table on Sunday.' This and other parts of the article wear an aspect of extravagance, so that we must wait for confirmation of the facts before commenting on them."

More than half of our "long reply" and *all* of that part of it that "gives a long list of fines and imprisonments" was the aforementioned article from the columns of the *Cynosure* itself. As it appears to the *Cynosure* to be so extravagant, we would mildly inquire whether it is the habit of that paper to print accounts that are so extravagant that they cannot be believed without confirmation? We might ask too what the *Cynosure* would count a "confirmation"? The account which we copied from the *Cynosure* is already a matter of public record in Arkansas even to the Supreme Court. In Tennessee also there are similar facts that are likewise a matter of public record. Does the *Cynosure* demand another

batch of those persecuting prosecutions to confirm the statements printed in its own columns? It seems to us that the *Cynosure* is exceedingly hard to convince.

As for commenting on the matter the *Cynosure* did that vigorously, and very properly condemned the persecuting proceedings, and asked that the names and the jails should be published at once, *while as yet it was a mere matter of report*; but since the *facts* have been given, and the *names and the jails* have been published in its own columns, not a word has the *Cynosure* had to say on the subject. And when we published the *Cynosure's* report in full, and commented on it in our columns, that paper turns upon us, and accuses its own article of wearing "an aspect of extravagance," and demands "confirmation" of its own published report before "commenting on" it.

As the editor of the *Cynosure* seems not to be acquainted with the matter he printed in his own paper, we will give him some references. Please look at the *Cynosure* of July 29, 1886, editorial page, and the editor's comment, and call for names and jails will there be found; then look at its correspondents' columns in the *Cynosure* of August 12, 1886, and there will be found the names of the persons, places, and jails, and with these the "long list of fines and imprisonments" and the facts, which seem to the editor of the *Cynosure* to wear so much of "an aspect of extravagance." We hope the editor of the *Cynosure* will examine the articles referred to for we very much desire to see what comments he will make upon the facts.

If the *Cynosure* must still wait for more confirmation, we know not how it can be satisfied except by repetition of the persecution; but to report such repetition would be only adding more extravagance to that which already has appeared. We agree with the *Cynosure* that the facts of this persecution do wear an aspect of extravagance. In fact we know not how the matter could be more extravagant without bordering very closely upon the manners and methods of the Romish Inquisition. Yet as the outcome of the National Reform movement will be to make such extravagance National, and as the *Cynosure* is heartily in favor of National Reform, there appears no ground of hope that we shall ever see in the columns of the *Christian Cynosure* any just comments upon such persecuting extravagance.

A. T. J.

"Our One Hundred Thousand Rulers" *The American Sentinel* 2, 1 , pp. 6, 7.

[IT will be noticed that the following article is on the same subject as one already printed in the December number of the SENTINEL. The writer of that article was absent from the office when he wrote it, and this article was written several days before that one reached the office. Consequently this article was laid over, and that one was printed. This is not printed now because we think that justice was not done in the other, but because it was already written and because it treats the subject so differently that really there is no repetition.]

In the SENTINEL for June we inserted the following: "The National Reform party proposes to make Christ king of the United States, and yet they maintain that the Government must still remain a republic! Will the *Christian Statesman* or some other one of the advocates of this 'reform' tell us how this thing can be?" Rev. M. A. Gault found this item in the SENTINEL, and in it he found something with which he could make his voice to clash, and so, in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, he has undertaken to tell us just how this thing can be, and this is how he does it:—

"If you would study your Bible more before you spring into the arena to champion the anti-National Reform cause, you would know that the model of Government which Christ gave to Israel was much more republican than that of the United States. All their rulers were elected by the people, while there are one hundred thousand of ours in whose election the people have no voice."

Mark it, reader, in the "model of government which Christ gave to Israel," "all their rulers were elected by the people." We know not exactly what time it is to which Mr. Gault refers as the one when Christ gave to Israel their "model of Government." We do not know whether he refers to the time when Moses was chosen; or when the seventy elders were chosen; or when the judges were chosen; or when Saul was chosen; and so not knowing to which time it is that he refers we shall have to notice all four of these, and of course the first one to which we come where the rulers were elected by the people, that must be the time, and that the "model of Government" received from Christ, to which Mr. Gault refers.

If the gentleman refers to the "model of government" that was instituted when Moses was chosen, then we should like very much for him to tell us about how many, if any of "the people" were at the burning bush when Moses was elected. Exodus 3.

If Mr. Gault refers to the "model of government" instituted at the time the seventy elders were chosen, then we would refer him to the following scripture: "And the Lord [not the people] said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with them there; and I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them. . . . And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people,

7

and set them round about the tabernacle. And Lord came down in the cloud, and spake to him, and took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and came to pass, that, when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." Num. 11:16, 17, 24, 25. And in view of this we wish he would tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of the seventy elders.

If our critic refers to the "model of Government" in which the judges ruled, then we would call his attention to Judges 2:16-18: "The Lord raised up judges. . . . And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge." And in view of this scripture will he tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of a judge whom the Lord raised up?

Or if perchance the reverend gentleman refers to none of these, but means that "model of Government" which was established when a king was chosen, then we ask him to read the following: "Now the Lord had told Samuel in his ear a day before Saul came, saying, Tomorrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people." "Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" 1 Sam. 9:15-17; 10:1. But Saul was finally rejected, not by the people, but by the Lord, and again Mr. Gault may read: "The Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite; for I have provided me a king from among his

sons." And when after all the other sons of Jesse had passed by, and David was sent for, when he came, "the Lord said, Arise, anoint him; for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon Daniel from that day forward." 1 Sam. 16:1, 12, 13. And David God said: "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7:12-16.

Mr. Gault conveys the idea that he has studied the Bible a great deal, it certainly is not asking too much of him to request that he tell us about how many of "the people" cast their ballots when Saul or David was elected king of Israel.

Here, then, in these four forms of Government—that under Moses and Joshua, the seventy elders, the judges, and the kings—are all wherein there is any possibility of finding a "model of Government which Christ gave to Israel," and the plain Scripture, the plain matter of fact, is, that in not a single one of them is there a shadow or a hint of such a thing as that "all," or any, of "their rulers were elected by the people." So much for Mr. Gault's study of the Bible and of the "model of Government which Christ gave to Israel."

Now just a word upon his study (?) of our own Government. He says that in our Government, in this Government of the United States, "there are one hundred thousand rulers in whose election the people have no choice." If this were to come from anybody but a leading National Reformer, we should call it a most astounding statement. But as these are the men who are to be made the interpreters of the Scriptures on all points civil, ecclesiastical, and moral, and whose decision is to be final, when one of them speaks *ex cathedra*, it becomes us, to whom there belongs no right of interpretation nor decision on any subject moral or civil, to be very meek about how we shall handle it. Therefore we shall be very careful in our examination of this oracular utterance.

No doubt it will be a piece of very interesting news to the American people to learn that they have in this Government "one hundred thousand rulers" at all; much more when it is declared that this is only the number of those "in whose election the people have no voice;" and that consequently there are in the United States "one hundred thousand rulers" beside those who are elected by the people! Now

we have looked this thing over somewhat, and we know that from the President of the United States down through the governors of States, to the constable of a precinct, they are all "rulers," as we presume Mr. Gault would call them, in whose election the people *do* have a voice. To go outside of the list of these, then, the only other place under the Government where we find "rulers" is among officers of the army and navy, for there we know there are some who rule with an iron hand. But they have nothing to do with us, they are not rulers "of ours;" besides there are not one hundred thousand persons in the army and navy together, officers, soldiers, and marines. So assuredly these cannot be the "rulers" whom our critic has in mind.

We cannot imagine, therefore, to what class of our rulers it can be to which Mr. Gault refers by such a vast number "in whose election the people have no voice," unless it be to the *appointees of the civil service!* that is, the postmasters, registers, and receivers of land offices, internal revenue collectors, etc., etc., and all their clerks! These we believe now amount to just about a hundred thousand; and these "rulers" are all appointed. In regard to these Mr. Gault is correct in saying that in their "election the people have no voice." And as these are the only "rulers" "of ours" in whose "election the people have no voice," we are absolutely driven to the conclusion that these *are* the "rulers" to whom our eminent critic undoubtedly refers.

But the idea of applying the title of "rulers" to postmasters, registers of land offices, revenue collectors, and such like! The idea of calling a lot of servants, "rulers"! Well, well, no number of exclamation points could express our astonishment, and we are utterly at a loss for language to fitly characterize such a conception of Government, and of rulers; especially when it is coupled with the ambition to make itself the sole interpreter in all affairs of Government.

And it is such men as Mr. M. A. Gault whom the National Reform party proposes to make the National interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points;" men whose interpretations the most casual reader can see are utterly at variance with every portion of Scripture on the subject; and whose ideas of Government are so crude as to suppose that a lot of Government clerks are rulers of the people. It is such men as this, and men of such ideas of Scripture and of Government as are these, into whose hands the American people are coolly asked to put, by Constitutional Amendment, the direction of all the affairs of religion

and Government. It is such men as these whom we are asked to make the supreme arbiters of the Nation, and whose decision will be "final." And the worst of it all is, that from what we see actually occurrent in the Nation at this very time, we are not prepared to say but that the American people are going to do just this thing. But let them know of a surety that in the day when the affairs of this Nation are put into the ambitious hands of the National Reformers, in that day the American people will bind the fair form of Liberty in fetters more absolute than any she has ever borne outside of the bitter rule of the Papal Inquisition.

A. T. J.

"Our Questions Answered" *The American Sentinel* 2, 1 , p. 8.

IN several different issues of the SENTINEL we have inserted for the special benefit of Mr. M. A. Gault a "clashing voices" exercise. So far we have no evidence that the reverend gentleman has applied his genius to the explication of any one of them. Now we have an exercise to which we would call the *particularly* special attention of Rev. M. A. Gault, District Secretary of the National Reform Association.

This which we now insert is not exactly a clashing voices exercise. We rather think that it would be more to the credit of Mr. Gault if it were. The voices are entirely too much alike to appear well. We happen to have in this office a copy of the St. Louis *Republican* of Sunday, August 1, 1886, in which there is an article written by Mr. George Yule, of St. Louis, under the heading, "Christians against Christ." The last words of Mr. Yule's article are as follows:—

"In conclusion I would remark that it is absolutely suicidal for the pastor of the First Christian Church to continue fooling, like a giddy little boy, in front of the ponderous wheels of the Juggernaut of Truth. *It may be an exhilarating thing for him to stand upon his head and turn handsprings before the public upon the serious Sunday question; but as his true friend, we beg of him, we plead with him, we implore him, to keep out from under those wheels.*"

Now with the last sentence of this, please "read, compare, and inwardly digest" the following written by the Rev. M. A. Gault in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, 1886, page 4, first column.

"It may be exhilarating for the editor of the SENTINEL to stand on his head and turn handsprings before the public upon so serious and important a question; but as his true friend, we beg of him, we

implore him, to keep out from under the wheels of the National Reform movement."

We say again that these voices are entirely too much alike to appear well for Mr. Gault. A comparison of these two quotations casts a good deal of a shadow upon Mr. M. A. Gault's literary honesty. And, lest some one should think that we are indulging in "insinuations," we would say that as a matter of fact Mr. Gault's words appear to be a downright plagiarism. For about his words in the *Statesman* there is not a sign of quotation marks nor of credit. The words appear in the *Statesman* as wholly his own. If the words are his own, then a comparison with those of Mr. Yule reveals a psychical phenomenon that is truly wonderful.

In our December issue we printed an article under the heading, "Is It Ignorance of Duplicity?" in reply to Mr. Gault's "counterblast to" the SENTINEL. And in view of that article there can be no doubt as to how our question should be answered. Our columns are open. Will Mr. Gault rise and explain?

A. T. J.

"National Reform and Romanism" *The American Sentinel* 2, 1 , p. 8.

NATIONAL REFORM says:—

"The churches and pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions 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 will be developed there."—*Christian Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884.*

It was in this way that Rome placed herself in the position of sole interpreter of the Scriptures on all points. Whenever a conflict of opinion occurred, it was brought immediately to the notice of the church, and she must decide as to what was the Scripture in the case, and which one of the disputants was in the right, and her decision was final; consequently no opinion could be held, and no duty practiced, which she chose to declare unscriptural. Therefore, if the Scriptures were to be interpreted alone by her, and conduct was to be regulated alone by her decisions, it is manifest that the more the people read the Scriptures, the more was she annoyed by new controversies, and by the necessity of rendering new decisions; and then *why should she not prohibit* the laity from reading the

Scriptures? Besides, where was the use of the laity reading the Scriptures anyhow, when none but the clergy could interpret?

When the National Reformers shall have succeeded, will they prohibit our reading and interpreting the Scriptures? If not, why not? Would it not be vastly better to do so at once than to be kept in a constant whirl of "interpretations" and decisions? Then they could regulate the faith and practice of their so-called Christian government by bulls issued as occasion required, "*in Domino salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*" This would save them a vast deal of labor, and doubtless would work just as well.

A. T. J.

February 1887

"The National Reform Doctrine of Majorities" *The American Sentinel* 2, 2, p. 11.

LAMST October, at the Wichita, Kansas, Reform Convention, Rev. J. M. Armour, of Sterling, Kansas, delivered an address, in which he inveighed against the idea of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and maintained that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," in the following manner:—

"If government be of man,—if it be the mere will of the people,—why should I stand in awe of it? I do not. I cannot look with awe and reverence upon the decisions and mandates of neighbor Jones, for I know that he is not the source of law to me; he is but my equal. Now if he and Smith agree to say what I shall do, must I recognize in Jones and Smith my rightful rulers? the government that I ought to respect and obey? Nay; if Jones and Smith and Brown agree to lay down the law for me, I am still unsubdued. I will assert my right. . . . Nay, let millions of men, each of them my equal, command what is wrong or what is right, and their commands can never inspire in me profound reverence. Their will cannot be law to me. . . . It is but the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best. Multiply it by the millions, it is the Jones, Smith, and Brown power still. *Its will is not law.* It has no authority but what belongs to brute force. Neither God nor my conscience bind me to obey the will of a million any more than one of my neighbors."—*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 13, 1883.

The same doctrine was held in the Cleveland National Convention. Rev. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Nor is the consent of the majority sufficient. One man cannot consent for another. Three-fourths of the people cannot consent for the remaining fourth. Forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine people cannot consent for the fifty-millionth man."

Again Mr. Armour said:—

"Any command by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is not only not binding upon those to whom it is addressed, but they to whom such command comes are solemnly bound to disobey and resist. . . . So all men owe it to themselves to obey no command but such as, traced to its source, has a divine sanction."

From these plain and forcible declarations, it would naturally be supposed that the National Reform party expect that the Religious Amendment will be adopted so entirely unanimously that there will not be one single dissenting voice. Because by the foregoing they plainly allow that if there shall be the fifty-millionth man who holds their work or their laws to be not of God, that "fifty-millionth man" is not bound to obey, but "solemnly bound to disobey and resist" the authority of their Government under the Religious Amendment. And the unanimous voice of the other "forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine" "cannot consent for" him.

But if the National Reform party means this, where then is the efficacy of their movement? "Aye! there's the rub;" they don't mean it; for proof of which, now see character in their Government." Please observe, "their (?) Government." *Christian Statesman*, November 1, 1881, editorial.

Again:—

"This Amendment of the Constitution means that a majority of the people of this land shall first believe the principles embodied there; and so believe them that their views shall crystallize into the form of law, and that in its most potent form." Please observe, "most potent." See *Statesman*, December 20, 1883, page 1.

Again:—

"How is the Amendment to be carried out practically? . . . A majority must decide."—*Id.*, Feb. 21, 1884.

So, then, if the Government be purely civil and secular, it is only the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best, though it be multiplied by "millions." But if it call itself Christian and religious, it is instantly clothed with "divine right." Neither God nor conscience binds us to "obey the will of a million any more than one," unless that "million"

call itself Christian. "The consent of the majority is not sufficient," provided that majority shall not call itself Christian. "Any command, by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is to be solemnly disobeyed and resisted," unless said command should be issued by a power calling itself Christian. But if the power choose to call itself Christian, though every act be the opposite of Christian principle; though it transcend by a "higher law" the sum of all Christian duty, yet if it only call itself Christian, then if it be a majority it "must decide," and exact obedience to its "views" by the "most potent form of law."

How ingenuous! How magnanimous! How eminently Christian! How pre-eminently charitable the National Reform party is, to be sure!!

A. T. J.

"Are Our Politics to Be Purified" *The American Sentinel* 2, 2 , pp. 12, 13.

THIS is a question asked by the National Reform party. We, too, may ask the same question. The Reform party place great reliance upon the success of their movement for the accomplishment of this (much-to-be-desired, indeed!) result. Dr. Merrick in his address at the Cleveland National Reform Convention, said:—

"Where, then, is the antidote [for corrupt politics] to be found? Unhesitatingly I answer, In the religion of Jesus Christ. . . . How can it fail to purify our politics if Christianity be allowed its legitimate place in our Government?"—*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 1883.

Dr. McAllister, also, in the same convention said:—

"Finally, the proposed Amendment will draw to the administration of the Government such men as the law of God requires,—not the reckless, the unprincipled, the profane but able men, who fear God and hate covetousness."—*Ibid.*, Dec. 27, 1888.

This thing has been tried several times, and always with the same result, namely, to make corruption more corrupt. Given, human nature what it is, and make profession of religion a qualification for governmental favor, or political preference, and the inevitable result will always be that thousands will profess the required religion expressly to obtain political preferment, and *for no other reason*; and so to *dishonest ambition* is added *deliberate hypocrisy*.

The first to employ this method was he to whom can be traced almost every ill that Christianity has suffered (this last one being by

no means the least),—Constantine. He made the bishop of Rome a prince of the empire, and clothed the inferior bishops with such power that they not only *ruled* as princes, but imitated the princes in pride, luxury, worldly pomp, and hateful haughtiness,—imitated the princes in these, and imitated the emperor in persecuting with relentless vigor all who differed with them in faith. And the

13

bishop of Rome, above all in rank, held the supremacy also in pride, arrogance, and profusion of luxury, to such a degree that one of most eminent of the heathen writers exclaimed, either in envy or indignation, "Make me bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian."

Nor were the governmental favors of Constantine confined to the bishops; they extended to all orders; and by the promise of a white garment, and twenty pieces of gold to every convert, there was secured in a single year the baptism of no fewer than twelve thousand men, besides a proportionate number of women and children. See Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of Rome," chap. 20, par. 17. And the inevitable consequence was that "*formalism* succeeded *faith*, and religion fled from a station among the rulers of Christendom to shelter in her native scenes among the suffering and the poor." Was politics purified there? No! religion was corrupted and faith debased; and amidst and by it all, were taken the widest and most rapid strides of the Church of Rome toward that fearful height of power and depth of degradation which was the astonishment and the shame of the world.

Another notable instance was Louis XIV. of France. The early part of his reign was a time of much license; "but in his old age he became religious; and he determined that his subjects should be religious too. He shrugged his shoulders and knitted his brows if he observed at his levee, or near his dinner table; any gentleman who neglected the duties enjoined by the church. He rewarded piety with blue ribands, pensions, invitations to MarlÉ, governments, and regiments. Forthwith Versailles became in everything but dress, a convent. The pulpits and confessionals were surrounded by swords and embroidery. The marshals were much in prayer; and there was hardly one among the dukes and peers who did not carry good little books in his pocket, fast during lent, and communicate at Easter. Madame de Maintenon, who had a great share in the blessed work, boasted that devotion had become quite the fashion."

And was politics purified? With a vengeance! We read on: "A fashion indeed it was; and like a fashion it passed away. No sooner had the old king been carried to St. Denis than the whole court unmasked. Every man hastened to indemnify himself, by the excess of licentiousness and impudence, for years of mortification. The same persons who, a few months before, with meek voices and demure looks, had consulted divines about the state of their souls, now surrounded the midnight table, where, amidst the bounding champagne corks, a drunken prince, enthroned between Dubois and Madame de Parabere, hiccupped out atheistical arguments and obscene jests. The early part of the reign of Louis XIV. had been a time of license; but the most dissolute men of that generation would have blushed at the orgies Regency."—*Macaulay's Essay on Leigh Hunt*.

But undoubtedly the most notable instance of all is that of the Puritan rule, of the Commonwealth of England. "It was solemnly resolved by Parliament 'that *no person shall be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness.*' The pious assembly had a Bible lying on the table for reference. . . . To know whether a man was really godly was impossible. But it was easy to know whether he had a plain dress, lank hair, no starch in his linen, no gay furniture in his house; whether he talked through his nose, and showed the whites of his eyes; whether he named his children Assurance, Tribulation, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz; whether he avoided Spring Garden when in town, and abstained from hunting and hawking when in the country; whether he expounded hard scriptures to his troops of dragoons, and talked in a committee of ways and means about seeking the Lord. These were tests which could easily be applied. The misfortune was that they proved nothing. Such as they were, they were employed by the dominant party. And the consequence was that a *crowd of impostors, in every walk of life*, began to mimic and to caricature what were then regarded as the *outward signs of sanctity.*"—*Ibid*.

Thus has it ever been, and thus will it ever be, where Governments, as such, attempt to propagate a religion. The only means which it is possible for Governments to employ are "*reward and punishment*"; powerful means indeed for influencing the exterior act, but altogether impotent for the purpose of touching the heart. A public functionary who is told that he will be promoted if he is a devout Catholic, and turned out of his place if he is not, will probably

go to mass every morning, exclude meat from his table on Fridays, shrive himself regularly, and perhaps let his superiors know that he wears a hair shirt next his skin. Under a Puritan [or a National Reform also we may say] Government, a person who is apprised that piety is essential to thriving in the world [see *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 21, Dec. 21 and 27, 1883, and Feb. 21, 1884. particularly, but in fact almost any number], will be strict in the observance of the Sunday, or, as he will call it, Sabbath; and will avoid a theater as if it were plague-stricken. Such a show of religion as this the hope of gain and the fear of loss will produce, at a week's notice, in any abundance which a Government may require. But under this show, sensuality, ambition, avarice, and hatred retain unimpaired power, and the seeming convert has only added to the vices of a man of the world all the still darker vices which are engendered by the constant practice of dissimulation. The truth cannot be long concealed. The public discovers that the grave persons who are proposed to it as patterns, are more utterly destitute of moral principle and of moral sensibility than avowed libertines. It sees that these Pharisees are further removed from real goodness than publicans and harlots. And, as usual, it rushes to the extreme opposite to that which it quits. It considers a high religious profession as a sure mark of meanness and depravity. On the very first day on which the restraint of fear is taken away, and on which men can venture to say what they think, a frightful peal of blasphemy and ribaldry proclaims that the short-sighted policy which *aimed at making a nation of saints* has made a *nation of scoffers.*"—*Ibid.*

Yet in the very face of these plainest dictates of pure reason, and these most forcible lessons of history, and in utter defiance of all the teaching of universal history itself, the National Reform party, with that persistence which is born of the blindness of bigoted zeal, is working, and will continue to work, with might and main, to bring upon this dear land all this fearful train of disorders. Their movement reminds us of nothing so much as of these quack medicines that are so abundant, warranted to cure every ill that is known to the human body; while at the same time they will create a thousand ills that the human system has never known before. As with these, so with the National Reform; it is warranted to cure all the ills of the body politic, while, as anyone with half an eye can see, it bears in its hands a perfect Pandora's box, wide open, to inflict its innumerable evils upon our country; and, as they will learn when it is too late, they will have

no power to retain even hope. She herself will have flown away, and nothing remain but utter, irretrievable, awful ruin.

A. T. J.

"History Repeating Itself" *The American Sentinel* 2, 2 , p. 15.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL aims to be true to its name, and to call attention to the dangers threatening our country. And though the chief danger, and that in which all other dangers culminate, lies in National Reform, yet it is both interesting and profitable to take other views of the political horizon than that which lies directly in the line of vision toward National Reform. The following we think is worthy the serious consideration of every thoughtful person.

In 1857 Lord Macaulay writing of the American Republic used these words:—

"The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, not one of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith; on the other is a demagogue, canting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in carriages, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by the workingman who hears his children crying more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such seasons of adversity as have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning. Either some Cesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions."

With that please read the following editorial note from the *Argonaut* (S. F.), of November 6, 1886.—

"Mr. Henry George has not carried New York, and has not become its mayor, but this is what has been done: An impecunious adventurer, who has no property, pays no taxes, has no residence or citizenship anywhere—so far as we know—takes his grip-sack in his hand and moves to the great American metropolis, and, gathering around him all there is of poverty, ignorance, discontent, and crime, proclaims himself a candidate for mayor; without party, or press, or money, he organizes discontent, and, becoming its

leader, he marshals a band of men who have little to lose and much to gain, and marches them to the ballot-box to obtain control of the government of a city containing more than a million of people and more than a thousand millions of aggregated wealth. That he does not succeed may be a matter of congratulation; that he came within a few thousand votes of his successful opponent, seems to us an incident of great significance, that carried with it the suggestion of danger. In saying this it is not necessary to deny to Mr. Henry George great ability thorough integrity of purpose. We may not call him crank or impracticable theorist; but the danger lies in the fact that the class of discontents is so numerous, and that it can be brought together for a political purpose, and become subordinate to party discipline, and wielded for political use. When one reflects in this direction, he can but question whether the unlimited exercise of the elective franchise ought not to be taken from an alien immigrating class, in order that the ranks of this dangerous and restless element may be prevented from further enlargement."

Then in connection with these two extracts the following from an editorial in the November *Century* is interesting and strongly suggestive. Under the heading of "The Congressional Balance-sheet" is given a striking illustration of the incapability, if not the failure, of Congress as a legislative body. The editor says:—

"The reader may perhaps desire an explanation of this failure of our national Legislative. Let him then go to Washington while the two Houses are in session. Let him sit in the gallery of the Senate, provided an 'executive session' does not turn him out; let him scan the faces of the Senators, reflect upon their previous records, and consider how many of them came to occupy their present positions.

"Let him then go and sit for a time in the gallery of the House of Representatives, and watch that national bear-garden. Let him enjoy the usual scene—one purple-faced Representative sawing the air in the progress of what is technically called an 'oration;' a dozen or more highly-amused colleagues surrounding him; the rest of the members talking at the top of their voices, clapping their hands for pages, writing, reading, telling funny stories and laughing uproariously at them, making social calls from desk to desk, doing anything and everything except the business for which they are paid.

"Let him try to estimate the rapidity with which a plain business man, finding his clerks engaged in such a scene during business hours, would make a 'clean sweep' of them. He will no longer ask an explanation of the congressional balance-sheet. What better result could be expected from two Houses, each in its own way controlled by influences antagonistic to intelligent legislation? Congress is no longer a legislative body. Its degeneration is now

admitted. It consists now of a plutocracy at one end, and a mobocracy at the other. The two chronic perils of a democracy have a firm grip on the Congress of the United States.

"Here is no question of comparative guilt or responsibility. Each House is as bad in its way as the other. Nor is there any partisan question involved. The course of Congress has for years been downhill. Able and sincere men are still to be found in both Houses, yet each successive Congress is, on the whole, worse than its predecessors; not because Democrats or Republicans control it, but because it is two years further on the road. . .

"The Congress of the United States has become the most incapable legislative body of the constitutional world. So far as the Senate is concerned, its case is hopeless; the only remedy is outside of it, in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. The case of the House is somewhat different; its failure may be redeemed by reform within itself."

But the prospect of a cure by this prescription is as hopeless as is the case for which it is given. "The only remedy for the Senate" is said to be in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. But the constituencies are as corrupt as is the Senate. Else how is it that the Senate is so bad? The House it is said "may be redeemed by reform within itself." It *might* be it is true. But will it be? Is there hope of reform from such a source? To think so is like expecting a man to lift himself by the straps of his boots. In the last resort therefore we see only that the whole case, as the editor says of that of the Senate, is hopeless.

In view of these things stated by the *Argonaut* and the *Century*, Lord Macaulay's words are remarkable. And when we view the destructive violence of the participants in the almost perpetual strikes, their secret and sometimes open sympathy with Anarchists, and their always open advocacy of Socialism, which can only end in anarchy, it appears as though the American "Huns and Vandals" mentioned by Macaulay are almost ready to burst upon the nation. And though Macaulay places the time of plunder in "the twentieth century;" and though there remain but thirteen years before the twentieth century comes; yet we very much doubt whether the nineteenth century instead of the twentieth will not see this time of ruin so clearly pictured by this justly eminent writer and thinker. For when the Hun and the Vandal came upon Rome there was no Cesar, and the time of the American Huns and Vandals seems too near to hope for a Cesar here.

Yet there is one more step that may be taken before ruin is reached. That is, let the whole body—representatives and constituencies—become permeated with the vileness of an apostate church; let religious hypocrisy be added to political chicanery and legislative incompetency, then will be reached the condition in which Rome stood at the time to which Macaulay refers, and having reached it, a dreadful fall awaits this nation, as surely as red-handed ruin fell upon Rome. And that there may not be a single color lacking in the lurid picture, National Reform presents itself, and in it the embodiment of the last element of corruption needed to fill up the cup of iniquity, as Rome's was filled when ruin overtook her. History *does* repeat itself. And if any just lesson may be drawn from history, it seems that this one must be that ruin stands at the doors of our nation to-day; and the National Reform party has its hand upon the latch ready to open and let her in.

A. T. J.

March 1887

"An Image of the Papacy" *The American Sentinel* 2, 3 , pp. 19, 20.

IN the Pittsburg National Reform Convention of 1885, President Brunot said:—

"The First Amendment of the Constitution which provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' was never intended to de-Christianize the nation, as some now hold, but, on the contrary, was meant to keep it Christian and free. First, by guarding against the establishment of a church or sect; and second, against restrictive legislation in case the power to enact laws should fall into the hands of the enemies of all *religion*."—*Christian Statesman, April 30, 1885.*

Very good. It is plain therefore that any interference or change in that amendment would tend to de-Christianize the nation, and to prevent its being free. As that amendment guards against the establishment of a church, to change the amendment would open the way for the establishment of a church. As that amendment guards against restrictive legislation by the enemies of all religion, should they have the power to legislate so, to change the amendment would open the way for the enemies of all religion to restrict or abolish the practice of the Christian religion in this nation.

But to change that amendment and so to open the way for these evils, is precisely what that association, of which Mr. Brunot is president, proposes to do. Thus says "Secretary" W. J. Coleman:—

"The first sentence of Article I of Amendments reads: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This would be made consistent with the proposed [National Reform] amendment by substituting the words 'a church' for 'religion,' making it read, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a church.' This is what the Reform Association believes should be the rule in a rightly constituted State. There should be religion, but no church."—*Statesman*, November 1, 1883.

By their own words, then, it is clearly the purpose of the National Reform Association to reverse the First Amendment of the United States Constitution so as to allow Congress to make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore it stands proven that the work of the National Reform Association is to open the way for "the establishment of a church or sect," and for the destruction of the freedom of this nation.

For (1), The State recognition of Christianity in law—both Constitutional and statutory—and the making of laws respecting and enforcing the principles of that religion, is that which the National Reform Association proposes to accomplish. But that is precisely what Constantine did in the fourth century, and *out of it grew the Papacy*. And just as surely as the National Reformers succeed in doing with Christianity in this nation, what Constantine did with it in the Roman State, so surely will it follow that out of their action will grow the living image of the Papacy. Nothing can prevent it, because—

(2) In the day when, by their proposed change in the First Amendment of the Constitution, the National Reformers put it into the power and make it the province of Congress to make laws respecting religion, or prohibiting its free exercise; that very day they open wide the gates and give free course to the enemies of all religion, and to the enemies of Christianity in particular, just as soon as they can secure the power to make laws restricting or even prohibiting the free exercise of the Christian religion.

And when the way is thus opened for the enemies of the Christian religion to oppress it, as soon as they can secure the power, everybody knows that they will secure the power at the earliest possible moment. Everybody also knows that the enemies of

Christianity have no compunctions of conscience in the matter, and that they will leave no means unemployed, that they will stop at nothing, to secure the coveted power. Therefore, if the National Reformers will maintain their cause in the conflict which they shall thus have opened, they will have to do it upon the field which they themselves have chosen—the field of politics—and with the weapons which *their enemies* shall choose. They will have to meet political power with political power; they will have to meet force with force; bribery with bribery; intrigue with intrigue; chicanery with chicanery; hypocrisy with hypocrisy. This they will be compelled to do or else lose all they shall have gained, as soon as they shall have gained it.

This is precisely the course through which the Papacy was developed. And the long and constant practice of these bad methods, which the bishop of Rome was compelled to employ if the Christianity which he represented was to hold its position against its enemies and the ambitious rivals of its power—the practice of these bad methods it was which made the Papacy what it is—"the very master-piece of human wisdom," and the most complete of all contrivances that have ever been "devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind." And if the National Reformers succeed in securing the changes in our Constitution which they propose; then by the practice of these bad methods which *they* will be compelled to employ to successfully cope with the enemies of the Christian religion, there will be developed in free America a perfect likeness of the Papacy.

On the other hand, having secured those changes in the Constitution; having empowered Congress to make laws respecting religion; and having entered upon this political contest to determine what kind of a Congress it shall be which shall make the laws respecting religion; then if the National Reformers do *not* employ the like methods with their political opponents, they will be defeated, the seats in Congress will be filled with the enemies of religion, and so the Christian religion in free America, its happiest home on earth, will be sold into the hands of its bitterest enemies, waiting to destroy.

In the one case, free Christianity will be enslaved; in the other, her beautiful form will be marred and her fair name dishonored; and in either case the unkindest thrust of all will be by the traitorous hand of National Reform. For a traitorous hand it is, because, under the First Amendment of the Constitution, *as it is*, Christianity is forever safe from all her enemies, and forever free, in free America. With the First

Amendment of the United States Constitution as it is, the presidential chair and every seat in Congress might be filled with the worst infidels and the most bitter enemies of Christianity that are in the land, and Christianity could not be molested or disturbed in the least degree. But with that amendment changed as the National Reformers propose to change it, then in the filling of the presidential chair and of each seat in Congress, Christianity would have just cause for fear, because there would be no means of knowing whether those who gain the seats were really her friends or her enemies; and with a bare majority of the enemies of Christianity in Congressional seats, every Christian in the land would be in danger of losing the dearest rights known to man. Traitorous, therefore, would be the hand of any but an avowed enemy of Christianity, that would attempt to break down this safeguard of Christianity in the United States; but to sweep away this safeguard is what the National Reform association, under the guise of the Christian name, declares that it is its purpose to do, and therefore most traitorous is the hand of National Reform.

One or the other of these evils will inevitably follow the success of National Reform in its designs upon the United States Constitution. The certain consequence will be either that Christianity will be delivered into the hands of open infidelity and atheism, or else there will be developed a new form of the Papacy to meet, and successfully contend with, the open enemies of Christianity. As to which of these forms of evil would be the worst we can form no opinion. Of the former we have an illustration in the French Revolution; of the latter we have an illustration in the Inquisition, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, and the Crusade against the Albigenses.

Yet, although we can form no opinion as to which would be the worst, we *can* form an opinion as to which form would rule—and ruin. We are fully persuaded that it would be the image of the Papacy. We are assured of this because we are satisfied that the National Reform Association, on its own part, would prove itself fully equal to the task of outdoing the open enemies of Christianity in all the political methods they might employ; and this assurance is made doubly sure, by the confessed fact that National Reform will be in close alliance with the Papacy itself. Read this:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."—*Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884.

And this:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation."—*Rev. S. F. Scovel, Christian Statesman, August 81, 1881.*

And the National Reform Association, inspired and supported by the Papacy can out-do political atheism in all the politically atheistic methods that they can employ. The Roman Church has had sixteen hundred years' practice "in resisting the progress of political atheism," and there is not a political method known to the human race, of which she is not the consummate mistress. In her presence all the political atheists in Christendom must bide their diminished heads. This is why we are certain that the success of National Reform will be to develop a new form of the Papacy. For with this alliance with Rome which the National Reformers are so anxious to complete—so anxious, indeed, that they will make repeated advances and suffer repeated rebuffs—when, under their reformed Constitution, the political conflict comes on between National Reform and the enemies of all religion, the "Reformers" will be thoroughly furnished unto all bad works. If bribery is demanded, Rome can furnish scores of eminent examples among the Popes, and ages of practice among all classes from kings and emperors to peasants and beggars. If mob violence or military force becomes necessary to the success of a candidate for office, Rome is likewise an adept in this, as the election of Pope Damasus and of many of his successors abundantly proves. If intrigue, treachery, fraud, and the most secret and deceptive wire-working are required, there are the Jesuits, whom Leo XI II. has lately restored to all their rights and privileges, and has thus prepared this strong support to National Reform.

We might follow these lines and extend these illustrations to almost any required length, but these points are sufficient to show to all thinking men that out of the success of National Reform there can come no good thing, but only evil, and that continually and continually increasing. If any of the National Reformers object to the points which we have here made, let them not blame us, let them call to account the president of their Association, and their district secretary, W. J. Coleman, whose statements, fairly quoted, we have only traced to their logical and inevitable consequences. If either President Brunot's or Secretary Coleman's statement in regard to the First Amendment

are not correct, let the National Reformers call *him* to account and correct *him* not us. We have only reasoned upon the premises laid down by these leading officials of the National Reform Association; if the premises are not true, that is their fault, not ours—let them correct the premises and we will revise our conclusions. But if the premises *are* true, and we believe they *are*, then the demonstration is complete that the success of National Reform will assure in this nation the development of *a living image of the Papacy*.

A. T. J.

"Secretary Gault and the Scripture Again" *The American Sentinel* 2, 3 , p. 22.

SECRETARY GAULT said that under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel" "all their rulers were elected by the people." We asked him for one instance of it, and he refers us to Deut. 1:13, and quotes: "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." But he does not quote enough. In that place Moses is rehearsing what had been done long before. The whole connection is this: "I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone; . . . how can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. And ye answered me, and said, The thing which thou halt spoken is good for us to do. So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes." Deut. 1:9-15.

Now at whose direction was this done? Mr. Gault says that it was under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel." We can easily learn whether it was or not. Moses says, "At *that time*." At what time. Turn to Ex. 18:13-26. As Moses sat to judge the people, he was occupied all day from morning till evening in hearing and deciding the cases of the people who came. "And *Moses's father-in-law* said unto him, The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone. Harken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, . . . thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating

covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge; so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. . . . So Moses hearkened to *the voice of his father-in-law*, and *did all that he had said.*"

There can be no shadow of doubt therefore that the rulers referred to by Moses in the text cited by Mr. Gault, were those who were appointed at the suggestion of Moses's father-in-law, who was Jethro, a Midianite. Does Mr. Gault mean to say that this piece of advice given *by Jethro* was the model government which *Christ* gave to Israel? If not, and most assuredly it was not, then what is his argument and citation of that scripture good for? It is good for nothing, but to show his utter and inexcusable ignorance of the true bearing of scripture. Of all men who have ever put themselves into print, the one who makes the most brilliant success of getting on the wrong side of every question that he touches, and every time that he is undoubtedly the "Rev." M. A. Gault, district secretary of the National Reform Association. A. T. J.

"The National Reform Idea of Tolerance" *The American Sentinel* 2, 3 , pp. 27, 28.

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

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

Here, then, is the National Reform definition of religion, officially declared. *Religion is a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.* And they are going to have in this Nation "State and religion." That is to say, they are going to have "State and a man's personal

relation of faith and obedience to God." In other words, they are going to have the State to associate itself with every man in his "personal relation of faith and obedience to God;" and the State must see to it that every "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God" shall be none other than the *Christian* relation of faith and obedience. For it is the State that rules; it is the State that bears the responsibility; it is the State's, and not the individual's, personal relation of faith and obedience to God that must take precedence. Therefore under their own definition, it is clear that the direct aim of National Reform is to have the State to interfere with, to regulate, and control every man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. And that is nothing else than a religious despotism. Yet they affect to deny that under such an order of things there would be any oppression. But oppression is absolutely inseparable from the scheme. For to deprive every man of his own choice and the exercise of his own personal relation of faith and obedience to God, is the National Reform idea; but without coercion all men are not going to yield this right; while coercion in such a matter is only the cruelest oppression.

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

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

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

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

"The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language. And then, further, they are almost wholly of foreign importation, and that of comparatively recent date, so that they did not share in the first settlement of this country; they did not brave the hardships; they did not profess the principles

which have made that first settlement memorable. . . . They breathed no protests; they suffered no martyrdom."

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

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

But Mr. Edwards continues his kind endeavor to relieve the minds of the people of all fear that "to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive." And, after giving a clear definition of the terms, atheist, deist, Jew, and Seventh-day Baptist, he says:—

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

Notice: the question is "between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial of any God." This in the face of his own statement just before, that "the deist admits God;" and "the Jew admits God, Providence, and Revelation;" and "the Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity." All this, and yet the contest is between the acknowledgment of a God, and the denial that there is any God; between theism and atheism; between Christianity and infidelity! How

does it happen then that a people who "believe in God and Christianity," must be classed with atheists and treated as atheists? Here is how:—

ACCIDENTAL ATHEISM

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

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

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

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

27

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

But Mr. Edwards proceeds:—

"I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . But he shall be tolerated. He may live, and go

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL REFORM GOLDEN RULE

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

And *this* is National Reform "Christianity." This gentleman is one of the worthies to whom is committed the interpretation of Scripture on all "moral and civil, as well as ecclesiastical points," and whose decision must be "final." This is the way that the sublime principles of the sermon on the mount are to be exemplified when this nation becomes the National Reformed "kingdom of Christ." But to

correspond to such an exposition and exemplification, the sermon on the mount will have to be "re-enacted." It now reads, in the words of Christ, as follows: "I say unto you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven."

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

EXALTING THEMSELVES ABOVE GOD

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

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

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

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

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

It is high time that all understand that National Reform is a standing menace to human liberty; and that the success of National

Reform will be the utter destruction of human liberty in free America.
A. T. J.

April 1887

**"The *Christian Cynosure* on National Reform" *The American Sentinel*
2, 4 , pp. 30, 31.**

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

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

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

CHRISTIANITY THE TEST OF CITIZENSHIP

"We, the people of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian Government], and in order to form a more perfect union," etc.

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

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

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

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

But says the *Cynosure*, the insertion of this "single word" in the Constitution is "to distinguish between the 'free exercise' of the *Christian* religion, and the 'free exercise' of child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and whatever crimes are called religion." In this expression the *Cynosure* shows as great destitution of a knowledge of the Constitution as in the other it showed of National Reform. Does that paper mean seriously to assert that the Constitution of the United States guarantees the free exercise "of child-murder, polygamy, assassination," and other "crimes" as it guarantees the free exercise of religion? Does the *Cynosure* know no distinction between crime and religion? If it does *not*, it is time that it understood that the National Constitution does know such distinction. It might be well also to inform the *Cynosure* that there are now both State and United States laws prohibiting child-murder, polygamy, assassination, and other crimes, and even misdemeanors. Therefore if its further

statement be true, that the sole object of the promoters of the Religious Amendment is "to prevent the Constitution from covering crime," then the "sole object" of the Reformers is wholly purposeless; for when their "sole object" should be accomplished, they would have only what they now have.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GROUNDLESS FEARS

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

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

But should the terrible king of Dahomey succeed in sinking our navy, and in eluding our militia, and should he actually capture the editorial staff of the *Cynosure* or some other of the National Reformers, there is still another "Constitutional barrier" against him, for clause 11, of the same Section before cited, declares that Congress shall have power, "To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and *make rules* CONCERNING CAPTURES on land and water." Oh, dear *Cynosure*, you and all your fellow "Reformers" are perfectly and constitutionally safe from being compelled to bear any part in the sanguinary celebration of the birthday of the king of Dahomey. As for the rest of us we will all willingly take our chances,

rather than to risk the rule of a National Reform *rÈgime*. So as this seems to be the most instantly and really urgent of all your "wants," and as there is now a double "Constitutional barrier" to protect you, you ought just as well stop all further agitation for your National Reform Amendment.

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

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

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

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

from the secret oath, rather than against the danger which would inevitably inhere in such an inquisition.

WHO IS SINCERE

The *Cynosure* closes by saying:—

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

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

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

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in government without bloody revolution, will depend entirely upon the strength and resistance of the forces of anti-Christ."

And again:—

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

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

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

read the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We "sincerely believe" you ought to.
A. T. J.

May 1887

**"National Reform Interpretations of Scripture" *The American Sentinel*
2, 5 , p. 35.**

AMS the leaders of the National Reform propose to make themselves the interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points," under the Government of the United States, it becomes important to the American people to know somewhat about the National Reform method of interpretation. As the people of this nation are asked to amend their Constitution so as to open the way for these men to make themselves the national interpreters of Scripture, the people ought to know what qualifications these self-nominated candidates possess for the high dignity to which their laboring souls aspire. That we may do our part toward enlightening the people on this subject, we propose, as far as possible to give examples of National Reform interpretations of Scripture.

The Scriptures clearly enjoin the obligation of subjection to civil government, of obedience to civil authorities: "To be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates," and to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." In Romans 13:1-10 this duty is set forth at greater length than in any other one place in the Bible. The first verse reads thus: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." In the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, there is quite an extended comment—more than a page—upon this text, written by Rev. David Gregg—the same who was lately installed as pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston. Mr. Gregg interprets this verse as follows:—

"The *authorities* that be are ordained of God.' 'There is no authority but of God.' All authorities that are not of God and are not in allegiance to him are usurpers. This is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that '*there is no authority but of God.*'"

There stands the plain declaration of the word of God that "there is no power but of God." At this Mr. Gregg gravely observes that all powers that are *not* of God are usurpers, and that this is a self-evidence truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that there is no power but of God.

Well it certainly is a fact, for the word of God says it. Therefore, it being a fact that there is *no* power but of God, then how *can* there be any powers that are not of God? As the powers that be are ordained of God, and as there is no power but of God, it is impossible that there can be *any* power but of God. Therefore Mr. Gregg's comment amounts to just this and no more: All powers that are not powers are usurpers. We think it altogether likely that that *is* "self-evident."

But, more than this, the National Reformers will not admit that the powers that be are ordained of God. Although the Scripture says as plainly as language can say anything that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and although the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and sense of the statement, the National Reformers "interpret" it to mean, the powers that *ought to be* are ordained of God. And as the National Reform power is what ought to be, it follows that National Reform is ordained of God, and when it shall secure that power it will be exercised by a right absolutely divine. That such is the National Reform interpretation is shown by Dr. Gregg's own words. In telling what Paul was doing in writing the words of Romans 13:1-10, he says:—

"He was giving us God's ideal of civil government. He was holding up a picture of what civil government *ought to be*. He was teaching Christians *what they should strive to make Governments*."

And again:—

The object was "to furnish then, as now, a standard by which to try existing Governments. It gives us God's ideal of civil government. If Governments conform to this divine ideal, then we are bound to recognize them as divine ordinances, and to give them conscientious support and homage, but if they do not, *we are bound to inaugurate* moral reforms and *revolutions* which will conform them to God's ideal."

By this style of interpretation, therefore, we are to understand that when the Lord speaks of the powers that be, he means the powers "that ought to be." When the word of God directs every soul to be subject to the higher powers, it means that every soul shall erect a tribunal and sit in judgment upon those powers. When God directs that we shall not resist the power but shall be subject for conscience' sake, he, means that we "are bound to inaugurate revolutions." Where the Scripture sets forth the duty to be law-abiding citizens, leading quiet and peaceable lives, the National Reform interpretation of it demands that men, Christians too, shall be revolutionists, with their eyes constantly on the Government, weighing it in the National

Reform balances, and watching for opportunities to inaugurate revolutions. In short, whereas the Scripture directs that men shall be Christians and law-abiding citizens, the National Reform interpretation of the Scripture demands that they shall be scheming politicians and revolutionists. Now could any interpretation possibly be further from the truth of the Scripture, or more directly opposed to the text under consideration? But we are not surprised at it; indeed we do not see how it could be otherwise, in view of the fact that the National Reform conception of the Saviour of the world is that he is a "divine politician." With such views of Christ, it would be impossible to hold any other views of the duty of the followers of Christ than such as are expressed in the above interpretations.

A. T. J.

"The Powers that Be Are Ordained of God" *The American Sentinel* 2, 5 , pp. 35, 36.

WE stated above that the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and the obvious sense of the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." We have not space to present all the texts that might be given in direct proof of it, but we shall give enough to show that Paul when he wrote this declaration was only doing as was his wont, reasoning out of the Scriptures.

Everybody knows that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, and that he was a heathen. Yet God spake by his prophet directly to Nebuchadnezzar, and said, "Thou, O King, art a king of kings; for *the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all.*" Dan. 2:37, 38. Through the prophet Jeremiah, the Lord sent yokes and bonds to the kingdoms of Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Sidon, by the messengers that came from these kings to Jerusalem, and with them also he sent this message: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, *and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me.* And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; . . . and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of

his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand." Jer. 27:4-8.

Now as Nebuchadnezzar was a heathen, and as his kingdom was a heathen kingdom, we can hardly think that even the National Reformers would pronounce his authority to be exactly "God's ideal of civil government." Yet there can be no shadow of doubt that the power possessed by Nebuchadnezzar and exercised by him over all the kingdoms and peoples round about, was a power that was ordained of God, for the word of God says so, and said so to him. In the time of Nebuchadnezzar the power that was ordained of God. Nor was it only in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The word of the Lord by Jeremiah asserted not only that this power was

36

give to him, but to "his son and his son's son" as well; and this succession covered the whole period of the kingdom of Babylon from Nebuchadnezzar to its fall. Therefore the proof is positive that the power of the Empire of Babylon was ordained of God.

The grandson of Nebuchadnezzar—Belshazzar—in the midst of the riotous feast of Tammuz, was told by the prophet of the Lord, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it;" and, "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." The commander who led the forces of the Medes and Persians was Cyrus the Persian. And of him the Lord had said: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure." Isa. 45:1; 44:28. When Babylon fell, the rule of the Medo-Persian Empire fell first to Darius the Mede, instead of to Cyrus. And the angel Gabriel said to Daniel, "I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him." Dan. 11:1. Therefore the word of God is clear that the power of the Medo-Persian government was ordained of God.

But not to multiply instances by noting them in detail, we will quote the scripture that sums up the whole subject in few words: "Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are his;

and he changeth the times and the seasons; *he removeth kings, and setteth up kings.*" Dan. 2:20, 21. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:25. These texts assuredly demonstrate the principle declared by Paul in Rom. 13:1, that "there is no power but of God;" and that "the powers that be are ordained of God." But if these texts should not be enough to demonstrate it, then we may add the crucial text of all Scripture. When Christ stood before Pilate, "Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that *I have power* to crucify thee, and *have power* to release thee? Jesus answered, *Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.*" John 19:10, 11.

The demonstration is complete, therefore, that the words of Rom. 13:1, are a statement of *fact* and not of *theory*; that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and that "there is no power but of God." As the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will; when he has given the power to whom he will, whether to Babylon, to Medo-Persia, to Grecia, to Rome, to England, or to the United States; whether that will be direct or permissive, who shall say that that power is not of him? and who shall say that that is not the power that ought to be? And to such powers Christians are taught to be respectful, quiet, peaceable, obedient subjects, and not revolutionists. The following from Macaulay is to the point:—

"The power which the apostle. . . pronounces to be ordained of God, are not the powers that can be traced back to a legitimate origin, but the powers *that be*. When Jesus was asked whether the chosen people might lawfully give tribute to Cesar, he replied by asking the questioners, not whether Cesar could make out a pedigree derived from the old royal house of Judah, but whether the coin which they scrupled to pay into Cesar's treasury came from Cesar's mint, in other words, whether Cesar actually possessed the authority and performed the functions of a ruler.

"It is generally held, with much appearance of reason, that the most trustworthy comment on the text of the Gospels and Epistles is to be found in the practice of the primitive Christians, when that practice can be satisfactorily ascertained; and it so happened that the times during which the church is universally acknowledged to have been in the highest state of purity were times of frequent and violent political change. One at least of the apostles appears to have lived to see four emperors pulled down in a little more than a year. Of the martyrs of the third century a great proportion must have been able to remember ten or twelve revolutions. Those martyrs must have had occasion often to consider what was their

duty towards a prince just raised to power by a successful insurrection. That they were, one and all, deterred by the fear of punishment from doing what they thought right, is an imputation which no candid infidel would throw on them. Yet, if there be any proposition which can with perfect confidence be affirmed touching the early Christians, it is this, that they never once refused obedience to any actual ruler on account of the illegitimacy of his title. At one time, indeed, the supreme power was claimed by twenty or thirty competitors. Every province from Britain to Egypt had its own Augustus. . . . Yet it does not appear that, in any place, the faithful had any scruple about submitting to the person who, in that place, exercised the imperial functions. While the Christian of Rome obeyed Aurelian, the Christian of Lyons obeyed Tetricus, and the Christian of Palmyra obeyed Zenobia. 'Day and night'—such were the words which the great Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, addressed to the representative of Valerian and Gallienus—'day and night do we Christians pray to the one true God for the safety of our emperors.'"—*History of England, chap. 14.*

These, however, were law-abiding subjects and citizens, and not National Reform revolutionists.

A. T. J.

"For What Are the Powers That Be, Ordained?" *The American Sentinel* 2, 5 , pp. 38, 39.

HAVING shown, in another place, that the powers that be are ordained of God, the question comes up for consideration, For what are these powers ordained? The National Reform theory claims that because the powers "that ought to be" are ordained to God, it follows that those powers would be ordained to minister in all things pertaining to God and man. But such an interpretation is just as far from the truth as is the average National Reform interpretation.

The powers that be are ordained of God *in things that pertain to civil government and in that alone*. The magistrate is "the minister of God" solely in things civil and in nothing else. And men are to be subject to the higher powers in things civil, and in nothing else, for those powers have to do with things civil and nothing else. It is admitted by the National Reformers that Romans 13:1-10 treats "of civil government and of civil duties." Now the definition of *civil* according to Webster is, "*Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State.*" Civil government, therefore, pertaining solely to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State, in the very nature of the case can have

nothing at all to do with the relations of the citizens to God. And as the National Reform definition of *religion* is, "Man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God," this is to say that civil government can, of right, have nothing whatever to do with religion. That these propositions are correct, we have decisive proof in two notable instances.

We have shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar was ordained of God. Now this same Nebuchadnezzar took upon himself to play the *role* of the grand National Reformer of his day. It was not enough that he should be ordained of God to rule in the relations of men with their fellow-men or with the State, but he must take it upon himself to rule in men's relations to God. It was not enough that his power was ordained of God in things civil, but he must exercise his power in things religious. It was not enough that he should rule men's bodies, he must rule their consciences as well. He would compel men to worship the god that he should choose and as he chose. Accordingly he made a colossal image, and set it up in the plain of Dura, not far from Babylon, and then sent and gathered together "the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers" to the dedication of the image. Then when all were assembled, he published an edict by a loud-voiced herald, that at a signal sounded by all the musical instruments together, everybody should fall down and worship the great golden image, and this under penalty, upon whosoever refused, of being pitched into a fiery furnace.

But in the crowd there happened to be three "political atheists"—Jews they were then called—who chose to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and so refused to obey the law. They were called up and asked about it, but they persisted in their opposition to National Reform, and said plainly, "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." But according to President Seelye's National Reform principle, the State, *i.e.*, Nebuchadnezzar, was both "courageous" and "wise," and therefore did "not falter," and into the burning fiery furnace intensely heated the "political atheists" were thrust.

NO POWER OVER CONSCIENCE

Then King Nebuchadnezzar "rose up in haste" and cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast *three* men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O King. He answered and said, Lo, I see *four* men *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Then the king called to the men to come out, and they did so, untouched by the fire. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, *who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants* that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, *except their own God.*" Thus God not only brought Nebuchadnezzar to the kingdom and ordained him a power over all the kingdoms and nations round about, but he also demonstrated to him that although his power was ordained of God, that power was not ordained in things pertaining to God. The Lord showed him that although God had given him power over all kingdoms and nations, he had not given him power over the worship, the faith, or the conscience of a single individual in any nation.

The Lord not only showed this to Nebuchadnezzar, but by having it recorded in his word he has shown it to all people to whom that word shall come. And it is one of the most surprising things, that in the end of this nineteenth century, in this land of Bibles and consequent light and liberty, there should arise a set of men who will go about to put in practice in this Government the principles of the heathen Nebuchadnezzar. There might be allowed some excuse for a poor, blind heathen doing such a thing twenty-four hundred and sixty-seven years ago; but what shadow of excuse can there possibly be for men who will do it now, with the Bible in their hands, and in the face of a miracle of God wrought expressly to show the iniquity of it?

Nor is this case of Nebuchadnezzar the only instance in which God has shown to men that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are ordained only in things pertaining to men, in their relations to their fellow-men as citizens, and to the State. Under Darius, the Mede, whose power was ordained of God, some envious officials grew so jealous of the prime minister, that they determined to get him out of the way. But in all their searching and spying they utterly failed to find any fault at all in him. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But there was no State law by which they could interfere with his rights of conscience or his

liberty of worship. So like the true National Reformers they were, they set to work to "inaugurate a revolution." They pretended to be greatly interested in the honor of the king, and the good of the State. Darius, suspecting nothing, but supposing their representations were made in good faith, fell into the trap, and enacted the law which they had framed. At their solicitation he established a statute, and signed a decree that nobody should ask any petition of either God or man, save of the king, for thirty days; and that, too, under the dreadful penalty of being made food for lions.

But Daniel knew that the power of Medo-Persia was not ordained to any such work as that, and when he "knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and, his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Then those men found Daniel praying, as was a foregone certainty, and rushed to the king with the report. Suddenly the eyes of Daniel were opened; he saw that he had been trapped, and took shame to himself that he had allowed himself to be so terribly hoodwinked, and immediately began to try to deliver Daniel out of their persecuting hands. "And he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him," but there was no remedy; the thing was law and the law had to take its course, for it could not be changed, and consequently to the lions Daniel had to go. But so far as Daniel was concerned the result in this instance was the same as the other, for when Darius hastened to the den in the morning and called out to him, Daniel answered him cheerfully and said, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as *before him innocency was found in me*; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

DON'T TRUST THEM

Now the same evil principle illustrated in this case, is being practiced in the United States to-day. And it is being worked in the same way precisely. Preachers professing great interest in the workingman, or great regard for the safety of the State, will go to the Legislature with a petition, and get some one of their kind to introduce a bill, for the enactment of a rigorous Sunday law, or for the repeal of a protective clause in an already rigorous law, and all this professedly as a "police regulation" or "in the interests of prohibition," or anything

else but what it really is. And by pious pretensions, honeyed phrases, and fair speeches, they conceal their real purpose, succeed in hoodwinking the Legislature, and secure the passage of their innocent appearing bill. But as soon as their will has been made law, their interest in the "workingman," or in "prohibition," etc., sud-

39

denly ceases, and the whole tide of inquisition, prosecution, and persecution, is turned against a few innocent people who choose to worship God on Saturday instead of on Sunday. This thing was actually accomplished two years ago in Arkansas, and in all the working of the Sunday law so secured, we have not been able to learn of a single case in which the person prosecuted was not a Seventh-day Adventist or a Seventh-day Baptist. By the efforts of the lawyers of that State, and the earnest leadership of Senator Crockett, the Legislature has remedied the iniquitous statute.

Nor is this evil spirit confined to Arkansas. In California the present year, the same scheme was tried on the Legislature, but it failed. The same thing was tried in the Legislature of Minnesota, about the same time as in California, and there too, at almost the last moment, the real intent of the thing was discovered, and the scheme frustrated. In Texas, also, and other States, it has been attempted, and all within the present year, but so far we believe all have failed, because the evil was discovered before it was too late. And what those men did in the law of Medo-Persia, and what these parties have done, and have tried to do in the laws of these States, that precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to do in the Constitution and laws of the Nation.

If the Legislatures of the States, or the national Legislature, will guard against persecution, let them beware of all preachers, people, parties, or associations, who try to secure the enactment of Sunday laws, or the repeal of exemption clauses in Sunday laws already enacted.

Nor is it only in the cases of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar that God has shown that civil government is not ordained of God in things pertaining to God, but only in things pertaining to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens and to the State. Christ laid down the principle that severs forever the connection between the State and religion, and which shows conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God only in things civil, and have nothing whatever to do

with any man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Certain of the Pharisees came to Jesus and asked:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and laid, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

With that read the following from Paul's words in Romans 13:1-10, and compare the italicized words:—

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. . . For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; honor to whom honor."

CIVIL GOVERNMENT HAMS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE FIRST TABLE OF THE LAW

Now what man can read these two passages of Scripture together, and honestly or truthfully say other than that Paul had in view the word of Christ, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's? and that Romans 13:1-10 is an inspired comment upon the words of Christ, showing not only that the powers that be are ordained of God, but also showing *in what* they are ordained of God?—No one, assuredly. This is made even clearer still by the fact that Paul in referring to the duties that devolve upon men under the powers that be, makes not a single reference to any of the first four commandments; but says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; *and if there be any other commandment*, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," thus referring solely to the second table of the law, and showing conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God in things civil,—in things pertaining to the relations of man with his fellow-man,—and in those things alone.

As in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God,

have nothing whatever to do with the first table of the law of God. Again, as the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duty that men owe to the powers that be there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties contained in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say again that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with them the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God—not to Cesar, nor by Cesar—that which is God's.

Therefore the proof is conclusive, and the truth absolute, that the National Reform ideas of civil government are utterly at fault, and that their interpretations of Scripture on the subject of civil government are only perversions of Scripture.

A. T. J.

June 1887

"The Pope in American Politics" *The American Sentinel* 2, 6 , pp. 42, 43.

THE following remarks we select from an article by James Powell, D. D., under the above heading, in the *Advance*. The article was called out by the action of the Pope summoning priest McGlynn to Rome to answer for his part in the Henry George campaign for mayor of New York City, last fall.

"The fact is, the Pope claims the right, and exercises it, to interfere directly with American politics. This fact ought to be a startling message to the whole country. If any queen, king, or emperor on the face of the earth were to interfere with the politics of the country, as the Pope has done in this case, the war fever would take possession of the land inside of twenty-four hours. The silence of the press on this point is almost entirely owing to the dangerous character of the political teachings championed by the priest in advocating the electing of Henry George. Socialism is a justly dreaded evil because of its destructive doctrines, but the truth or falsity of political doctrines affects not the principle that *foreign powers must not be allowed to interfere with the rights of American citizens*. We give that principle away, when, without protesting

against the interference, we commend the Pope for dealing with Father McGlynn as he has.

"Suppose that the priest had been silenced, and ordered to Rome to answer for openly defending the public-school system in oppose-

43

tion to the direction of his archbishop, where would be the difference so far as the principle is concerned? It would not be any more an interference than in the case under consideration; yet had it been so, from one end of the land to the other, the press and pulpit would have been heard speaking out. Interference of any kind, and to any degree, with American politics, on the part of the Pope, should be resented not only by popular protest, but by the State Department of our Government at Washington. The Pope should be given to understand that when he summons an American citizen to answer in Rome for political acts and words performed and spoken in the exercise of his political rights, he assails the Republic.

"No jugglery of word definition should be allowed. Rome is well up on that little trick. She knows how to make the word religion elastic enough to mean anything that is wanted. She can easily make a definition to mark any political theory she wishes as "contrary to the teachings of the church," and then, under the pretext of discriminating between religion and politics, proceed by anathema and excommunication to carry out her purpose. The Republic is not called upon to accept her definitions. It is intelligent enough to make its own, and strong enough to stand by them. This incident of Father McGlynn is a providential opportunity to hold up the Papacy before the people as it really is,—a foreign power claiming the right to interfere with Governments. It is the old story.

"It will not do to say the Rome does not allow its priests to mix in politics. It does. It has done it. Priests are all the while mixing in politics. So long as they are fighting our common-school system, the very bulwark of our free institutions, not a word is heard from the bishops; they are all in it themselves. Nor from the Pope; that is in the line of his temporal policy. But when a priest takes a political position that antagonizes the theories of Rome, then politics becomes religion—a definition does it—and the poor priest, if he fails to see it in this light, is declared to be disobedient to the holy mother church, and exposed to all the censures and punishments that belong to all the censures and punishments that belong to the heretic. And what is that? The loss of his soul. So he himself and all good Catholics must regard it. What a terrible engine this for working mischief in the Republic! Whatever the outcome, whether Father McGlynn submits or leaves, the incident is full of meaning and significance. Press, pulpit, and platform ought to give it full ventilation."

Yes, the press, the pulpit, and the platform *ought to* give it full ventilation, but they will not. Instead of giving this menace full ventilation or any ventilation at all, press, pulpit, and platform will pay assiduous court to Rome, and invoke her further interference. Rev. C. C. Stratton, D.D., one of the foremost men of the Methodist Church on the Pacific Coast, visits the Archbishop of San Francisco to form an alliance, in a political measure. The late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., one of the foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in all the country, only a little while before his death proposed a like alliance, to force religion into the public schools. The National Reform party, composed of "all evangelical denominations" and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, bids for the help of Rome, and pronounces itself willing to suffer rebuffs to gain her help to amend the Constitution of the Nation so as to make it recognize and enforce a national religion. The press of the Nation publishes whole columns of cablegrams from Rome, telling how imposing are the parades and ceremonies of the Pope, what crowds of people attend, how they fall on their knees as the Pope enters in state, how many kiss his hand, and to whom is granted the sublime dignity of kissing his toe. Government vessels of the United States, carrying official representatives of the Government, put the Papal flag in the place of honor, instead of the Stars and Stripes. And this is the way in which the pulpit, the platform, the press, and the Government, give full ventilation" to the interference of the Pope with American politics!

A. T. J.

"The Doings of National Reform" *The American Sentinel* 2, 6 , pp. 45, 46.

WE herewith present to our readers a report of the doings of National Reform assembled in convention in the city of Pittsburgh, and also a summary of the work of the Association for the past year.

The Convention assembled Wednesday evening, May 11, at 7:45. After the formalities of opening there was a speech by Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and one by Rev. J. P. Mills, the Methodist Episcopal "District Secretary" of National Reform; after which Dr. McAllister closed the evening meeting with a statement and an appeal. The statement was that the Association began the year with a debt of between \$2,500 and \$3,000, and that the work had been carried forward on so broad a scale that there had

been a little added to the debt, although the receipts had been over \$7,000. Four men had been laboring all of the time, and three others a part of the time. One man had preached 150 sermons, delivered 60 addresses, and had written articles by the score.

He stated that the successful work in the South had awakened enthusiasm in the North, especially in Pittsburgh. He said: "There is developing one of the grandest movements the world ever saw,—a work that is to bring the North and South together. It will bring together all patriots. If we can unite the Christian sentiment of North and South, we shall bridge what has been called the 'bloody chasm.'" The appeal was then for funds to carry on the work. "In the South men of all the different denominations are ready to take hold. There ought to be three or four men to go all through the South, to organize the work. The cause is worthy of your confidence and your means."

"Secretary" Weir is the man who has just made a tour through the South, and an account of his trip was made the special order for the evening session on the morrow.

The first thing after the opening exercises on the morning of the 12th, was the annual report of the Corresponding Secretary. He stated that "the past year has been memorable in the history of the cause, because never before was there such a readiness to receive our speakers. We had speakers at Ocean Grove, at Chautauqua, and at Saratoga. At Saratoga was the most hearty reception. Arrangements have been made for an all-day session at Ocean Grove the coming season, also at a popular resort in Maryland, and near Chicago, and for a three days' session at Lakeside, Sandusky, Ohio. The *Christian Statesman* has been placed in 289 reading-rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association. More than 30,000 of the old series of National Reform documents, and 5,000 of the new series, have been distributed. So that, including the *Christian Statesman*, there has been circulated by systematic and habitual distribution 2,710,000 pages of National Reform literature."

"Besides the regular lectureship of the Association, there have been nearly fifty volunteer lecturers, who have given about 100 lectures. The greatest help has been by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Two years ago the Union established a department of Sabbath observance. One year ago, at the suggestion of National Reform, the Union established a department on the Bible in public schools." The secretary himself had addressed their National Convention, and they had thanked him." Of the monthly responsive readings of the Woman's Christian

Temperance Union, three were in the line of National Reform—one on God in Government, one on Sabbath observance, and one on national sins. Miss Willard loses no opportunity to declare that the Government rests on His shoulders. Both Miss Willard and Mrs. Woodbridge addressed the workingmen and introduced National Reform ideas. And not the least gratifying sign is the fact that for the first time in our history the fear of God has found a place in political platforms. And that this opportunity might be made the most of, the following memorial had been framed, and is to be sent to every person that can be reached; to be signed and returned:—

"The undersigned, who has sympathized and acted with the— party, desires that the future platforms of that party shall not fail to contain an acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of authority and, power in civil government, of Christ as the king of all nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws; together with declarations favoring the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the defense of the Sabbath, the Christian features of our public education, and a national marriage and divorce law in harmony with the law of Christ. The names of women are desired as well as the names of men!"

"This with the special design of pressing the subject upon the attention of all parties at their next National Convention."

Also last fall an "admirable draft" for thanksgiving proclamations in the name of Christ had been sent to all the governors, but the request had been complied with in only one instance, and that was Governor Scales, of North California. In conclusion he stated that "never before were there echoes of National Reform from so many, nor so influential, quarters," and referred to statements made by Dr. Talmage, "Sam" Jones, Joseph Cook, and others.

Next there was given the reports of District Secretaries. Secretary Foster reported 135 sermons, 65 lectures; interviewed 10 presidents of colleges, 30 professors, and 12 editors; preached in 12 Presbyterian and 11 Methodist Churches, and lifted collections averaging \$109.78 a month. And the people ready for National Reform!

Secretary Wylie reported for "three months, spent mostly in Michigan and Indiana, especially in connection with the Prohibition Campaign in Michigan. Delivered 25 sermons, 39 lectures, visited 2 annual conferences of the United Brethren Church, and 1 of Free Methodist, and 3 colleges. No difficulty to get a hearing in colleges."

Secretary Weir reported that from April 1, 1886, to February 4, 1887, he had addressed in the aggregate over 7,000 people, received

over \$500, traveled 6,400 miles, held 97 interviews, and addressed 4 synods, 2 colleges, and W. C. T. Unions in 3 places. All signs he said point to this as the hour when these things should be pressed upon political parties. "If our enemies say these things shall stay out, we must be determined that they *shall go in.*" He spoke of "the workingmen, whom Socialism, and Anarchism, and Catholicism, are all trying to catch." But in the Executive Committee the day before it had been decided that National Reform must secure the workingmen, and that they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath, for workingmen do not want to work on the Sabbath.

Secretary Mills reported seven months' work principally in his own conference, Northern Ohio, and chiefly among M. E. Churches. He published a small sheet himself to help spread his views; gave 12 lectures a month on National Reform direct; collected in all \$375.

Secretary Coleman had addressed 9 meetings, 2 ecclesiastical bodies, and 5 colleges. The coming year the way is open to reach twice as many colleges. He said, "The bad are growing worse, and the good are growing better."

A series of about twelve resolutions was introduced. But neither in the resolutions nor in their discussion was there anything developed that had not been covered in the speeches and reports, except in the one in which the convention complimented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. One speaker caused a good deal of sparring by saying that he "would not have the ballot put into woman's hands." Mr. Stevenson remarked that he foresees far larger results from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union influence in National Reform than even they themselves realize. Within five years they have bid their hand on the legislation of twenty States, and have secured scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. Another speaker said: "This movement is bound to succeed through the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

Another said: "When we get women and Christ in politics, *and they will both go in together*, we shall have every reform, and Christ will be proclaimed King of kings and Lord of lords."

The chairman closed the debate on this resolution by saying that "when woman undertakes anything good she will do it. And if she attempts anything bad she will accomplish that. What Ahab would not do Jezebel did. And what Herod would not do to John the Baptist otherwise, his wife caused him to do." No one attempted to explain

just exactly where, in this observation, there lay the compliment to the W. C. T. U. It seemed to the SENTINEL representative that the compliment was rather backhanded. And yet we could not help wondering whether in the end the observation might not prove true and the simile appropriate, even though it be not preeminently complimentary as it stands.

Rev. Mr. McConnel, of Youngstown, Ohio, proposed the formation of "a Praying League, to be composed of all who are interested in this movement, to covenant together to offer a prayer at the noon hour, wherever they may be, every day till our prayer is answered in the abolition of the liquor traffic, and till this nation is made God's kingdom." The proposition was heartily endorsed by the convention, and Mr. McConnel was given charge of the concern.

Thursday evening, the closing meeting, Secretary Weir occupied in giving the account of his Southern trip. It began February 24 and closed May 11. During this time he delivered 42 addresses, visited 7 States, traveled 2,800 miles, addressed 7,700 people, collected \$157.07, and held 103 interviews, three of which were with the governors of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The others were with preachers, professors, officials of Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, and editors. Meetings were held in 6 churches of different denominations. Out of the 42 meetings 24 were in these churches; some were even union National Reform meetings. In Raleigh, N. C., the Methodists and Presbyterians united. He gave addresses in 16 educational institutions, 9 of which were colored, and he never had, he said, more attentive listeners. His reception throughout was cordial. "Never," said he, "was I better treated than by the people of the South. All denominations, *every one of them, all* gave a hearty welcome to the cause of National Reform." He only met three people who flatly opposed National Reform, and all three were ministers.

Mr. Weir described the outlook as most promising. He said: "Any man can take National Reform principles and carry them safely and satisfactorily all through the South. In Atlanta, among all the leading people, there was no need to *explain* National Reform. They understand it, and are ready to join hands with us. I believe it is going to be a walk-over in the South. A confederate brigadier said, 'I am a Southerner, was a confederate soldier, a secessionist. But all that is past now, and I am ready to join hands with you at once.' And nine out of every ten will do the same thing."

Mr. Weir then closed with the impressive appeal: "Don't we see in this our opportunity—an opportunity such as seldom comes to any cause? It will have a welcome everywhere. Don't we see how it will build for the unity of the nation? Don't you see in this the unifier of this nation? Some say prohibition will unite them, but *this it is that is to do it.*"

And we could not possibly say but that it is true. We have not space for any further comment, but only to remark, that in view of these plain statements of fact in the progress of the National Reform movement in a single year—all given in sober earnest, and none with any air of extravagance nor of braggadocio—how much longer shall the movement have to prosper so, how much longer will it have to grow, before the American people will awake to the fact that the National Reform movement, which bears in its train the union of Church and State, with all the evils that accompany such an illicit connection, is on the eve of a fearful success? How long shall the AMERICAN SENTINEL have to stand alone amongst the journals of the nation in pointing out the dangers that threaten religious liberty in this land of freedom? How long?

A. T. J.

July 1887

"The Prospects of National Reform" *The American Sentinel* 2, 7 , pp. 49-51.

TO THE regular readers of the SENTINEL we need offer no argument here to prove that the success of National Reform will be the union of Church and State in this Government. This has been amply proved in preceding numbers of this paper; yet if there are any of our new readers who have not seen the proofs of it, we are prepared to furnish the evidence, upon demand, in any quantity, and at short notice. Knowing therefore that the success of the National Reform will be the union of Church and State, it becomes important to all people to know what are the prospects of its success. This is especially important in view of the *fact* that the movement is even now on the very eve of success. To set this fact forth as it is shall be the purpose of this article.

1. The movement is supported by "all evangelical denominations." The Association has one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, *eighty*

of whom, including Joseph Cook, are Revs. and Rev. D. Ds., and Rev. D. D., LL.Ds., and some are even *Right* Rev. D. D., LL.Ds. Of these eighty, *eleven* are bishops made up from the Episcopal, Evangelical, and United Brethren Churches. Besides these eighty divines, there are in the list *ten* college professors, *one* governor, *three* ex-governors, *nine* justices of Supreme Courts, *two* judges of Superior Courts, *one* judge of the United States District Court, *one* brevet brigadier-general, *one* colonel, and *seven* prominent officials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

2. The W. C. T. U. is counted, both by themselves and the National Reformers, as one with the National Reform Association. Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. Clara Hoffman, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrop, and Mrs. W. I. Sibley, of the Union, are all vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, May 11, 12, 1887, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman* and corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, in his annual report made the following statement of the co-operation of the W. C. T. U. with National Reform:—

"Two years ago Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, suggested the creation of a special department of its already manifold work for the promotion of sabbath observance, "*co-operating with the National Reform Association.*" The suggestion was adopted at the National Convention in St. Louis, and the department was placed in charge of Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, of Ohio, as national superintendent. Mrs. Bateham has since, with her own cordial assent, been made one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. . . .

"One year ago your secretary placed in the hands of President Willard a memorandum suggesting the creation of another department 'for the retention of the Bible in the public schools,' and assigning reasons for such action. This step was recommended by Miss Willard in her annual address before the late National Convention at Minneapolis, and was adopted in so far that a committee was appointed to make preliminary inquiries during the coming year, with Miss Willard herself at the head of the committee.

"It was your secretary's privilege this year again to attend the National W. C. T. U. Convention, and it would be unjust and ungrateful not to acknowledge here the cordiality with which for the sake of the cause he was received. A place was kindly given for an address in behalf of the National Reform Association, and thanks were returned by vote of the convention. A resolution was adopted *expressing gratitude to the National Reform Association* 'for its

advocacy of a suitable acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in the fundamental law of this professedly Christian nation.' . . .

"In the series of 'Monthly Readings' for the use of local Unions as a responsive exercise, prepared or edited by Miss Willard, the reading for last July was on 'God in Government;' that for August on 'Sabbath Observance' (prepared by Mrs. Bateham), and that for September on 'Our National Sins.' *Touching the first and last-named readings* your secretary had correspondence with Miss Willard *before they appeared*.

"A letter has been prepared to W. C. T. U. workers and speakers, asking them, in their public addresses, to refer to and plead for the Christian principles of civil government. The president of the National Union allows us to say that this letter is sent *with her sanction and by her desire*.

"The heartiness and intelligence, the faith and courage, with which these Christian women embrace and advocate the fundamental principles of Christian government are most gratifying. Mrs. Woodbridge chose for her theme at Ocean Grove and Chautauqua, 'Shall the United States Acknowledge Christ as Sovereign?' Miss Willard loses no opportunity of declaring that 'the Government is on his shoulder.' Similar expressions are constantly on the lips of their leading speakers and writers. . . . Mrs. Woodbridge, in her address to the Workingmen's Assembly in Cleveland, appealed to them to join hands with the temperance forces in placing this 'Government upon the shoulder of him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and in men's crowning Christ our Lord as the Ruler of Nations.'"

3. The workingmen. It will be seen by the above that the National Reform Association

50

has not only gained the Union itself, but that through the Union it is making strong bids for the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations. Indeed, it was stated in the late convention that "the Anarchists, the Socialists, and the Catholic Church are all trying to catch the workingmen, but *National Reform must secure the workingmen*." And we are safe in saying that National Reform will secure them. Even though the Roman Church should secure the workingmen's associations, bodily, that will be no hindrance to National Reform's securing them, for of all the bids for support that the National Reform Association is making the strongest are made *for the support of*

4. *The Catholic Church*. Thus says the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

And again:—

"We cordially, gladly recognize the fact that in South American republics, and in France, and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism. . . . In a world's conference for the promotion of national Christianity many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics."—*Editorial before quoted.*

Now let us read a word from Rome. In his Encyclical published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart and soul and body and mind in defense of the church and Christian wisdom."

From the above quotations from the *Statesman* it is seen that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity. National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation is the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what "all Catholics" are by the pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, and not to lose sight of it for an instant. What the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome are identical, and of course they will "gladly join hands."

5. The Prohibition party as such. The national Reform report before mentioned says on this point:—

"The national platform of the Prohibition party adopted in Pittsburg in 1884, contained an explicit acknowledgment of Almighty God, and of the paramount authority of his law as the supreme standard of all human legislation. The Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner, D. D., of Boston, an eloquent and devoted friend and *one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association*, was a member of the committee *which framed the declaration*. After that presidential campaign was over, and before the State conventions of 1885, Professor Wallace, of Wooster University, wrote to your secretary, suggesting that all diligence be used to secure similar acknowledgments and kindred declarations on related points, in the Prohibition platforms of the several States. Under this most judicious and timely suggestion, a large correspondence has been held with the leaders of the party, and its chief workers in many States."

And then of the State and county Prohibition Conventions that have "incorporated into their platforms" distinct acknowledgment of National Reform principles, there are named the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut; and the counties of Washington, Lancaster, and Chester, Pa., and Belmont, Ohio.

WHAT SHALL BE THE ISSUE

Now take the voters of "all the evangelical denominations;" the voters of the Prohibition party; the voters of the workingmen's associations; and the voters of the Catholic Church; and it is perfectly clear that they compose an overwhelming majority of all the voters in this nation; and much more would it be so if the W. C. T. U. should secure their demanded right of suffrage. *And against this thing there will be no "solid South."* Take, then, all the voters that are here represented; take with them an issue upon which all will heartily unite; veil National Reform under that issue; then bring that issue to a vote at the polls, and it is absolutely certain that it will carry by a vast majority.

Is there then any such issue in view? There is such an issue, and that already clearly defined and well developed. That issue is THE UNIVERSAL DEMAND FOR SUNDAY LAWS, or, as otherwise expressed, laws enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath." Every one of these bodies that we have named will almost unanimously support whatever demand may be made for Sunday

laws, even to the subversion of the national Constitution to secure them. The reader needs not to be told that all the churches are in favor of rigid Sunday laws. It is well known that one grand aim of the W. C. T. U. is to secure the enactment and enforcement of strict Sunday laws. The Baltimore Plenary Council, indorsed by the Pope, commands the observance of Sunday, and the Romish Church will heartily support any movement to enforce its observance by national laws. It is this very thing that makes the National Reform Association so anxious to secure the help of Rome. Both the Catholic and the National Reform papers urge upon the workingmen that as they have already struck for eight hours for a day's work, now they must strike for six days for a week's work, and Sunday secured by law.

In the late National Reform Convention, it was not only stated as we have quoted that "National Reform must secure the workingmen," but it was also said that "they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath." And they are securing them by this very means. The Illinois Legislature, which we believe is yet in session, had before it for passage a Sunday law framed by the preachers of Chicago—it might well have been framed by the Inquisition itself—and a petition, said to represent 25,000 Knights of Labor, was sent up urging its passage. Nor does the movement stop with the Knight's of Labor and other workingmen's associations, but even the Socialists join themselves to the movement and are welcome, as the following from the *Christian Union* testifies:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath [Sunday, of course] is to be preserved at all—and we are sanguine of its preservation—the *non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to re-enforce the religious demand* for Sabbath [Sunday] rest, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o'nights in fear and trembling."

Are not the Legislatures of all the States already being besieged at every session with demands for the enactment of rigors day laws with no respect whatever rights of conscience? Only the past winter such demands were made upon the Legislatures of California, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Illinois sweepingly and with cheers—we have not learned the result in the Senate. But State laws will amount to but little while national statutes wanting. And now Congress itself is to be besieged. Reformed Presbyterianism and National Reform are identical—each—each is t'other—and of the action of their Synod month, the dispatches tell us this:—

The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of America, in session here, has adopted a resolution declaring that the violation of the Sabbath by the Post-office Department is one of the greatest sins of Government, as well as one of the greatest causes of the Sabbath desecration throughout the whole commonwealth, and calling upon *the organization of all evangelical bodies in States* to combine in order *to secure abolition* of whatever in the Post-office Department is a violation of the *Sabbath law*."

And the National Reform Committee of the United Presbyterian General Assembly, also held in June, passed the following resolution:—

"*Resolved*, That the moderator and clerks be directed to append their signatures in behalf of the Assembly to the [National Reform] petition requesting Congress to pass a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no future contracts which shall include the carrying of the mails on the Lord's day."

51

Of course under the Constitution as it is, Congress can pass no such law, because the passing of all such laws, whether by Congress or by State Legislatures, is essentially religious legislation, and is prohibited by the Constitution. Therefore it is that the National Reform Association wants the Religious Amendment adopted, making the Constitution to recognize the Christian religion, and so give a basis for Sunday legislation.

Here then is the situation. The National Reform Association proposes a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Through such an Amendment there will be formed a union of Church and State. Under cover of the universal demand for Sunday laws, the question of the Constitutional Amendment can be made a question of national politics, and can be brought to a vote of the nation. When it is so brought to a vote, the National Reform Association can bring to the polls, in its support, the voters of "all evangelical churches," the voters of the Prohibition party, the voters of the Catholic Church, the voters of the Knights of Labor, and the workingmen generally, and with these the Socialists and all the rest of the non-religious rabble, and the whole thing sanctified by the sweet influences of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and so can carry it as sweepingly as inquisitorial Sunday laws are now carried in some of the State Legislatures.

We pretend not at all to say how soon this may be the grand question in national politics. It *can* be done very soon, but whether soon or late, we know, and so everyone else who will look at this

thing exactly as it is, may know, that whenever the day comes that it is brought to a vote it will as surely carry as that day comes. That that day will come is as sure as that these facts exist. And when it does come, then there comes with it a union of Church and State, with its whole train of attendant evils in this Government. And in that day, liberty—whether civil or religious—will forever take her departure from this dear land, her last and happiest home on earth. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And *now* such vigilance is demanded as never before in the history of the nation. May God arouse the people to a sense of it.

A. T. J.

"The State, the Church, and the School" *The American Sentinel* 2, 7 , pp. 52, 53.

WE have received from the author; C. H. L. Schuette, A. M., a book entitled, "The State, the Church, and the School." It is quite a full and free discussion of each of these institutions in itself, and in its relation to the others. He first discusses "The State"—"Its Nature and Office," "Its Chief Arms," and "Its Sphere of Jurisdiction"—and he does it well. Next he treats of "The Church"—the rights of religion, the "Essence and Forms" of the Church, "Its Object and Its Methods," "Limits and Powers of Action"—and he does that well. Next he shows their "divinely ordered relation," and that too he does well. Next he discusses their "*humanly* ordered relation," which of course is their vital union. This he does, if anything, better than all. First he refutes, and splendidly, too, the arguments for their union, whether under the form of a particular church organization, or under the form of Christianity as a whole. Then he presents a series of excellent arguments directly against any such union. Next we have not the least valuable chapter of the whole book,—giving copies of the sections of the National Constitution, and of all the State constitutions that relate to religion. Then, last of all, he discusses "The School"—"Parental Duties," "What It Is and Should Be," "Its Relation to State and Church," and "The American School"—this likewise he does well.

At this our readers may wonder why we did not say at once that it is an excellent book, and so send forth our hearty commendation. Well, this we should have done had we found the book consistent with itself. To use a familiar and homely illustration: It is all very well

when we see a cow give a large quantity of excellent milk, but it is not at all well to see her lift her foot and kick it all over. It is a pleasure to read a sound treatise on an interesting subject, but it is most painful, while reading such, to find your author suddenly turn a complete somersault and subvert every principle which he has established, and labored to illustrate. And this is precisely the predicament in which we found this

53

author when we reached section 15 of this book, pages 281-296.

After critically discussing the sound principles of Government and Religion, and their relation to each other, or rather their proper separation from each other, and after showing this proper separation as illustrated in the theory of our own Government, he finds, as anyone may find, certain practices, especially in our State governments and legislation, that are inconsistent with the sound principles which he has established. But instead of allowing them to be exactly what they are, "inconsistencies," and allowing them to stand condemned by his principles, as inconsistencies, he undertakes to justify them. And in his attempt to justify the inconsistencies he is compelled to use arguments that subvert every principle that would stand against a union of Church and State, and which subvert the very arguments which he himself uses against such union.

Of these "inconsistencies" he selects three, and names them thus:—

"The law of the observance of Sunday, the law punishing blasphemy, and the law creating chaplains to the Government—these are the specimen statutes now to be reviewed with a special reference to the question whether they are in full harmony with the principles of a perfect religious freedom and with a complete legal separation of State and Church."

Then of the law of Sunday observance he very properly argues as follows:—

"Were we to inquire, for example, why we have a Sunday by the law of the land in which we live, we venture to say that nine answers out of ten would point us to the decalogue. In other words, we would be told that whereas God has instituted the Sabbath, our Government, as a matter of course, must command its observance. Yet no answer made could be more fallacious, and, in its logical workings, more disastrous to our theory of Government. And here we do not refer to the question whether or not the divine law of the Sabbath is of universal application—a matter on which Christians

themselves are divided—but to the utterly false political principle on which the answer is based, to wit: that whatever God has forbidden or bidden must also for that very reason be forbidden or bidden by the law of the land. On such grounds every biblical injunction and precept would have to be embodied, as an integral part thereof, in our legal code; and whither such a procedure would lead us, it is not difficult to foresee. The distinction between politics and religion, the State and the Church, would thus be completely wiped out, and there would ensue a condition of affairs more woful than the world has ever known. In our day, and in our land especially, because Church and State are separate, no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds."

Now Sunday is purely a religious thing, and laws for its observance must be based on purely religious grounds, for the thing itself exists upon no other grounds—it is wholly an affair of the church. In view of this quotation, therefore, the query very properly presents itself. How can our author justify civil laws for the observance of Sunday? He attempts it thus:—

"The true *rationale*, therefore, of laws such as have a religious significance, and as we have named above, must be sought elsewhere."

That is to say that the *rationale* of laws having a *religious* significance must be sought elsewhere than on *religious* grounds. How could things having a religious significance be found anywhere but on religious grounds even if they were sought? How can things having a religious significance grow out of any but religious grounds?

But the grounds upon which he seems to seek this "true *rationale*" are that the majority of the people demand it, and that is enough, whether their demand be well founded or not. Thus he argues:—

"Whether the religious belief which leads the great majority of the people to demand the legal sanction of Sunday be well founded or not, or whether their motives be pure or not—these are points on which it is not the business of the law and the law-makers to decide. The mere fact that the general body of the people wants a day of worship is enough to give a solid foundation to the law which respects the will so expressed."

How it would be possible to frame a proposition that would be more destructive of every principle of justice or of right we cannot imagine. Whether the demand be well founded or not, or whether the motives of those who make the demand be pure or not—these are points that cannot enter into the question at all! They are the majority, and the majority demand it, and even though it be an unjust demand, wickedly intended, "that is enough to give a solid foundation to the

law"! According to this there never has been, and there never can be, in any place where the majority could or can make their demands to be heeded, any law that did not, or that would not, rest upon "a solid foundation." According to this even the crucifixion of the Saviour rested upon a solid foundation. For was there not "a great multitude" with the chief priests and the scribes and the elders, who demanded his crucifixion? To Pilate was this not the majority? Whether the demand was well founded or not or whether their motives were pure or not—these were not points on which it was the business of Pilate to decide. The mere fact that the great multitude wanted it, was enough to give a solid foundation to the act of Pilate, which respected the will so expressed. We submit that this is a valid argument under the proposition laid down by this author in support of Sunday laws. It is an infamous proposition, that is all.

And further, immediately following the words above quoted, he says:—

"Especially must the popular will be heeded in this matter, because of its religious nature, on the ground that religion is the source and strength of all true morality."

This, too, not five pages from where he wrote that "no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds." That is to say: "No civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds," but civil statutes must be enacted in favor of Sunday, "especially," "because of its religious nature"! If the inconsistency which he attempts to justify is any more glaring than that which appears in his justification, our Government must be in a pitiable condition.

We have not the space to notice his justification of laws against blasphemy. Suffice it to say that he disallows Blackstone's definition of blasphemy, in civil jurisprudence, and proposes one of his own that does not relieve the matter a particle, and he sustains it by argument that would justify criminal statute against everybody who should openly choose to disagree with the religious belief of "the great mass of our people" (page 292). And as he himself condemns the appointment of chaplains by the Government, it is not necessary that we should notice that.

The truth is that in his section on "Inconsistencies" the author of "The State, the Church, and the School," has attempted to do what cannot be done. Webster defines "inconsistent," as "irreconcilable in conception or in fact." The things which our author mentions as

inconsistencies, *are* inconsistencies. And his attempt to reconcile them is simply an effort to reconcile the irreconcilable.

Yet there is a way in which his credit for consistency as a writer may be regained and maintained, and by which the standing of his book may be assured. Let him blot out his attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable in these two places in section 15, let the "inconsistencies" stand as they are, and let them stand condemned as they are by the sound principles of the book throughout. With those parts blotted out, we verily believe that the book would stand as the best treatise in existence on the subject with which it deals; it would well deserve a place on the table of every household in the land; and we would gladly do our best to see that it had that place. But as it is, the book only condemns itself, as it ought to be condemned by every person who loves human right and religious liberty.

The book is issued by the Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

A. T. J.

August 1887

"Civil or Religious, Which?" *The American Sentinel* 2, 8 , pp. 60, 61.

LAMST month we showed that the universal demand for Sunday laws is the wave upon which National Reform will ride to success and that this is the issue under cover of which the unsuspecting nation will be plunged into the evils of a union of Church and State. We showed that the passing of all laws enforcing the observance of Sunday is essentially religious legislation, because Sunday is wholly a religious thing, and laws enforcing its observance must be based upon religious grounds, for the thing itself exists upon no other grounds. Of course the National Reform Association itself does not propose legislation, whether in favor of Sunday observance or anything else, upon any other than religious grounds. But there are thousands of people who pretend to stolidly oppose any such legislation, yet who, at the same time, strive most strenuously to secure the enactment of laws enforcing Sunday observance, under the plea that such laws have nothing to do with Sunday as a religious institution, but entirely as a "police regulation;" that such laws have nothing at all to do with religion, but are wholly in the interests of health, education,

patriotism, etc. But every such plea is a sheer fallacy. We have read a good many arguments based upon this plea, even in court decisions, but never yet have we read one in which the plea was fairly sustained. Nor can the thing ever be done, because to do so there has to be *established*, that which is always attempted, a distinction between what are called the civil and what the religious aspects of the day. But no such distinction can ever be shown, because it does not exist. They may call it Sabbath, Christian Sabbath, Lord's day, or whatever else they please, the institution is wholly a religious one. Its duties and its obligations pertain solely to the church, and it has no civil aspects, and never can have any.

But perhaps as good a way as any to show this would be to set down some of the arguments that have been made in the endeavor to justify Sunday laws on a civil basis. One of the most prominent, and perhaps the best known, of the advocates of this theory, is Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of Brooklyn, New York. He has written a book entitled "The Sabbath for Man," which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union commands to be kept in constant circulation. He tries to make it appear that Sunday laws and their enforcement have nothing to do with religion, but have "relation to health, education, home virtue, and patriotism," and his attempt is crowned with the

61

usual success of such efforts, that is, to prove emphatically the contrary. He says:—

"Such a day [as is secured by *well-enforced* Sabbath laws] causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of"—What suppose you, reader? On the platform of "health" interests? of "educational" interests? of the blessings of "home virtues"? on the platform of "patriotism"? Not at all. But "causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of *religious* equality." Yet Sunday laws *well-enforced* have no relation to religion! Again:—

"Liberty allows the majority no right . . . to enforce its religion upon others. But inasmuch as more than three-fourths of the population are members or adherents of Christian churches, and so accustomed to set apart the first day of each week for rest and religion; and inasmuch as it is the conviction of this majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without laws, therefore Sabbath laws are enacted," &c.

Let us analyze this. (a) The nation cannot be preserved without *religion*. (b) But religion cannot be preserved without the *Sabbath*. (c)

But the Sabbath cannot be preserved without *laws*. Now if these laws are to preserve the Sabbath *that* the Sabbath may preserve *religion*, it inevitably follows that all such laws are enacted in the interests of religion solely.

To obtain proof that Sunday laws "in relation to health" are justifiable, Mr. Crafts sent out the following question:—

"In your observation of clerks, mechanics, and other employes, which class are in the best physical and mental condition for the renewal of business on Monday morning, those who are church-goers, or those who spend the Sabbaths in picnics and other pleasures?"

To secure testimony to show whether Sunday laws are justifiable on the score of health, he inquires which class has the better health on Mondays, *church-goers* or non-church-goers! and yet Sunday laws have no relation to religion!!

But what answer did he get? He says he received written answers from about one hundred and fifty persons, and "the general answer is 'church-goers.'" One says, "The church-goers are worth twenty-five per cent. more on an average." Another says, "Church-goers. Their conscience is void of offense. Their mental peace and comfort impart increased power and endurance to the physical system." Another says, "Many workingmen have told me that a short, practical sermon rests them." Another says, "The church-goers are as fresh as larks, while the pleasure-goers have aches in the head, heart, and home, and so come into the week all out of breath." Mr. Clem. Studebaker answers, "My observation is, that clerks and mechanics who spend their Sabbaths in church and Sabbath-school work are the best fitted for the duties of the office or shop on Monday morning." And Col. Franklin Fairbanks answers, "Those who attend church and Sunday-school on Sunday are the most valuable in our business. I can tell the difference between them and the others by their work in the shop." And last, Dr. Crafts says, "Scores of manufacturers and merchants on both sides of the sea, agree that those who go to church on Sunday are best fitted to go to work on Monday."

Now we do not object at all to these statements. We do not doubt in the least that such is the fact in the case, as a rule. We freely admit that Sabbath-keeping, church-going people are better off in every respect than are those who are not such kind of people. It is not at all to the statements, nor to the fact, that we object. But we do most decidedly object *to the use that he makes of them* in his argument. For if his argument proves anything at all, it proves positively that

laws should be enacted compelling everybody *to go to church* on Sunday.

Mark, his proposition is that "laws requiring that the people shall rest on Sunday from the exciting pursuit of gain and amusement are consistent with liberty in the same way as other health laws." But all his proofs show that it is the church-goers who above all have the best health. The only conclusion therefore that can be drawn from his premises is that the State should enact laws compelling everybody to go to church on Sunday, and listen to a short, practical sermon to rest them, because their health will be twenty-five per cent. better than if they don't. And so all such laws "are consistent with liberty in the same way as other health laws." And yet Sunday laws well enforced have no relation to religion! And so will end, logically, every argument that is ever made to justify Sunday laws on a "civil basis." We say again, There is no such basis, and nothing is needed to more plainly prove it than do these attempts to prove that there is, which always end in proving the opposite.

Thus says Mr. Crafts:—

"Sabbath laws for protecting the worshiping day of the prevailing *religion*, . . . are vindicated."

And so he goes on, insisting all the time that Sunday laws must have "no relation to religion," yet proving by every line of argument, in spite of his propositions, and in spite of logic, that such laws are wholly in the interests of religion. So it is, and always will be, with everyone who attempts the task. All of this goes to show that the animus of the whole discussion is the Sunday as a *religious* institution, and the enforcement of its observance as such. A further illustration of this is seen in the above quotation. Notice, he says the "majority has no right to enforce its religion upon others." Then without the slightest break, or hesitation, he goes right forward and declares that a majority "are members or adherents of the Christian churches, and have set apart the first day of each week," etc., etc., and winds up with the demand for laws for the enforcement of Sunday "*for the preservation of religion*, in obedience to the will of that majority."

After all this we are not surprised to find him sanctioning an exposition(?) of the first Amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." He calls it "that much misunderstood article of the National Constitution," and says:—

"President Charles E. Knox, D. D., of the German Seminary at Bloofield, N. J., in a *very able paper* on the 'Attitude of Our Foreign Population toward the Sabbath,' urges that this Amendment needs to be expounded everywhere to our foreign population. It should be shown to them that while Congress possesses no law-making power in respect to an establishment of religion, it *may*, and *does*, and *always has*, passed laws which have respect to religion."

Then our foreign population are to be informed, are they, that Congress "may, and does, and always has," violated the Constitution? That would be an exposition of this article indeed. This will be news to the National Reform Association, too, as well as to the rest of us. We feel almost sure that if Dr. Crafts can convince that Association of the truth of this exposition, he will be promoted to great honor. However, we doubt his ability to do it. First, because this statement of Mr. Knox is notoriously false; and secondly, because the idea advanced by Mr. Crafts himself that the enactment of Sabbath laws is "not in violation of this article," stands contradicted by the United States Senate, in that, when in 1830 it was petitioned to legislate on this very subject of Sunday, it declared that such action would be unconstitutional.

A. T. J.

September 1887

"Sunday Laws and Liberty" *The American Sentinel* 2, 9 , pp. 67, 68.

DR. CRAFTS asks a very important question, to which we should be very much pleased to have some Sunday-law advocate give a consistent answer. Here is his question:—

"But how is it consistent with liberty that those whose religion requires them to rest on the seventh day are compelled to give up public business and public amusements on the first day?"

In his answer he separates the Jews from other Sabbath-keepers, and says:—

"In the case of the Jews the case is not as difficult as many have thought. If he cannot do more business in five days in Great Britain and the United States than in six days elsewhere, *he is free to remain elsewhere*. If when he comes into Great Britain or the United States he finds by experiment that a 'conscientious Jew cannot make a living,' *the world is all before him* to choose where he will dwell."

And so it appears that whether a man can be an inhabitant of the United States, is to depend altogether upon whether he will keep Sunday. Compel a man to stultify his conscience or leave the country; and yet the cause of all this has nothing to do with religion!

Rabbi Wintner, of Brooklyn, applied a touch-stone to this thing which in an instant proves its "true inwardness." In reply to questions and proposals of Dr. Crafts, looking to the adoption, by the Jews, of Sunday instead of Sabbath,—

The Rabbi proposed "a compromise between Christians and Jews, by agreeing on 'a neutral day in the middle of the week' as a sabbath for all—showing that he is willing to give up Saturday and take some other common day, his national prejudice against the Christian first-day Sabbath being his only reason for preferring the third or fourth day to the first, a prejudice which *of course the law cannot recognize.*"

But why "of course"? If Sunday laws have relation simply to "health, education," etc., cannot these be promoted just as well on Wednesday as on Sunday? If not, why not? Cannot the laboring man rest just as well on Thursday as on Sunday? And if the rest is to have no reference at all to religion, nor to the "religious aspect of the day." then why is not the proposition of the rabbi eminently proper? You ask the Jew to give up the day which he observes; he only asks that you do likewise. He proposes to meet you half way; certainly nothing could be fairer, but "of course" it cannot be recognized. Oh, no, "of course" everything must be given up for Sunday, and every man's conscientious convictions must be crushed out that Sunday laws may have free course to run and be glorified. And all this without any reference to the religious aspect of the day? Nay, verily ! For the "opinion" of these people "is very decided for freedom [on Sunday] from anything that could shock a *thoroughly Christian community.*"

Of other seventh-day keepers, illustrated by his citation of the Seventh-day Baptists, he says:—

"So, also, the Seventh-day Baptists, being only one five-thousandth of the population, can hardly ask to have the laws changed for them."

Why not, pray? Is it not just as proper for the seventh-day keepers to ask that the laws be *changed* in their behalf as it is for the Sunday-keepers to have those laws *enacted* in their behalf? Or is it true that all rights, civil and religious, human and divine, are summed up in the National Reform Sunday-law advocates?

Again:—

"It would not be reasonable for the Legislatures to compel the other ninety-nine-hundredths of the population who do not regard *Saturday* as a sacred day, to stop business for the few who do."

True enough. But suppose that those who "regard *Saturday* as a sacred day" were the *majority*, then, according to the premises of Dr. Crafts, and the Sunday-law people generally, it *would be* reasonable for the Legislatures to *compel* all who did not so regard it, to *stop business* on Saturday. But will they admit the reasonableness of this logical conclusion from their own premises? Not for a minute. Suppose, for instance, that in the State of Ohio the Seventh-day Baptists, the Seventh-day Adventists, and the Jews were the majority. Then suppose that they should unite and secure the passage of a law compelling all the people of the State to rest on the seventh day (Saturday), what a roar of indignant protest would immediately arise from united Christendom! Such exclamations as "religious bigotry!" "Destruction of religious liberty!" "Violation of the rights of conscience!" etc., etc., to the end of the catalogue, would fill the air. And justly so, say we. But if the claims of the Sunday-law advocates be just, where would there be any wrong, where any injustice, in such an action? If it would be wrong for Saturday-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Sunday-keepers to rest on Saturday, wherein then is it right for Sunday-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Saturday-keepers to rest on Sunday?

And, too, in answer to all their protestations, they could say, Why, dear sirs, you need not make so much ado. This is no restriction of your rights; this is no invasion of your liberties. Your right to rest on Sunday still remains to you. You are at perfect liberty to refuse to work on Sunday. Our action is entirely "consistent with liberty." We do not by this law compel you to keep Saturday *religiously*; this statute has "nothing to do with religion." This does not compel you to go to church; you are at "liberty" to stay at home. This law has nothing to do with "the religious aspects of the day," it only has relation to your "health," to your "education," to your "home virtue," and to your "patriotism"! Now, reader, we ask you candidly, Is there in all the United States one person who regards Sunday as a sacred day, who would accept any such reasoning as that? And yet those who do so regard Sunday are the very ones who offer this reasoning (?) and expect us to accept it as conclusive, *for the reason* that they are the majority, and for that reason alone.

But if it be thus, as Mr. Crafts says, that "laws for protecting the worshiping day of the prevailing religion from disturbance, are then "vindicated," who does not see that laws for the protection of the institutions of the *prevailing religion* are vindicated in the same way, whatever and wherever that religion may be? And then is not the Mohammedan, in his own country, fully justified in enacting laws compelling Christians to shut up their places of business, and rest on Friday, his Assembly day, and saying to them, in the words of Dr. Crafts, "If you cannot do more business in five days in Turkey or Arabia than in six elsewhere, you are free to go elsewhere. If you find that in Turkey or Arabia a conscientious Christian cannot make a living, the world is all before you to choose where you will dwell." Every man who has the least conception of liberty will say that that would be oppression. Yet these same Sunday-keeping Christians, who would unanimously pronounce that oppression in Turkey, will do the same thing in America in behalf of Sunday, and call it liberty. And wherever a voice is raised against their action, it is immediately branded as the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," even though the opposition be made by a *majority* of the inhabitants of a whole State, as in California in 1882. And for this these free citizens of the State of California are called by this Sunday-law champion, "this oligarchy of *foreign liquor sellers*." Hear Him:—

"In California this oligarchy of foreign

68

liquor sellers was *actually allowed* to repeal the Sabbath law, as a "league of freedom."

His application here to the "League of Freedom," is as false as any of the other of his claims. The *Rescue*, the organ of the Good Templars, said of the Sunday plank in the Republican platform, that it was an "entire blank, *acceptable to the League of Freedom, and entirely in their interests*." And Dr. McDonald, president of the Home Protection Association, said that he was "disgusted with the Sunday-law plank in the platform;" that it was "too treacherous and unsafe," etc. And the Home Protection Association was the most active opponent of the League of Freedom. It "is a consummation devoutly to be wished," that, while these folks strive so strenuously for their *Christian Sabbath*, they would show some respect for the Christian duty to "speak the truth," and to "not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

They were "actually allowed," he says, to "repeal the Sabbath law." "Allowed!" By whom? That Sunday law was repealed by virtue of an

issue that was carried by a majority of 17,517 votes, in the State election. And the governor and other State officers who were "actually allowed" to be elected in that campaign, were also "actually allowed" to conduct the affairs of the State for four years. And by the same token, and on the same day, Secretary Folger was "actually allowed" to be beaten for the governorship of New York by a majority of about 200,000. We should not wonder if Dr. Crafts would one of these days volunteer the information that the people of the United States were "actually allowed" to abolish slavery! After this display of erudition, we are not at all surprised to find him, in the very next sentence, calling the repeal of that law an act of *oppression*. See:—

"This *oppression* of masses by margins *must be stopped*."

So, then, a condition of affairs under which all people are at liberty to keep the day as they may choose, without the *slightest interference, is oppression*. But if only a law could be enacted *compelling all* to keep the Sunday, under penalty of fine, or imprisonment, or confiscation of goods, or banishment, *that* world be LIBERTY. To quote his own words, it "leaves a man's religious belief and practices *as free as the air he breathes*." Yes, it does. As free as the air that was breathed in the Black Hole of Calcutta.

And in leaving "a man's religious beliefs and practices" so free, "it only forbids the carrying on of certain kinds of business on a certain day of the week, . . . in deference to the feelings and wishes" of a certain class. It therefore was no restriction whatever of the "religious beliefs and practices" of the apostles when the priests and Sadducees laid hands on them and put them in the common prison, and commanded them not to speak at all nor to teach in the name of Jesus. That was perfect religious liberty! And for the apostles to oppose the will of the majority as they did, was the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," we suppose. Acts 4 and 5. The priests and Sadducees and the Council did not command them to not *believe* in Jesus and his resurrection. They did not command that they should not worship him. They only commanded that they "should not *speak* at all nor *teach* in the name of Jesus." The Sadducees were the "majority," and as the preaching of the apostles disturbed their "thoroughly" Sadducean religion, "this oppression of masses by margins" had to be "stopped." And thus might Dr. Crafts and the National Reform party justify every act of oppression, and condemn every work of reform that has ever been in the world.

A. T. J.

"Some Facts about National Reform" *The American Sentinel* 2, 9 , pp. 70, 71.

THE *Christian Nation* of July 13, 1887, presents an argument to show that "National Reform is non-sectarian." It presents "three facts" and then says:—

"The National Reform Association is not asking the nation to recognize Calvinism, Arminianism, Catholicism, or *any other ism*."

On this point of "any other ism" we have a word to say, and we shall say it, after the manner of the *Christian Nation*, by presenting a few facts—more than three—for the consideration of the people in general and of the *Christian Nation* in particular.

First fact. The first step that was ever taken, the first paper that was ever presented, in favor of the National Reform movement, or the organization of that association, was by a Reformed Presbyterian.

Second fact. Until within about the last three years, all the active public workers—the District Secretaries—of the National Reform Association have been Reformed Presbyterians, and all but three of them—Leiper, Weir, and Mills—are now Reformed Presbyterians.

Third fact. Both of the editors of the *Christian Statesman*—Dr. McAllister and T. P. Stevenson—are Reformed Presbyterians. Dr. McAllister is a professor in a Reformed Presbyterian College, and Mr. Stevenson is pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.

Fourth fact. Mr. John W. Pritchard, by whom the *Christian Nation* is "conducted," is a Reformed Presbyterian; and for two years or more was the Reformed Presbyterian Synod's "Financial Agent for National Reform."

Fifth fact. Both the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation* are recognized church papers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as well as organs of National Reform.

Sixth fact. The *Reformed Presbyterian*, for the month of January, 1870, published to the world an article by Rev. James Wallace, in which are the following statements:—

1. "This important truth of the Lordship of Jesus Christ over the nations, was attained by our reforming and martyred Fathers in Scotland, . . . and has been transmitted down to us sealed with their blood, and is the precious and peculiar inheritance of the Reformed Church, and distinguishes her from all the other evangelical churches in this and other lands. No other church

professes to maintain this great principle in its practical applications."

2. "The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are *and the only principles*, of National Reform."

3. "Now the Association for National Reform simply proposes to have these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church adopted into the Constitution of the United States, annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles. . . . The adoption of this Amendment into the Constitution would be the Government doing . . . the highest honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the greatest benefit *to our church*."

4. "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 his.)

Seventh fact. These statements are confirmed by Rev. J. R. W. Sloane's account of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," in which he says:—

"The more special and distinctive principle of this church, the one in which she differs from *all others*, is her practical *protest against the secular character* of the United States Constitution. . . . They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice."

Eighth fact. The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of 1886 in its report on National Reform said:—

"It is ours to hold up the ideals of God, *which have originated the National Reform cause.*" And the Synod of 1885 said of National Reform, that "This is the tap-root of the Reformed Presbyterian Church."

Therefore the sum of all this matter is—

THE UNDENIABLE TRUTH, that National Reform is nothing under heaven but Reformed Presbyterianism—and that in politics.

In view of these facts, the statement of the *Christian Nation* that "the National Reform Association is not asking the nation to recognize Calvinism, Arminianism, Catholicism, or *any other ism*," looks rather queer as a representation of truth. And all the more so as it is so exceedingly difficult to understand how it can be that the Reformed Presbyterian conductor of the *Christian Nation* does not know of these facts.

In proof of the "non-sectarian character of the National Reform creed" the *Christian Nation* proposes the fact that "the membership of the National Reform Association embraces representatives of almost every evangelical communion. Joseph Cook and Dr. Miner, Dr. Leonard and Bishop Littlejohn, Frances E. Willard and Julia McNair Wright, and thousands of others . . . find room and welcome on the broad platform of National Reform." But it proves nothing of the kind, because the "broad (?) platform of National Reform" is composed only of the narrow distinctive principles of the Reformed Presby-

71

terian Church," and when these people of other communions step upon that platform, they in that adopt the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and so far make themselves Reformed Presbyterians. And when they of other communions push the National Reform movement to a successful issue, they are only pushing to a successful issue the distinctive principles of Reformed Presbyterianism; they are only fixedly planting in the soil of our national affairs "the tap-root of the Reformed Presbyterian Church."

The logic is perfectly easy. By their own words, we have the following syllogism:—

MAJOR: Reformed Presbyterianism "originated the National Reform cause."

MINOR: "The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, and *the only principles, of National Reform.*"

CONCLUSION: National Reform is *only* Reformed Presbyterianism. And when the National Reform Association asks the nation to recognize National Reform, it asks the nation to recognize Reformed Presbyterianism, and *no* "other ism."

The *Christian Nation* ought to adopt some other form of denial. It might have better success in getting at the truth. A. T. J.

"As to a Religious War" *The American Sentinel* 2, 9 , p. 71.

A CORRESPONDENT asks the following questions:—

"What effect will the success of the National Reform have on the unbelievers at large? We heard one say that they would raise a little army and fight, before they would submit to the authority of a church. Another said he would get out his old shot-gun and 'shoot down a few of them.' Will there be enough of that spirit to bring on a religious war? A. R. S."

As to the first question we can say that according to the words of the National Reformers themselves, the success of National Reform will "disfranchise every logically consistent infidel." Notice particularly that it is only the "logically consistent" unbeliever who will be disfranchised. That is to say that though he be an infidel, if only he will silently submit to the dominance of National Reform ideas, or every openly, though hypocritically, favor the National Reform scheme, he will not be disfranchised. But if he shall be at all "logically consistent" and oppose the work or the rule of National Reform, or shall express his dislike of the National Reform government and its so-called "Christian features," then, according to the words of the National Reformers, all such unbelievers must "go to some wild, desolate land, and stay there till they die."

But if they refuse either to play the hypocrite, or "to go to some wild, desolate land," and propose to resist, as these mentioned by our correspondent, then that brings up the alternative of the second question, upon which we can only say that we have no idea how much of this spirit of violent opposition there will be against National Reform. We know, however, that the question of a religious war all depends upon the opposition—the National Reformers are ready for it, and are coolly calculating the bloody chances. On this very subject the "Rev."—mark it—the Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the most representative of National Reformers, says:—

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in Government without a *bloody revolution*, will depend *entirely* upon *the strength and resistance* of the forces of anti-Christ."

Therefore, as the question of a religious war depends "entirely" upon the forces of resistance to National Reform, and as we have no idea how much forcible resistance there will be, we cannot form any estimate of the probabilities of the coming of a religious war. It may be that through the immense premium that National Reform will put upon hypocrisy, the forces of resistance will be, if not entirely vanquished, so far overcome as to avert a religious war. For be it distinctly understood that the AMERICAN SENTINEL proposes no violent nor forcible resistance to National Reform. Our opposition is, and ever will be, conducted strictly and entirely upon Christian principles. We unsparingly point out the evil of it, and warn our fellowmen against it; knowing the terrible nature of it, we persuade men to avoid it, and whether they will hear or whether they will forbear remains entirely with them. Should National Reform succeed

in its designs, and establish its shameful rule, we shall offer no violent resistance. In things pertaining to God, however, we shall forever disobey it, and shall forever persuade others to disobey it. But it will always be a disobedience that consists in obedience to the commandments of God and the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. It will be disobedience without resistance. If others choose to resist it by force of arms, we are not responsible for that, and shall take no part in it nor encourage it. Our work now is to expose the essential iniquity of the thing, that it may not be slipped upon the nation unawares. And if, after all, it shall succeed, then our work shall still be to expose the iniquity of it, and to set the example of open, but non-resisting, disobedience to its Papal-political precepts.

A. T. J.

October 1887

"The 'Christian Cynosure' Again" *The American Sentinel* 2, 10 , pp. 77, 78.

OUR readers will remember that in the April SENTINEL we reviewed some National Reform arguments of the *Christian Cynosure*. Well, the *Cynosure* has replied, and expects us to reply to this also. We shall do so. And as the *Cynosure* issues beforehand its *pronunciamento* that, "If the AMERICAN SENTINEL wishes to be read by the *Cynosure* editor, it must deserve to be read," we shall go very softly and shall humbly endeavor to make our reply so that it may deserve the august notice of the *Cynosure* editor. First the "*Cynosure* editor" says:—

"Our Constitution forbids Congress to 'make any law concerning an established religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*' Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting '*the free exercise*' of polygamy and assassination by Danites or Blood Avengers at Salt Lake; or the multitudes of religious murders by the Kofong, Purrow, Bondoo and other religious secret societies which cover Africa. Insert the word *Christian* before religion, and our Constitution would recognize exactly what the framers meant and supposed they had done, viz., 'the free exercise' of the religion of Christendom, that is, of the Bible."

Now the first thing that we wish to say is, that we respectfully submit to the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that it is a most discouraging thing to have to argue about the United States Constitution with a person who cannot quote it correctly. Mark, the

says, "Our Constitution forbids Congress to 'make any laws concerning an established religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'" Mr. Editor, the Constitution does not do any such thing. The Constitution forbids Congress to make any "law *respecting* an *establishment of* religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The difference is very material; we confess, however, that we have little hope that the *Cynosure* will detect it. Nor for that matter do we care particularly, whether it does or not; what we want is that the editor of the *Cynosure* should by some means gain sufficient knowledge of our Constitution to quote it as it reads.

Further he says that, "Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting 'the free exercise' of polygamy and assassination by Danites or Blood Avengers at Salt Lake." To this we can only say as we did before, Does the *Cynosure* mean seriously to assert that the Constitution of the United States guarantees polygamy and assassination as it guarantees the free exercise of religion? In other words, are "religion," and "assassination" synonymous terms, so that the free exercise of the one is the free exercise of the other? Is the free exercise of religion the free exercise of assassination? Does the prohibition of assassination, or any other crime, prohibit the free exercise of religion? Is it possible that a distinction must be made between these things, that the *Cynosure* may be enlightened? It seems strange that anybody, much less an editor in this age, should know no such distinction must be made between these things, that the *Cynosure* may be enlightened? It seems strange that anybody, much less an editor in this age, should know no such distinction.

But more, and just as bad, he continues, "Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting 'the free exercise' of . . . the multitudes of religious murders by the Kofong, Purrow, Borldoo, and other religious secret societies which cover Africa." Well, suppose that all this were even so, what harm can it do? What on earth has our Constitution to do with either allowing or prohibiting the murders, whether religious or otherwise, by "the Kofong, Purrow, Bondoo, and other religious societies which cover Africa?" Suppose the editor of the *Cynosure* could have our Constitution actually prohibit the murders by the religious societies that cover Africa. What good could it possibly do? That would be decidedly a prohibition that would not, prohibit. It *could* not prohibit, because our Constitution has nothing, and can have nothing, whatever to do with the secret societies, nor with anything else, that cover Africa.

Now let not the *Cynosure* whimper over this as it did over our strictures upon its desire to prohibit the religion of Dahomey. That is exactly what it has said. We have only copied *verbatim et literatim*, its own words. And by these words, its demand is that our Constitution shall have a religious amendment, so that laws can be made under it, which shall prohibit murders committed by the "secret societies which cover Africa." The *Cynosure* may, perhaps, say that that is not what it means. Then what *does* it mean? We have no way of learning what it means but from what it says. Yet we do not so much blame the *Cynosure* editor, for it seems to be the prime property of National Reform to so confuse the ideas of its advocates that they become incapable of putting together sentences in plain English, that shall tell what they do mean.

Once more, he says: "Insert the word *Christian* before religion, and our Constitution would recognize exactly what the framers meant and supposed they had done." This is the "single word" the insertion of which the *Cynosure* declares is all the addition that National Reformers want to make to our Constitution. Let us try it and see how it would then read, and how it would work. Here it is: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of *Christian* religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Then under *that* Constitution Congress could make laws respecting an establishment of any religion on earth, except the Christian religion. Under that Constitution the Mohammedan religion, the Chinese religion, or any other except the Christian religion, might be made the established religion of this Government, only so that the free exercise of the Christian religion was not prohibited. Is *that* "exactly what the framers meant"? Is *that* "exactly" what they "supposed they had done"? If it is, then that they were mistaken is the happiest thing that ever befell this Nation. But the mistake was not with the framers: they did "exactly" what they meant to do. The mistake lies altogether and solely with the "*Cynosure* editor."

Next the *Cynosure* says:—

"As to Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists who insist on keeping Saturday and working on Sunday, the *Cynosure* holds that 'Man needs and God requires a Sabbath.'"

78

But that is not all that the *Cynosure* and National Reform hold, not is that as they hold it. The *Cynosure* and National Reform hold that "Man needs and God requires" *Sunday* as a Sabbath. And when "Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists" and Jews or any others have

kept Saturday as Sabbath, as "man needs and God requires," the National Reformers want to compel them to keep Sunday besides. The National Reformers declare that all that God requires of man in this connection is one-seventh part of his time, or one day in seven, and then when these people religiously and conscientiously render to God the one day in seven that he requires, the National Reformers want laws to compel them to render another day also. Although, according to their own principles all that God requires of man is one-seventh of his time, they will compel all seventh-day keepers to render two-sevenths, unless they yield their consciences and accept the interpretation of the National Reformers. But in that case men's right of conscience and of interpretation of Scripture is destroyed, and the National Reformers impose themselves and *their* interpretation upon men's consciences in the place of God. And that is the Papacy over again.

Yet says the editor, "The *Cynosure* is opposed to coercing conscience." That may be so, but National Reform is *not* opposed to it. And as the *Cynosure* is pledged to National Reform, we doubt very much whether it is indeed opposed to coercing conscience.

Again the *Cynosure* editor avows:—

"We are opposed to imprisoning or fining any decent law-abiding man, who has kept Saturday, because he does not keep Sunday also. The *Cynosure* would help pay such a man's fine, petition for his instant relief from jail, and instruct the Legislature to repeal the law which imprisoned him."

But there have already been a number of instances, in two States, where just that kind of men have been imprisoned, fined, and shamefully treated, for that very reason and no other; and yet the *Cynosure* never offered to help pay any of the fines, it never petitioned for their relief at all, nor did it ever "instruct" either of the State Legislatures to repeal the law which imprisoned the men, and robbed women and children. True, while the *Cynosure* did not believe that there were any such cases in existence, it was so bold as to observe that "nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than such persecution." But when *facts* were presented in its own columns by a trustworthy citizen of its own city, who himself saw some of the persecutions, then the *Cynosure* instead of helping to pay the fines, or petitioning for the relief of the persecuted, or instructing the Legislature to repeal the persecuting law, calmly folded its editorial hands and concluded to "wait for confirmation of the facts before commenting upon them." Then when the facts were confirmed

by the public records clear to the Supreme Court of the State, and even to the halls of the State Legislature itself, the *Cynosure* has never even to this day offered a single word of comment upon the subject, and the persecution continued for more than a year—it continued in fact till the Legislature repealed the law and so put a stop to it. And although the Legislature repealed the law, it never received a word of instruction from the *Cynosure*, to do so. Mr. Editor, words are very cheap, and until your acts show differently on this subject from what they ever have shown, your professions will amount to nothing, though your words may charm never so wisely—"The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords."

"But" says the *Cynosure*, "if the Arkansas cases of persecution are just as given, and not the result of religious squabbles, and law perverted by sectarian or neighborhood fights, then the severest strokes of the SENTINEL will but second our own."

Those cases of persecution were exactly as given, if not worse. But that is not the question at all. Suppose they were entirely the result of "religious squabbles" and of "law perverted by sectarian fights." It is for that very reason that they ought to be utterly condemned. For what business has the civil law to be made the channel through which shall be poured out the venom that is engendered "in religious squabbles"? By what right is it that the State shall be made the tool of the irregular passions of sectarian bigots who happen to be in the majority, in their "sectarian fights"? It is against this that the SENTINEL wars. It is the principle of the thing which we condemn. Whether the victims of the persecution were Seventh-day Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, Indians, or Chinese, the principle is the same, and is utterly perverse. But to make such a thing universal in all this Nation, is the direct aim of National Reform and of the *Christian Cynosure*. For such will be the inevitable result of the religious amendment to the National Constitution. Therefore the SENTINEL opposes the so-called National Reform, and shall ever oppose it to the very utmost.

Then as was to be expected the *Cynosure* swings back upon the subject of secret lodges, and says:—

"Several Legislatures have passed laws against imposing secret oaths by secret lodges. The New York Reports, Wendell, Vol. 13, and the testimony before the Rhode Island Legislative Committee give these oaths in the terms imposed in the lodges, *sworn to by*

Masons; and published by John Quincy Adams as given. These oaths swear men to have their throats cut if they violate the by-laws of their lodges."

That may all be true. We shall allow that it is true at any rate, for the sake of argument. Yet however true it may be, here is something that is just as true as that can be: The taking of such an oath is wholly a voluntary act. No man in the world was ever compelled to take any such oath, much less was anyone ever compelled to take it under penalty of forfeiture of citizenship and all rights of conscience. Yet to compel men to conform to their will, or else suffer the weight of such a penalty, is precisely what the National Reformers will do if they ever succeed in their project. And this is why that, although secret societies and their oaths are bad, National Reform is worse; yes worse than they ever can be unless they should set about to do as the National Reformers are trying to do.

The *Cynosure* says in effect that if our reply does not suit, it will notice the SENTINEL no more. Very well, we earnestly hope that this our reply will suit: yet if it does not the SENTINEL will survive the calamity we are sure. So dear *Cynosure* if it must be so,

"Then fare thee well;
And if forever,
Then forever
Fare the well."
A. T. J.

November 1887

"A Monstrous Bid" *The American Sentinel* 2, 11 , pp. 81-83.

WE have several times shown the declared purpose of the National Reform Association to "gladly join hands" with the Catholic Church, and to co-operate with the Roman Catholics in any way that *they may* choose, in carrying to success the National Reform scheme. But, although the National Re-formers have for several years thus held themselves in readiness, they have not till now made any distinct official advances to gain the Papal co-operation. Now, however, they have decided on a course that can scarcely fail to win the so much, and so long, coveted assistance of the Papacy. This was the outcome, and the only immediately practical one, of the Saratoga National Reform meeting, August 15-17.

The main question there discussed was the question of religion in the public schools, under the heading of "Secularism in Education." Mr. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and Corresponding Secretary of the National Reform Association, opened the discussion.

"The speaker argued against the secular programme: 1. That it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics or conciliate them to our school system. Their special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious worship and instruction from the schools only gives color to the charge."

So, then, the public-school system of the United States must be revolutionized because "it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics." That the Roman Catholics may be conciliated, and "their special outcry" stopped, "religious *worship*" and religious "instruction" must be forced into the public schools. As, therefore, the movement is, first of all, specially to satisfy the Roman Catholics, it would logically follow that the "religious worship and instruction" that would be conducted and given in the public schools, under the National Reform *regime*, would be such as should specially satisfy the Roman Catholics. And for once in its history the course of the National Re-form Association is strictly logical; for in the course of the discussion, Rev. S. V. Leech, D. D., of Saratoga, who has been for seven years chaplain of the New York Senate, asked the Corresponding Secretary to state how National Reformers would answer this argument:—

"If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, *how could we object to the Douay version* [the Catholic Bible] *in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?*"

"The Corresponding Secretary" answered,—
"WE WOULDN'T OBJECT."

The National Reformers "wouldn't object!" They "wouldn't object" to a majority of Roman Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands of the children of Protestants and other non-Catholics, in the public schools! They "wouldn't object" to twenty Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands, and the Catholic worship upon the minds, of the children of nineteen non-Catholics in the public schools!

Therefore, let it forever be borne in mind that the aim of the National Reformers is, by amendment of the National Constitution, to put it into the power of the Roman Catholics, wherever they may be in the majority, to force the Roman Catholic "worship and instruction"

into the minds of the children of non-Catholics, in the public schools. And let it also forever be borne in mind, that the Rev. Herrick Johnson, D. D., of Chicago, was chairman of the meeting in which this wicked thing, this religious tyranny, was proposed and indorsed; and that Joseph Cook, of Boston, took an active part in the same conference.

Then, as though realizing the effect of his unqualified answer, the Corresponding Secretary attempted to guard his answer, and to deaden its effect, by saying:—

"We would be glad to see Roman Catholics putting the Bible, in any version, into the hands of their children."

"Into the hands of *their* children," so should we. But that was not the question, Mr. Stevenson, nor is that point involved in the question. The question was *not*, Shall the Roman Catholic put the Douay version into the hands of *his* children? But it was, Shall he put that Catholic version into the hands of *my* children? You said the National Reformers "wouldn't object" to it. But I do most decidedly object. There was no such question asked as, Shall the majority of Roman Catholics put the Catholic Bible or any other Bible, "into the hands of *their* children"? But the question was, Shall the Roman Catholics, when in the majority, put the Catholic Bible into the hands of *our* children? You said the National Reformers would not object to it. But, Mr. Stevenson, we do most decidedly object to their doing so; and we object to your National Reform scheme of putting it into their power to do so. Your "glozing" argument, Mr. Stevenson, is entirely foreign to the question; yet it is valuable in that it shows how readily, and how perfectly, the National Reformers adapt themselves to the

82

crafty ways of the Jesuitical system whose alliance they so deeply crave. Yet, although we should be as glad as anybody to see the Roman Catholics putting the Bible into the hands of *their* children, even then we most decidedly object to their doing it in the public schools and at public expense.

But the Corresponding Secretary goes on:—

"This is not a question of versions, but of the right of the word of God to a place at all in the public schools. Prof. Tayler Lewis once wrote two valuable articles on the theme, 'The One Bible,' in which he maintained that no body of Catholic scholars, in the face of the scholarly world, would deny that King James's version is a real version of the Holy Scriptures, while Protestant scholarship cheerfully admits the same of the Douay Bible. There are not a half a dozen passages in it which even seem to inculcate any

distinctively Roman doctrine. It is a Latinized version rather than Anglo-Saxon, far less plain than ours, but it is a version."

Exactly what Mr. Stevenson means by the phrase "distinctively Roman doctrine" we cannot say, because the popular Protestantism of the day is making so many compromises with Romanism that it is difficult to tell just what is distinctively Roman doctrine. But we here quote one verse from the Douay version, and ask the non-Catholic people of this country whether this is not enough distinctively Roman in doctrine to distinctively condemn the National Reformers in their proposal to give the Catholics power to teach such stuff in the public schools of this Nation. We quote Hebrews 11:21, which in the Douay version reads thus:—

"By faith Jacob dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod."

To *adore*, is "to worship with profound reverence; to pay divine honors to; to honor as a *god*."—*Webster*. Therefore the Douay version distinctly inculcates the doctrine that Jacob worshiped with profound reverence the top of his rod; that he paid divine honors to, that he honored as a god, the top of his rod. And this is the version of the Bible which the National Reformers "wouldn't object" to have a majority of Catholics by law to put into the hands of the children of a minority of non-Catholics. This is the doctrine which the National Reformers propose, by constitutional amendment, to empower a majority of Roman Catholics in any school district of the United States, to teach to the children of non-Catholics. Therefore, if National Reform succeeds, what is to hinder the Roman Catholic majority from teaching your children and mine to adore the top of the priest's rod, in the public schools? For what is the Bible to be taught for in the public schools if it is not to be obeyed in the public schools? And if the Catholic Bible is to be taught in the public schools where the Catholics are a majority, then is not the Catholic Bible to be obeyed in such schools? As the National Reformers propose to have "religious *worship*" as well as religious instruction in the public schools; as they propose to have Catholic worship and instruction in the Catholic Bible in the schools where Catholics are in the majority; and as the Catholic Bible says that Jacob scepter and kingdom, whose vicegerent on earth the Pope is, and also "as an instance and argument of *their* faith"? Who can prevent it, when once the Roman Catholics are empowered by constitutional amendment to do so?

How long shall it be before the American people will awake to the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement?

Whether, according to Mr. Stevenson's idea, this passage is one of the less than half a dozen passages which inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine, we know not, but we do know that it inculcates distinctively *idolatrous* doctrine. But even then that is not the primary question involved here. Whether there be in the Douay version a half dozen such passages, or one such passage, or none at all, the principle is the same. And it is the *principle* upon which we stand. That principle is that the Catholic majority has just as much right to force the Catholic Bible, and the Catholic instruction, and the Catholic worship, upon the non-Catholic minority in the public schools as the Protestant majority has to force the Protestant Bible and the Protestant instruction, and the Protestant worship, upon the non-Protestant minority in the public schools. And that is but to say that there is no right at all on either side of the question, nor in the question anywhere. And this only illustrates the principle that neither the Bible, nor religious instruction, nor religious worship, can of right have any place in the public schools of the United States Government, or of any other civil government on earth. We have cited the above passage from the Douay version, and made the argument upon it, only to make more clearly apparent the justice of the principle, and not because we think that the Catholics have any less right in the matter than Protestants have.

But is there any prospect of the National Reformers succeeding in this project? There is decidedly a favorable prospect of it, and therein lies the danger. It must always be borne in mind that the phrase National Reform Association embraces all the "evangelical" churches, the Prohibition Party, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Now all this force, allied with the Catholic Church, and increasing its strength by the support of the professional politicians whom it can influence, can carry their issue at the polls as soon as they can bring the matter to a vote. The only question that remains an open one is, Can they gain the alliance of the Catholic Church? With a few more such bids as this one made by the Saratoga meeting, we are sure they can, even if they do not by this one. To set forth the matter a little more fully, let us size up the proportions of the bid that was made at Saratoga.

First, they said in substance that the Douay version and King James's version of the Scriptures are the one Bible; that the Catholic

Bible is just as nearly the true word of God and that the great question is not one of versions, but of the right to this word of God to a place in the public schools, while the question of versions is a secondary matter, to be decided after the main question has been decided.

Secondly, they declared that wherever the Catholics are in the majority, they may put the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools.

Now let us suppose that the Catholic Church accepts the bid, what would be the result? By this alliance the National Reform Party can carry a constitutional amendment, declaring that the Bible shall forever have a place in the instruction of the public schools of this Nation. Thus that question will be fixed, and whether the Bible and its instruction shall be in the schools, would be no more a matter of controversy. The only question then remaining will be, What Bible? And by the main question already decided, this question will be reduced to very narrow limits. It will be only a question between Catholics and Protestants. Because so far as the non-religionists are concerned, the question is already decided that the Bible shall be in the schools; and to the man who cares nothing particularly about the Bible or its instruction, it will make not a particle of difference what Bible is in the schools; and this indifference will be justified and emphasized by the National Reform Protestant concession, already made, that there is no difference. Therefore the question of, What Bible? being solely one between Catholics and Protestants, what would be the result? Here are some figures from the census of 1880.

In	Catholics.	Protestants of all classes.
California,	216,000.	52,621.
Louisiana,	280,000.	100,223.
Massachusetts,	500,000.	253,397.
Wisconsin,	306,000.	189,844.
Minnesota,	139,500.	118,627.
New York,	1,210,000.	771,171.

Connecticut,	175,000.	131,480.
Rhode Island,	96,000.	37,150.
Colorado,	28,000.	14,992.
Nevada,	5,000.	2,117.
Washington Ter.,	12,000.	6,023.
Montana,	16,450.	1,896.
Arizona,	42,000.	141.
New Mexico,	121,000.	290.

Therefore, if the Catholic Church should accept the Saratoga National Reform bid for her alliance, and the question of the Bible and religious instruction in the public schools were decided to-morrow, or next year, or at any other time, the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, could be established in all the public schools of these ten States and four Territories.

Nor did the Saratoga meeting stop with this. Read the following from the official record of the proceedings:—

"REV. DR. PRICE, of Tennessee: 'I wish to ask the Secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *consensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools as they do in Massachusetts?'

83

"THE SECRETARY: 'I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.'

"DR. PRICE: 'I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference, to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible.'

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

We believe it is not only possible but probable, for very opportunely with this action of the National Reformers at Saratoga, there came from the Pope to the Catholic prelates assembled at Baltimore to discuss the plans of the new Catholic University at the capital of the Nation, the following:—

"The unlimited license of thought and writing, to which erroneous notions concerning both divine and human things have given rise, not only in Europe but also in your country, has been the root and source of unbridled opinions, while, on the other hand, with religion banished to a great extent from the schools, wicked men strive by craft and fallacious wisdom to extinguish the light of faith in the minds of the young, and to enkindle there the flames of irreligion. Wherefore it is necessary that youth be nourished more carefully with sound doctrine, and that these young men especially, who are being educated for the church, should be fully armed to fit them for the task of defending the Catholic truth. We therefore most gladly welcome and heartily approve your project for the erection of a university, moved as you are by a desire to promote the welfare of all and the interests of your illustrious republic."

Now when the National Reform Association, to gain the religio-political alliance of Rome, goes as "requested" to these Roman Catholic authorities, carrying in its hands the concession that the Catholic Bible is as nearly the word of God as is the Protestant Bible, that they are virtually all one; and also carrying in its hands the public schools of ten States and four Territories of this Union, to be delivered over bodily to the religious rule of *Rome—will the Romish Church accept the bid?* We fear she will. But whether she will or not, we call it A MONSTROUS BID. And if she does not, we are sure the National Reformers will increase the bid, and will keep on increasing it till she does accept it.

And what are you going to do about it?

A. T. J.

"The National Reform Head" *The American Sentinel* 2, 11 , pp. 86, 87.

AT the Lakeside National Reform Convention, the following question was asked:—

"Does your movement not appeal more exclusively to the educated classes than to all classes in general?"

The question was answered by both Dr. McAllister and "Secretary" Coleman. Dr. McAllister's answer we shall notice at another time. Mr. Coleman's answer was this:—

"It is true our movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body."

It is so seldom that we find a National Reform expression with which we can agree heartily, unreservedly, and without any if's or but's, that we hasten to give to this statement our unqualified indorsement. We perfectly agree with it. It *is* true. It is as full of truth as an egg is full of meat. The National Reform movement in the past, and from its very beginning, *has* had a great deal more head than body. We not only perfectly agree with Mr. Coleman's statement, and give it our unqualified indorsement, but we feel disposed just now, for the sake of the cause, to emphasize the fact somewhat by giving some proofs in its support.

It is well known that the National Reform Association has had for years, and has now, a string of vice-presidents numbering about one hundred and twenty—this year they number one hundred and *twenty-two*. Those who have ever seen the list know that, with but two exceptions, it is made up of titled names to the fullest extent that titles can be obtained; such as Rev.; Rev. D. D.; and Rev. D. D. LL.D.; Right Rev. D. D.; and Right Rev. D. D. LL.D.; Rev. Bishop; Rev. D. D. Bishop; and Right Rev. D. D. Bishop Rev. Professor; and Rev. D. D. Professor; Rev. President; and Rev. D. P. President; President D. D.; President D. D. LL.D.; President Ph. D. LL.D.; and President W. C. T. U.: Hon.; Hon. Ex-Governor; and His Excellency Governor: Col.; Brev't Brig.-Gen.; etc., etc., *ad nauseam*.

All this is generally known, but it is *not* generally known that *nobody knows whether the one-half of these people are in favor of National Reform or not*. The National Reformers themselves do not know whether all the men whose names they publish as vice-presidents, are in favor of National Reform or not. No, there are some of them of whom they do not know whether they have been dead or alive for the last five years. *We* know that they are not all citizens of the United States, and that they do not all even live in the United States. We know that they are not all in favor of National Reform.

We know that in the very latest published list of their vice-presidents they have the name of a man who is a bishop of the Church of England *in Canada*, and has been for five years. Yet all these years the National Reformers have run his name as a vice-president of their association, calling for an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and still do so! Of this we have the written evidence. Will the National Reform gentlemen please tell us

what a Canadian bishop can have to do with amending the Constitution of the United States?

We know that they have run for five years or more the names of men as vice-presidents representing certain States, while those men have not lived in those States at all in all that time. Of this also we have the written evidence.

We know that in their latest published list they have the name of one man at least who is openly opposed to the whole National Reform movement. We are not at liberty to print the gentleman's name (he is a clergy-man to whose name the title of "D. D." is annexed), but we may insert some of his words on this point; it throws some light upon the National Reform method of getting so many and such distinguished names in their list of vice-presidents. He says: "I was placed there [among these vice-presidents] evidently as a mere *figure-head*, never having done, or been asked to do, anything to further its objects. Some months ago I was written to, and asked if I had any objections to my name being retained on the list, and if I did not answer *silence* would be taken for *consent*. From sheer indifference I did not answer."

And *that is* how this gentleman's name remains on the list of vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. How it got there in the first place he does not know. But they got his name and made him a Vice-president, and then asked him whether his name might be "retained" and "silence" would give "consent." Out of "sheer indifference" he kept "silence," and so he is still a vice-president of the National Reform Association. If he had been dead it would have been all the same, because then there would have been "silence," and silence would have given "consent," and so, even though dead, he would yet have been a vice-president, in good standing no doubt, of the National Reform Association.

Indeed, just such a thing as this was stated in the Pittsburg Convention last May. One of the secretaries said they ought to revise their list of vice-presidents, because a number of names that had been on the list for several years were of men who were dead, and he thought those names ought to be dropped. As long as it is only the *name* that is used, anyhow, we see no use in dropping the name just because they find out that the *man* is dead. The *name* of the Right Rev. John Smith, D. D., LL.D., Ph. D., President of a Female Institute in a place where there is no such institution, is of just as weighty importance after he is dead as before. And as the influence of his

name is all that is asked of a vice-president of the National Reform Association, the name can be used just as well after he is dead as when he is alive. As our correspondent further says, "As it seems that *names* and *not active co-workers* is all that is cared for . . . this holding on to men, dead or alive, is doubtless true of others in the list.

And *that* is how so large and influential a list of vice-presidents of the National Association is kept up. And these facts, for they are facts, serve to illustrate and to emphasize Mr. Coleman's statement that the National Reform "movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body." Yes, indeed, a great deal more. But we are perfectly assured that it will not be always thus. With the immense bids that the National Reformers are making for the alliance of Rome, we are fully persuaded that they will yet gain the active, abiding efforts of Rome exerted in behalf of a national religion here. Then their movement, so far as *they* are concerned, will change ends, and in the proportion will have "a great deal" more *tail* than body—unless indeed they then become incorporated into, and a part of, the great body of Rome itself.

That Mr. "Secretary" Coleman's statement may state the exact truth a little more exactly, we propose an amendment so that the statement shall read as follows:—

"It is true our [National Reform] movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body, and the head itself has been a great deal more *figure-head* than anything else."

That is the exact truth in the case according to the facts. We have more to say on this but haven't space just now.

A. T. J.

December 1887

"The Christian Statesman Speaks" *The American Sentinel* 2, 12 , pp. 90-92.

THE *Christian Statesman* has found a voice at last, and to some purpose too, as will be seen. It says that the SENTINEL is published by the Seventh-day Adventists, and that—

"This people hold not only to the seventh day of the week as the true and only Sabbath, but to certain peculiar interpretations of the prophecies contained in the book of the Revelation. They believe themselves to be the witnesses who are to be slain in the period

indicated by the sounding of the sixth trumpet, and the ground of this persecution is the observance of the seventh day."

Oh-h-h-h-ho-oh ! where did the *Statesman* learn that? It must have drawn very heavily upon its inner consciousness to have evolved such excellency of wisdom as that. We know something about the doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventists, we have heard some of their preaching, and have read some of their books. When we read this in the *Statesman*, we went and got the very last book in which that people have printed anything on that subject, and that is in 1887, and we find that their view is, that the sixth trumpet ended in 1840, and that the prophecy concerning the two witnesses applies to the Dark Ages and the Papal persecutions. In view of this, the *Statesman's* exposition of the belief of that people is grand! Howbeit, it does not speak very well for the *Statesman's* knowledge upon the subject, and yet we think that the *Statesman* knows about as much on this subject as it does upon the principles of government and of law. We hope that the editor of the *Statesman* will read the SENTINEL some more, and try again.

Again the *Statesman* says:—

"Their apprehensions take on wild and excited forms, and many things seem to them significant which have no significance at all. For example, they believe that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church."

91

"They believe" this, says the *Statesman*. Well, why shouldn't we believe it when the *Statesman* and the National Reformers say it. The *Christian Statesman* in an editorial, December 11, 1884, speaking directly of the Roman Catholics, said:—

"Whenever they are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

Again, in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester S. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, and a vice-president of the National Reform Association, said that—

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

There is precisely what the National Reformers say on that subject, printed in the columns of the *Christian Statesman* itself, and yet, in the face of these things, the editor of the *Statesman* leans back and with an air of injured innocence gravely charges the SENTINEL with believing that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church, and that this, among other things, the SENTINEL thinks significant, while it has "no significance at all." Very well. If the *Statesman's* editorial utterances and the official propositions of National Reformers "have no significance at all," then perhaps we are to blame for believing that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church. But then, we cannot see how we are so much to blame, either, for how should we know that what the *Statesman* and National Reformers say has "no significance at all"? We confess that it is a new thing in our experience with men and journals, to find that a paper with the pretensions of the *Christian Statesman* exists for the publication of things which have no significance at all.

We believe they signify exactly what is shown in these quotations. Notice the article in last month's SENTINEL on the action of the Saratoga meeting in relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps the editor of the *Statesman* will be telling us next that *that* action "has no significance at all."

But we do not believe that these things have no significance at all. We believe the National Reformers are ready to do just what the *Statesman* said. We believe they are ready to join hands with the Roman Catholic Church whenever that church is willing, and will gladly join hands with them. We believe they are ready to co-operate in every way with their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We believe they are ready to make repeated advances, and to suffer repeated rebuffs, to gain the consent of the Roman Church to strike hands with them. We believe that when Rome is ready, they will gladly accept her co-operation in any form in which she may be willing to exhibit it. We do believe these things because the *Christian Statesman* and the National Reformers have said so. And we do *not* believe that these things "have no significance at all," even though the *Christian Statesman* does say so. We know that it is "one of the necessities of the situation," and that if the National Reformers are to win, they will have to win by the help of the religio-political intrigue of the Church of Rome. The *Statesman* may spend its time if it chooses in publishing things which it deems to have no significance at all, but to us these

things *have* significance, and they have a deep significance also to the people of this nation, and the SENTINEL is going to point out their significance, and set it before the people just as long as the *Statesman* furnishes the material for us with which to do it.

Then, the *Statesman* quotes from the SENTINEL of July our statement of the prospects of the success of National Reform, in which we stated that the universal demand for Sunday laws is the issue upon which National Reform will be brought to a vote, and under cover of which the union of Church and State will be accomplished here. And upon this it says:—

"Sabbath laws have been a conspicuous feature in the American Government from the beginning, and have never led to persecution."

This statement is on a par with the others that we have noticed, but, perhaps, like what the *Statesman* has said in other things, this may "have no significance at all." But be that as it may, it is not true. It is true, to be sure, that Sunday laws have been a conspicuous feature in the early colonies and in certain places in the United States, from the beginning. But they have never been a feature of the American Government, because the American Government is forbidden by the Constitution to have anything to do with laws respecting religion or religious things. Neither is it true that these laws have never led to persecution. They led to persecution in New England, when, under them, men were compelled to attend church, and to have spies set upon their track to see how they conducted themselves at their homes or wherever they might happen to be staying, during Sunday. They have led to persecution in Pennsylvania not many years back; and within the last three years, yes, within the last two, they have led to persecution in Tennessee and in Arkansas, such persecution too as is a shame to civilization. But, undoubtedly, this is a thing which to the *Statesman* has "no significance at all."

Then the *Statesman* mentions that in many States the keepers of the seventh day are exempted from penalties attached to Sunday laws, and says:—

"This exemption we have always approved and sustained, and shall seek to make universal."

That is to say, "We will take these people under our charge, and will see that they have all that belongs to them, because we are the ones who have the power to grant it to them." Oh, yes! Only the other day the whole of Ireland, the National League and all, was proclaimed under the Coercion Act. Some of the supporters of that Act tried to

excuse themselves under the plea that they thought that the power of the Coercion Act was a good thing for the Government to have, but that they did not expect the Government to use it, and advised against its use. But Sir William Vernon Harcourt very aptly replied that such persons "ought to have known that to give the Tories a Coercion Act, with advice not to use it, would be like putting a tiger in a cage with a man, and enjoining him not to eat the man." So say we to the purring pretensions of the National Reformers. They ask the people of this nation to surrender into their hands all the rights which they have under the present Constitution, kindly promising that *they* of their benevolence will generously bestow upon dissenters all the privileges that they ought to have. This is plainly shown in what follows.

Again says the *Statesman*:—

"Our conflict is not with the keepers of the seventh day, but with national atheism and its upholders."

Yes, that sounds very well. It is becoming quite fashionable lately in National Reform circles and conventions to pass resolutions something after this manner:—

"*Resolved*, That the welfare of the community and the law of God require further safeguards for the civil and Christian Sabbath, not inconsistent with the rights of those who observe the seventh day."

These things look very pretty on the outside, and they sound very nice to those who are not well acquainted with National Re-form, but when it is understood what the National Reform idea is of the rights of those who observe the seventh day, then that puts a different face upon the matter entirely. That it may be seen just how these things stand, we quote from a National Reform speech by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., a representative National Reformer, in a National Reform Convention in New York City, February 27, 1873, which is still officially sent forth as National Reform literature.

After naming in order the atheist, the deist, and the Jew, Mr. Edwards says:—

"The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very

much regret, but which we cannot help. The first named [the atheist] is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party. . . . What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist

92

may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent."

By this it is seen that the rights of the keepers of the seventh day are the rights of the atheist, that the rights of the atheist are the rights of the lunatic and the conspirator, and the toleration that he is to receive is the toleration that the lunatic and the conspirator receive, and that there is nothing out of hell that should not be tolerated as soon. In view of this, the *Statesman's* word that "our conflict is not with the keepers of the seventh day, but with national atheism and its upholders," is one of those things "which have no significance at all," because the keepers of the seventh day *are* upholders of national atheism. Also, it is evident by this, that their nicely framed resolution on this subject is likewise one of those National Reform sayings "which have no significance at all," because the keepers of the seventh day have no rights at all. It may be that they think they shall catch some of the keepers of the seventh day with such honeyed phrases, and they may think that they will even catch the SENTINEL, but we can tell them, Not much. We have read many times the sweetly-toned invitation, "Will you walk into my parlor?" said the spider to the fly." No, no, dear *Statesman*, it may all be that your utterances have no significance at all, but to the AMERICAN SENTINEL they have so much significance that we do not propose that the National Reformers shall slip their noose over the heads of the American people without the people being warned of it. Whether or not it be the rights of the keepers of the seventh day which are directly involved, is not the question. It is true that these are the particular class of

Christians who are singled out by the National Reformers as the object of their tolerant attentions, along with other "atheistic" "lunatics" and "conspirators," but as this is solely because they choose to differ from the opinions and aims of the National Reformers, it is evident that what is said of these by the National Reformers is equally applicable to everybody who chooses to oppose the work of national corruption which is carried on under the guise of National Reform. And as everybody ought to oppose the work, it follows that this question concerns everybody else just as much as it does those who keep the seventh day or those who keep no day.

Then, the *Statesman* asks:—

"Does the SENTINEL espouse the secular or infidel theory of government?"

The SENTINEL espouses the Christian theory of government; the theory enunciated by Christ: that man shall render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's and to God the things which are God's; the theory that so far, as man or civil government is concerned, the heathen, or the infidel, or the atheist, has just as much right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as the Christian has; the theory that under civil government any man has just as much right not to worship God as the Christian has to worship him; the theory that, though a man be a Christian, he is not thereby entitled to authority or lordship over other men's consciences or rights; the theory that will reach all men by the power of truth, in love and persuasive reason, and not by the power of the sword or of civil law, in bitter persecution and oppressive force.

That is the theory of government which the SENTINEL espouses. Does the *Christian Statesman* agree with it? If not, why not? Come now, don't dodge.

A. T. J.