VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM, SERIES ONE

**Views of National Reform. Series One.**

**—Being—**

**Thirteen Pointed Treatises upon the Various Phases of the National Reform Movement.**

*THE National Reformed Constitution AND THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY*

WE propose to give the American people a view of our Constitution as it will appear when amended to conform to the views of the National Reformers. This is a matter that concerns everyone, and will do so more and more as the National Reform party grows in influence and power. {VNR 3.1}

In this matter of reforming the Constitution, and thereby the nation, the National Reformers begin with the Preamble. At the first National Convention ever held by the National Reform Association—Alleghany City, Pa., January 27, 28, 1864—a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking the United States Senate and House of Representatives to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in substance as follows, the Amendment in brackets:— {VNR 3.2}

**THE PREAMBLE**

“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, establish justice, Insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” {VNR 3.3}

It will be seen at a glance that this work of “reforming” the Constitution, cannot stop with the Preamble. For as the amended Preamble demands “a Christian Government,” it follows that the whole Constitution will have to be made to conform to this idea. This is exactly the aim of the Reformers. In that same memorial to Congress, immediately following the reformed Preamble as above quoted, is the following:— {VNR 4.1}

“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 these Amendments in the Preamble.” {VNR 4.2}

As the purpose of this reformed Preamble is declared to be “to constitute a Christian Government,” it necessarily follows that all who are to have any part or lot as citizens under the Government must be Christians. Therefore Section I of Article XIV of Amendments to the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read thus:— {VNR 4.3}

All *Christian* persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside, etc. {VNR 4.4}

This is proved by “District Secretary” Coleman’s words that:— {VNR 5.1}

“The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel.”—*Christian Statesman, November, 1883*. {VNR 5.2}

And Rev. J. C. K.—John Calvin Knox—Milligan says:— {VNR 5.3}

“When the Amendment is adopted, how will it act upon the civil and political rights of infidels, Jews, etc.? This depends largely upon themselves. The worst result will be to disfranchise them.”—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1888*. {VNR 5.4}

This then being a “Christian Government,” all officials in the Government will have to be Christians. Therefore Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read as follows:— {VNR 5.5}

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be a Christian, and an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen. {VNR 5.6}

Section 3 of the same Article will have to read the same way in regard to Senators, thus:— {VNR 5.7}

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be a Christian, and an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen. {VNR 5.8}

In relation to the President, Section I, Article II, will have to read about as follows:— {VNR 6.1}

No person except a Christian, and natural-born citizen of the United States, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years resident within the United States. {VNR 6.2}

In the matter of the oath this same section will have to be reformed so as to read something like this:— {VNR 6.3}

Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath of office: I do solemnly swear “*in the presence of the eternal God, that during the whole term of my office I will serve the same eternal God to the utmost of my power, according as he hath required in his most holy word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and according to the same word, will maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus;* and shall abolish all false religion contrary to the same; *and shall rule the people committed to my charge according to the will and command of God revealed in his word; and shall procure to the utmost of my power to the church of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace*;” and that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. {VNR 6.4}

This is a genuine National Reform oath, and is strictly according to the doctrines which that Association preaches. To accord with this, Article VI will have to be reformed about as follows:— {VNR 6.5}

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by *the aforesaid oath, substituting in each case the title of his own office for the words “President of the United States;”* and the test of the Christian religion shall be required as a qualification to every office or public trust under the United States. {VNR 6.6}

This will necessitate the reform of Article I of Amendments to the Constitution, so that its first clause shall read thus:— {VNR 7.1}

Congress shall make laws respecting the establishment of the Christian religion; prohibiting the free exercise of all other religion and of all irreligion; and abridging the freedom of speech and of the press in religious matters. {VNR 7.2}

This is confirmed by the words of “District Secretary” Rev. M. A. Gault, who says:— {VNR 7.3}

“Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize *God’s authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it*.”—*Christian Statesman, January 13, 1887*. {VNR 7.4}

Just here, and as a fitting comment upon these words of Mr. Gault, we may very properly insert a remark of Mr. Waddington: “When the authority of Heaven is pleaded for the infliction of punishment, it creates an implacable and remorseless spirit, since it supersedes, by a stern necessity, all ordinary motives, and stifles the natural pleadings of humanity. The crusaders exclaimed, ‘It is the will of God!’ and in that fancied behest, the fiercest brutalities which the world had ever beheld, sought—not palliation, but—honor and the crown of eternal reward.”—*Church History, chap. 21, sec. 4, “Effects of the Crusades*.” Let the National Reformers once get what they fancy is “God’s authority,” behind their power to move the arm of the State, and it will be a heavy hand indeed that will be laid upon all non-conforming religion. But to return to the question before us. In the Pittsburg National Reform National Convention, 1874, Prof. C. A. Blanchard argued as follows:— {VNR 7.5}

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. *So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion*.” {VNR 8.1}

Therefore clauses 5, 6, and 10 of Section VIII of Article I of the Constitution, will have to be reformed so as to read thus:— {VNR 8.2}

The Congress shall have power— {VNR 8.3}

5. To coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and to fix the standard of weights, measures, *and religion*. {VNR 8.4}

6. To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin, *and the religion* of the United States. {VNR 8.5}

10. To define and punish *irreligion*, piracies, and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations. {VNR 8.6}

It is certain that all these changes in the body of the Constitution will not be made without universal and almost endless controversy. To say nothing of the open and confirmed opposition that there will be, it is evident that among those who would favor the changes, there will be great differences of opinion upon the exact shape and wording in which the changed Articles shall be couched. Nor will the controversy be confined simply to the called-for changes in the Constitution. As the reformed Preamble declares the “revealed will” of Christ to be the “supreme law,” the changes in the Constitution will be but the culmination of a grand national discussion as to what is the revealed will of Christ, and just how it is to be made applicable in national affairs. This is only what the National Reformers expect. Rev. J. C. K. Milligan writes on this subject, as follows:— {VNR 8.7}

“The changes will come gradually, and probably only after *the whole frame-work of Bible legislation* has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens; an outpouring of the Spirit might soon secure it.”—*Christian Statesman*. {VNR 9.1}

But that the National Reformers expect such a condition of affairs as this, is not all. They arc doing, and will do, their very best to create it; not out of love for the Bible, nor for Christianity, but for their own self-aggrandizement. This is clearly revealed by Mr. Milligan in words immediately following the passage just quoted. He continues:— {VNR 9.2}

“The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and *with interpretations of Scripture* on moral *and civil*, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the *final decision* of most points will be developed there. ‘Many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion.’” {VNR 9.3}

Exactly! the churches are “Zion,” and “the law shall go forth of Zion.” Therefore in the national canvass of “the whole framework of Bible legislation,” when it comes to the changes in the body of the Constitution, and thus the culmination of the discussion, in the form of law, then Congress, the State Legislatures, and the Supreme Courts will have to receive that law from the churches and pulpits, and the law in its final form will have to be according to the mould or the indorsement of the “leaders and teachers” in the churches, for “*the law shall go forth of Zion*,” and the “*final decision will be developed there*.” And then, after this august deliverance, the Rev. Mr. Milligan straightens himself up and admiringly pats himself, and all his fellows, upon the back, after this style:— {VNR 10.1}

“There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy than the leaders and teachers in our churches.” {VNR 10.2}

In connection with these words there are certain scriptures which we would commend to Mr. Milligan’s consideration: “Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips.” Proverbs 27:2. “For men to search their own glory is not glory.” Proverbs 25:27. “Not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth.” 2 Corinthians 10:18. {VNR 10.3}

But whether they will heed these scriptures or not there is one thing certain: that is, by the evidences here presented, it is perfectly clear that the direct aim of the leaders in the National Reform movement is the exaltation of themselves into a hierarchy as absolute as is that of Mormonism, or as was that of the Papacy in the supremest hours of the Dark Ages. They deliberately propose to make themselves the arbiters of every controversy, and the interpreters of Scripture on all points, moral, civil, theological, and ecclesiastical. And mark, their decision, it is plainly declared, will be “final.” There can be no appeal, for there is none higher than they. There can be no appeal to God, for is not the Lord King in Zion? and don’t they represent Zion? and isn’t the law to go forth of Zion? Thus they would make themselves the vicegerents of the Lord, and the fountain of all law. And just now, and in view of these propositions of the National Reformers, the American people would do well to remember the truth stated by Dean Milman in relation to what is simply a matter of fact in all history: “In proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.” {VNR 11.1}

Upon the surface, some of the changes in the Constitution, which we have marked, appear very innocent. It is only when we go below the surface that the real iniquity of the thing appears. When the real purpose of the movement is discovered, it is found that the Christianity that is to become national, is just what this hierarchy shall declare to be Christianity; that the “revealed will,” which is to be the supreme law of the land, is what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will; it is seen that in submitting to the proposed test of the Christian religion, it is not such a view of that religion as a man’s own conscience approves, but such a view as the hierarchy approves; that in submitting to this proposed revealed will as the supreme law, it is not to that revealed will as a man may read it in the Scripture and interpret it by the best light of his own conscience, but to what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will, as interpreted by their own will. Then there is no more the liberty of every man worshiping God ac-cording to the dictates of his own conscience, but all must worship(?) according to the dictates of the hierarchy. {VNR 11.2}

Then when these exceedingly “intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy leaders in our churches” shall have succeeded in thus placing themselves in the position of supreme arbiter of all controversies, and supreme interpreter in all points of the revealed will of Christ, it will be necessary to reform Section 7 of Article I of the Constitution, so that it shall read about as follows:— {VNR 12.1}

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, *and the President*, shall, before it become a law, be presented to “*the leaders and teachers in our churches*,” *whose “decision” shall be “final*.” {VNR 12.2}

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President, *and to “the churches and pulpits*” of the United States, *and the “decision” of “the leaders and teachers in our churches” shall be “final*.” {VNR 13.1}

There, fellow-citizens, are some of the features that our Constitution will present, when it shall have been “reformed” according to the doctrines of the National Reform party. If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will he the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask their indulgence a little further, while we present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt. {VNR 13.2}

Let it be observed that the immediate effect of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, will be to make the ten commandments the supreme law of the land. This is what the National Reformers propose, and here is the proof. Rev. J. C K. Milligan, in the article before referred to, asked the question, “How is the Amendment to be carried out practically?” And in the answer to this question he made this statement:— {VNR 13.3}

“In brief, its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will become unconstitutional.” {VNR 13.4}

The ten commandments are the law of God. The ten commandments are, for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. They are the moral law. Every duty enjoined in the Bible, that is to say, every duty of man, finds its spring in some one of the ten commandments. This law takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To violate that law, even in thought, is sin. For said Christ: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” And again: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” Matthew 5:21, 22, 27, 28. And “whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” 1 John 3:15. {VNR 14.1}

This is sufficient to show that the ten commandments deal with the thoughts, with the heart, with the conscience. By this law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 3:20); in fact, God’s own definition of sin is that “sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. And as already shown, the law may be transgressed by thinking harshly or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so. {VNR 14.2}

Let it also be observed that the National Reformers not only propose to make the moral law the supreme law of the Government of the United States, but they propose to make themselves the supreme interpreters of that law. Again we quote Mr. J. C. K. Milligan’s words:— {VNR 15.1}

“The *churches* and the *pulpits* have much to do with *shaping* and *forming* opinions on *all moral* questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on *moral* and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points.” {VNR 15.2}

Now there is absolutely nothing that a man can do, or say, or think, that does not involve a moral question. The National Reformers propose to bring about in this Government, a condition of things by which they shall have “much to do” with “all moral questions,” and “with interpretations of Scripture on moral points;” which is only to say that they propose to have “much to do” with what every person does, and says, and thinks. Therefore it is proven to a demonstration that the direct aim of the National Reformers is to establish in this nation a hierarchy perfectly patterned after the infamous model of the Papacy. {VNR 15.3}

We have not the space, nor will it be considered necessary, in confirmation of this, to take up the ten commandments one by one. One of them will be sufficient, and we shall choose the one upon which the National Reformers themselves make their greatest argument for national guilt, that is, {VNR 15.4}

**THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT**

Bear in mind that in the National Reformed Government, the fourth commandment will be a part of the Constitution of the United States; in fact, strictly speaking, the ten commandments will be the Constitution, because they are to be the supreme law. Then everybody in the United States will have to keep the fourth commandment, for to refuse to do so will be rebellion. Let no one misunderstand us. Our opposition is not against the ten commandments, nor against any one of them. We believe most decidedly in keeping the ten commandments, in every jot and tittle, according to the word of Christ, and we teach men so. In short, we believe in keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We strictly practice in accordance with this belief. Therefore what we shall ever say on this subject, let no one misconstrue into an opposition to the ten commandments, nor to Christ, nor to the Bible. Our opposition is solely to the National Reform movement, and to the hierarchy, the establishment of which is the object of that movement. We believe in strictly keeping the moral law, in deed, in word, and in thought; but we decidedly oppose the project of the National Reformers to put civil government into the realm of morals, to make civil rulers moral governors, and to make a set of ambitious clerics the supervisors of men’s thoughts and the conservators of men’s consciences. {VNR 16.1}

Suppose that the National Reform movement has proved a success. The ten commandments are the supreme law—the Constitution of the Government—and the National Reformers set about to accomplish one of the “practical results” that is sought by their Amendment, namely, “the perpetuation of the Sabbath.”—*See Resolutions, Pittsburg Convention*. The National Reformers expect a “universal gathering” and “discussion” about the changes that will be made in the Constitution, and this question of the bearing of the ten commandments will, in the nature of the case, be the chief, because the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the “Reformed” Constitution. And as the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the Constitution, and as the fourth commandment of the ten is to have the chief place in the efforts of the National Reformers, it follows that the bearing of the fourth commandment will be the one great national question in the National Reformed Government. What then says the commandment? Let us read:— {VNR 17.1}

“Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” {VNR 17.2}

Even now there is no little discussion about the meaning of this commandment. There are the National Reformers who profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the seventh day—Saturday. There are the National Reformers and the evangelical Christians generally who also profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the first day—Sunday. Then between these extremes there lies a third class who are not Jews, neither are they classed as “evangelical” Christians, yet they profess to be Christians, and profess to keep the fourth commandment—we refer to the Seventh-day Baptists and the Seventh-day Adventists. These insist that to obey the commandment, the seventh day must be kept even by Christians. There are yet others who believe that Sunday should be kept with some degree of sacredness, but with no reference whatever to the fourth commandment. {VNR 18.1}

It is evident that all these discordant views of the bearing of the fourth commandment, are not going to be reconciled by the adoption of the proposed Amendment to the Constitution. And as that commandment will then be a part of the National Constitution, the question of the meaning of commandment, and of what day is to be observed in obeying the commandment, will have to be decided in the Supreme Court of the United States. And mark, if the Supreme Court be left to itself, if the court be allowed to sit simply as a court of *law*, when this question should come up for decision it would do, so as a question of law and not of theology. {VNR 18.2}

Considering it therefore as a question of law, the court would be guided by the acknowledged rules that are laid down for the interpretation of law and statute. Let us try the interpretation of the commandment by some of these rules. Chancellor Kent, in his “Commentaries,” lays down this rule:— {VNR 19.1}

“The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import.” {VNR 19.2}

The first question then is, Are the words of the fourth commandment such as are of common used Look at them and see. The only answer that there can be is, They are. There is not a word in the commandment that is not of common use. Then the judges have no alternative, the words are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import. {VNR 19.3}

The Hon. John A. Bingham was appointed by the House of Representatives, to conduct the impeachment of President Johnson. In the course of that trial Mr. Bingham stated this rule of law:— {VNR 19.4}

“When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction. They must be followed.” {VNR 19.5}

The words of the fourth commandment, being of common use, must be plain. Then the court is allowed no latitude for construction, it must follow the plain words of the statute. {VNR 19.6}

What is the purpose of the fourth commandment? It is to secure the keeping of the Sabbath day. For the first sentence is, “Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.” But what day is the Sabbath-day? The commandment itself tells: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Remember that we are asking these questions from the standpoint of law, and not of theology. We are examining it as it will have to be examined should the National Reform movement succeed. These are the very questions that the judges of the Supreme Court will have to ask. And if they are to follow the rules of law, and the words of the then Constitution, these arc the very answers that they will have to make. The judges must follow the words of the statute. As jurists they can do nothing else. Therefore if the court be left to itself and to the principles and rules of civil law, as everybody knows that Saturday is the seventh day, it follows inevitably that as surely as the National Reform movement succeeds, every-body in these United States *will have to* {VNR 20.1}

**KEEP SATURDAY FOR THE SABBATH**

But is *that* what the National Reformers desire to accomplish? Is *that* what they are aiming at? No, indeed, not they! For the court is not to be left to itself and to the rules of civil law. Such a decision as that, the National Reformers never will allow. And right here is where their hierarchy comes in. Here is where they appear as the “interpreters of Scripture” on “all questions of morals.” Here is the point at which they step in with their “final decisions.” For as soon as such an interpretation as that is proposed, they will assert that that is not the *correct interpretation*. They will say that the rules of *civil* law do not apply in the interpretation of a *religious* statute; that this is a theological question and it must be decided by theological definitions. They will say that the unanimous verdict of the theological world on this question is that the expression “seventh day” in the fourth commandment does not mean the definite seventh day of the week, but “one day in seven,” “one day of rest alter six days of work;” that in the Jewish dispensation the day kept was Saturday, but in the Christian dispensation the first day of the week is the. Christian Sabbath, that it is in fact the distinctive badge of Christianity; that this has been by Constitutional Amendment declared to be a Christian nation, and as this commandment is a part of the Constitution, it must be interpreted by the rules of Christian theology. {VNR 20.2}

Can there be any doubt as to which way the question will be decided? Not the least. It will have to be decided in favor of the prevalent Christianity, and the “Christian Sabbath” will thus be declared to be the Sabbath in this Government. But by whom is the question decided? by whom is the final decision made? Not by the judges, but by the theologians. Not by the court, but by “the leaders and teachers in our churches.” And that is nothing else than the rule of a hierarchy. {VNR 21.1}

Here, and by this, we are brought face to face with another important consideration—in fact, the culmination of National Reform purposes and aims. It is this: As all these questions are to be decided not as questions of law, but of theology; and as “the leaders and teachers” in the churches are to be the interpreters on moral and theological points; it follows that the success of the National Reform movement will be the destruction of all distinction between law and theology, between civil and religious affairs. All the courts of the land will be—not courts of law but—courts of theology; and every question of government and of life will become a theological question, subject to the supervision and the “final decision” of these “leaders and teachers” in the churches. All of which will be but to turn this Government into a man-made theocracy, with the leaders of National Reform in the seat of God. In short, it will be but a new form of the Papacy under the title of National Reform. {VNR 22.1}

Even when this question of the Sabbath is decided, we do not believe that all the Seventh-day Baptists, and all the Seventh-day Adventists, and all the Jews in the country, are going to accept and conform to the decision, without coercion. But coercion will be persecution; while if there is no coercion the Reformed Constitution will be set at defiance, and all the work of the National Reformers will be in vain. But as we are not to suppose for a moment that they are working in vain, it follows that the success of National Reform will certainly bring persecution. But that is only to carry out the spirit of the Papacy. {VNR 22.2}

If these people who do not want to keep Sunday should all set themselves to work together to obtain an Amendment to the Constitution, by which they could and would, under pains and penalties, compel all persons in the United States to keep Saturday and submit to their “interpretation” and “final decision” upon all questions of Scripture and morals, the National Reformers would at once pronounce it an invasion of human right and religious liberty—in short they would pronounce it an infamous proceeding. And so should we. Therefore when the National Reformers deliberately propose to do this very thing, only putting Sunday instead of Saturday in the law, and bend every element to its accomplishment, then we do likewise pronounce that an infamous proceeding. And so should everyone who has any regard for human right and liberty of conscience. {VNR 23.1}

If there be any such thing as logical deductions from clear statements, we believe that we have fulfilled our promise to show that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation. A. T. JONES. {VNR 23.2}

*NATIONAL REFORM AND THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE*

The avowed purpose of the National Reform party is to secure an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which every man shall be compelled to acknowledge that God is Sovereign, that Christ is Ruler, and that the Bible is the supreme law. Whether a man believes it or not, is no difference, he must be compelled to acknowledge it because *they* profess to believe it. The *Christian Statesman* of October 2, 1884, says:— {VNR 23.3}

“Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation; and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution... *Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality*.” {VNR 23.4}

“*Enforce*,” according to Webster, is “to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor.” Therefore the proposition of these National Reformers is to *force, to compel* all to keep the laws of Christian morality,—to *execute with vigor* upon all the laws of Christian morality. {VNR 23.5}

And what is to be the penalty for dissent? Well, they *pretend* to be so kind that they will not whip anybody for it; they pretend to be so liberal that they will not impose a fine upon anyone for it; they pretend to be so merciful that they will not imprison anyone for it; but they are neither so kind, so liberal, nor so merciful but that they *will disfranchise* everyone who will not acknowledge, and submit to, the provisions which they choose to embody in their Religious Amendment to the Constitution. {VNR 23.6}

Thus, for a religious opinion, however conscientiously held, which may disagree with theirs, they deliberately propose to deprive men of their birthright to the most inestimable right of earth—that for which thousands upon thousands have laid down their lives; that for which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor—the right to be a citizen among a free people, and in this instance a citizen of the best Government *on* the earth. Every honor to which he might otherwise aspire, every right to which he might otherwise be entitled, must be swept away at one stroke, because, forsooth, he chooses to claim the right to worship God according to the dictates of *his own* conscience. That this is no fancy picture that we have drawn, that it is no fable that we have devised, in regard to what that party proposes to do, we have abundant proof in their own words. {VNR 24.1}

In the *Christian Statesman*, of November 1, 1883, Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the principal exponents of the National Reform religion, replied to some questions that had been put by a correspondent who signed himself “Truth Seeker.” We copy the following:— {VNR 24.2}

“What effect would the adoption of the Christian Amendment, together with the proposed changes in the Constitution, have upon those who deny that God is the Sovereign, Christ the Ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once... The classes who would object are, as ‘Truth Seeker’ has said, Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand towards it if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would *disfranchise* every logically consistent infidel.” {VNR 24.3}

There we have in plain words what they propose to do with dissenters under their “Christian Constitution.” But let us look into this a little further. Notice, it is only the *logically consistent* dissenter that will be disfranchised. By the same token, then, the logically inconsistent can all be citizens. That is, the man of honest intention, of firm conviction, and of real principle, who values his principles more than he does political preference, *he* must be disfranchised; while the time-servers, the political hacks, the men of no convictions and of no principle, *they* can all be acceptable citizens. In other words, the *honest man*, if he be a dissenter, *cannot* be a citizen; but *every hypocrite can* be a citizen. Therefore the inevitable logic of the National Reform position is to put a premium upon hypocrisy. And *such* will be the value of citizenship under their so-called Christian Constitution. {VNR 25.1}

Such a result from such proceedings is not new. The Puritan Parliament “solemnly resolved that no person shall be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness.” And as the natural consequence, the realm was filled with hypocritical piety. {VNR 25.2}

But it is not so much our purpose in this place to notice the logic of their position, as it is to show their avowed purpose of outraging every principle of the rights of conscience. Mr. Coleman is not alone in thus defining the *status* of dissenters. In the *Statesman of* February 21, 1884, Mr. J. C. K. Milligan, in writing upon the same subject, expressed himself thus:— {VNR 25.3}

“The worst result will be to disfranchise them.” {VNR 26.1}

But this is *not* the worst result which they wish, nor which they intend. Read carefully the following extract from an address delivered by Rev. E. B. Graham at a National Reform Convention held at York, Nebraska, and reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885:— {VNR 26.2}

“We might add, in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die.” {VNR 26.3}

That is pretty heavy, but there is one more step that could be taken, and it is taken. Rev. Jonathan Edwards says:— {VNR 26.4}

“Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon.” {VNR 26.5}

The “true inwardness” of this last can be the more readily appreciated when it is understood that this reverend gentleman defines atheism to be whatever opposes National Reform. For in the same speech he distinctly named atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists, besides using the general term, “our objectors.” He declares that “the atheist does not believe in the soul,” and says of all:— {VNR 26.6}

“These are all, 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 named from him [the atheist]; they must be treated as, for this question, one party.” {VNR 27.1}

So, then, under a National Reform *regime,* dissenters must not only be disfranchised, but they must all be sent to the devil, and that, too, in some “wild and desolate land;” and even that is not enough, but they must “stay there till they die.” And *that* is the National Reform idea of “justice.” *That is* the kind of Government that they propose under their Christian Constitution. *That is* the way in which they propose to convert men to the Christian religion. *That is* the way in which they propose to exemplify the sublime Christian principle of brotherly love, and the means which they will employ that brotherly love *may continue! That is* the way in which they are going to bring about the reign of universal peace, even, as they say, the millennium itself. *That* will be indeed the reign of the saints(?)! By a like scheme of the Christian endeavor of the “Society of Jesus,” there was peace once in the fair Waldensian Valleys. By like exertions Innocent III. succeeded in creating peace amidst “the graceful scenery, the rich fields, and the splendid cities of Languedoc and Provence.” {VNR 27.2}

And yet, by resolution in National Convention, they gravely assure the world that “the Religious Amendment, instead of infringing on any individual’s right of conscience, will form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens”! But the liberty which the National Reformers propose to guarantee to every man, is the “liberty” to do as *they* say, and the “liberty” to conform to what *they* shall establish as Christianity and morality. And *that* is a kind of liberty that is strictly compatible with absolute tyranny. Such liberty as that, the Papacy at the height of its power was willing and anxious to grant. Indeed, of that kind of liberty the Inquisition was the best conservator the world has ever seen. {VNR 27.3}

More than this, they declare themselves to be the “conscience party”! Dr. Edwards, in the speech previously referred to, exclaimed, “We are the conscience party, the free conscience party!” Their purpose to disfranchise and deliver to the devil in “some wild, desolate land,” etc., all who do not assent to the National Reform ideas of Government, is to be carried out altogether in behalf of liberty of conscience, *that is*, the conscience of the National Reformers. They give us clearly to understand that it is entirely out of respect to their own consciences that they propose to do all these things. Mr. Coleman says further, in the place before quoted:— {VNR 28.1}

“If there be any Christian who objects to the proposed Amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in this matter.” {VNR 28.2}

So, then, in this National Reform Christianity, it is the perfection of conscientiousness to outrage some other man’s conscience. And the *reverse* of the golden rule becomes, to them, the law and the prophets. Their chief complaint is that the present Constitution disfranchises *them* (which is false), and therefore they must have it changed so that it will disfranchise everyone but them. {VNR 28.3}

Therefore all things whatsoever *ye would not* that men should do to you, *this do ye* even unto them; for this is the law of National Reform. {VNR 28.4}

When we read these things, and many others of like import, in the National Reform literature, and, in view of them, express our fears that religious intolerance and persecution will be the inevitable consequence of the success of the National Reform movement, they seem to think it passing strange. {VNR 29.1}

To them it seems only “folly and fanaticism” that anybody should harbor any such fears. Then they come cooing like a dove, “Why, you need have no fears at all; we would not hurt a hair on your heads.” But the sentiments expressed in the above quotations are spoken with too much earnestness, and are received with too much favor in the National Reform Conventions, for us to allow any weight whatever to such honeyed phrases as, “You need have no fears,” and, “We would not hurt a hair of your heads.” {VNR 29.2}

But even if we heard only pleasant words and fair speeches on their part, and had none of these plain and forcible expressions of their real sentiments and feelings, we should be none the less assured that intolerance and persecution would be the result of the success of the National Reform party. First, because all history proves that such a thing is to be dreaded; and secondly, because such a result is inseparable from the success of such a movement. {VNR 29.3}

We repeat: *Intolerance and persecution are inseparable from the success of such a movement as is represented in the National Reform Association*. Their purpose is to place what they decide to be Christian laws, institutions, and usages, upon an undeniable *legal* basis in the fundamental law of the land. Such Christianity thereby becomes the law of the land; and the only point upon which turns the question of persecution or no persecution is, Will the law be enforced? If the law shall not be enforced, then their movement will be a failure; for, so far as any real, practical results are concerned, the whole matter would stand just as it does at present, and the present order of things is the subject of their sorest lamentations. But if the law shall be enforced, then there is persecution, for compulsory conformity to religious opinions is persecution. So the sum of the matter is this: If the laws which they establish shall not be enforced, their movement will be a failure. If those laws shall be enforced, then there will be persecution. And that the principles which they advocate will be enforced, if they obtain the power, is just as certain as that human nature is what it is, or that two and two make four. {VNR 29.4}

And who are they that propose to do these things? An Association of which the vice-presidents alone number *one hundred and twenty*, than whom we verily believe that there cannot be found in the United States an equal number of other men and women who could exert a more positive influence. In a list given in the *Christian Statesman* of December 24, 1885, we find the names of *eleven* Bishops, *sixteen* College Presidents, *fifteen* College Professors, *three* ex-Governors, *seven* Justices of Supreme Courts, *five* Judges of Superior Courts, *two* Judges of the United States District Court, *one* Judge of the United States Circuit Court, with such a number of Hons., Revs., and D. Ds., that we cannot attempt now to count them. {VNR 30.1}

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not charge that *all* the eminent men here referred to intend to persecute, nor that they would favor persecution. We freely grant, and we really believe, that among these there are those who would abhor persecution. But that they would abhor persecution does not help the matter a particle, as long as they, as officers of the Association, are doing their very best to establish a system of Government and laws under which it will be possible for persecution to be inflicted by those who do not abhor it, but who, on the contrary, are bigoted and fanatical enough to enjoy it. {VNR 30.2}

Admitting that among these there are men so humane that they would shrink from the enforcement of unjust or oppressive laws, such consideration does not in the least relieve them from the responsibility so long as they persist in doing their utmost to make it possible for the fanatic or the savage to enforce the laws which are put into his hands. George Bancroft truly says: “As the humane ever decline to enforce the laws dictated by bigotry, the office devolves on the fanatic or the savage. Hence the severity of their execution usually surpasses the intention of their authors.” Doubtless there are men who favor the National Reform movement and the enactment of laws embodying its principles, but who would be shocked at such an enforcement of them as is proposed by the Rev. E. B. Graham, and the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D. But that does not relieve them of the responsibility; they have no business, much less have they any right, to enact such laws. It matters not how humane, nor how eminent for Christian character, they may be, they are but playing into the hands of the fanatic and the man of savage disposition. If they so abhor persecution, just let them withhold from such characters as these the power to persecute. {VNR 31.1}

As for us, we are neither Jews, infidels, nor atheists. But as we dissent totally from the doctrines of the National Reform party, we suppose, of course, that we shall be placed in Dr. Edwards’ catalogue of atheists; and we are willing to confess that we belong to that fourth class to which Mr. Coleman referred by the phrase, “and others.” We do not deny that God is Sovereign, nor that Christ is Ruler, nor that the Bible is the supreme law. We freely confess all these. But while we confess that God is Sovereign, we positively deny that he has delegated his sovereignty to the National Reform party. While we confess that Christ is Ruler, we deny that he has chosen the National Reform party as his confidential advisers in his rule, or that he has appointed that party as his vicegerent in the United States to rule this country in his absence. While we confess that the Bible is the supreme standard of human actions, we deny *in toto* that the Author of the Bible has appointed the National Reform party to be the infallible interpreters of that book. {VNR 32.1}

And now from the plain statements of the National Reform officials themselves, we submit to all candid men that we are justified in saying that the success of the National Reform movement will be the destruction of the dearly-bought principle of American liberty; the destruction of the inestimable treasure of American citizenship; and the destruction of every principle of the rights of conscience, under the Government of the United States. And because of this we labor for the defense of the genius of American institutions. A. T. JONES. {VNR 32.2}

[CD-Rom Editor’s Note: Pages 33-53 are sections entitled “National Reform is Church and State” starting on page 33, and “Purity of National Religion” starting on page 48. The first section can be found as a [separate publication of the same name](https://legacy.egwwritings.org/?ref=en_VNR.150.1&para=1258.437#NRCSB.1.1) elsewhere in A. T. Jones’ collection, and the second was not authored by him.]

*National Reform an Absurdity*

The fundamental proposition upon which the whole National Reform structure is built, is that “the nation is a moral person.” If this proposition will not hold good in the sense in which National Reformers use it, their whole scheme is a fallacy. That it will not hold good is certain. {VNR 54.1}

Their idea of the State as a moral person will not allow that it is the whole people, but that it is a mysterious, imaginary something which stands separate and distinct from the people which compose it. Their concept of a State is that it is formed of all the people, yet that it is not all the people, but a distinct entity, having a personality all its own; and this personality that springs in some way from the whole people, is a person in the eyes of men just as distinct as is General Sherman or Mr. Blaine. As therefore General Sherman, or Mr. Blaine, or any and every other person, is a moral person, is responsible to God, and must acknowledge that responsibility, so this other individual, which springs in part from each individual, being a person as real, as distinct in the eyes of men as is any one of the people, is a moral person, is responsible to God, and must acknowledge that responsibility. As it is the duty of General Sherman, or Mr. Blaine, or any other person, to have a religion, and to exercise himself about religious affairs, so this person called the State or the nation must have a religion, and must exercise himself about religious affairs, with this very important difference, however, that, whereas General Sherman, Mr. Blaine, John Smith, James Robinson, Thomas Brown, John Doe, and Richard Roe, each having his own religion, must exercise himself in that religion without interfering with the exercise of anybody else’s religion, this other individual must not only have a religion of his own, and exercise himself with that religion, but he must exercise himself about everybody else’s religion, and must see to it especially that the religion of everybody else is the same as his own. {VNR 54.2}

A State, as pictured by Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, 1872, is as follows:— {VNR 55.1}

“What is the State? ... Its true figure is that of a colossal man, his consciousness the resultant of the consciousness of the millions that compose this gigantic entity, this body corporate, his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal the end to which they are moving; a being created in the sphere of moral law, and therefore both moral and accountable.” {VNR 55.2}

But that is not all; they even go so far as to give the State a soul! In this same speech Professor Sloane said:— {VNR 55.3}

“‘The State has no soul’ is the dictum of an atheistic political theory. On the contrary we say, with the famous French priest, Pere Hyacinth, ‘What I admire most in the State is its soul.’” {VNR 55.4}

Well, if the State be, as he also said, “a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as General Grant or Mr. Colfax,” then we cannot wonder that it should have a soul. But what is the soul of the State? He tells us:— {VNR 55.5}

“*Moral principles are the soul of a nation;* these are the informing spirit that mould its various elements into a compact unity, and that bind them together with bands stronger than steel.” {VNR 56.1}

Does Professor Sloane mean to say that “moral principles” composed the soul, and were the *kind* of a soul that “General Grant or Mr. Colfax had”? Are moral principles the soul of each of the millions of people that compose this “gigantic entity”? If, as he says, the consciousness of this colossal man is “the resultant of the consciousness of the millions that compose him, his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal their goal,” then why is not his soul their soul? If moral principles are his soul and he is but the resultant of all the other’s then what can their souls be but moral principles? Truly this is a new conception of the soul, which we commend to the consideration of psychologists and theologians. We confine ourselves to the political aspect of the question. {VNR 56.2}

The doctor proceeds:— {VNR 56.3}

“A still more practical view of this subject is taken when we consider the moral obligations of a nation as such; like an individual, it is held bound in the judgment of mankind to the fulfillment of its obligations. Great Britain, France, and Italy owe enormous debts. The same is true of our own country. Shall the obligations of these debts be met? May the nation repudiate? If not, why not? ... Or does the law, ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ bind a nation as well as an individual? ... Do we not apply to nations the same adjectives expressing moral qualities, which we apply to men? Has not Great Britain a national character as well defined in the minds of men as her Queen or Prime Minister—a character into which her physical character and resources scarcely enter, but which is determined by moral qualities? Is not the United States a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as General Grant or Mr. Colfax?” {VNR 56.4}

Having thus established, as they suppose, their proposition that the State is a moral person, the fundamental principle of the whole National Reform movement is, as stated by themselves:— {VNR 57.1}

“The nation being a moral person, must have a religion of its own, and exercise itself about religious affairs.”—*Christian Statesman, February 28, 1884, p. 5*. {VNR 57.2}

It is too often the case with a person who is eager to prove a particular proposition that he first resolves upon his conclusion, and then makes “a *major* of most comprehensive dimensions,” and, having satisfied himself that it contains his conclusion, never troubles himself about what else it may contain; and as soon as it is examined it is found to contain an infinite number of conclusions, every one being a palpable absurdity. This is exactly the logical position occupied by the advocates of this so-called National Reform. Take the statements which we have here quoted, and who cannot see that they apply with equal force to any conceivable association of human beings for a common purpose? Let us here apply their argument in a single case, and anybody can extend it to any number of similar cases:— {VNR 57.3}

What is a railroad company? Its true figure is that of a colossal man, his consciousness the resultant of the consciousness of the stockholders of this gigantic entity, this body corporate; his power their power, his will their will, his purpose their purpose, his goal the end to which they are moving; a being created in the sphere of moral law, and therefore both moral and accountable. It is composed of moral beings subject to moral law, and is therefore morally accountable, A still more practical view of this subject is taken when we consider the moral obligations of a railroad company as such; like an individual, it is held bound in the judgment of mankind to the fulfillment of its obligations. May the railroad company repudiate? If not, why not? Or does the law, “Thou shalt not steal,” bind a railroad company as well as an individual? Do we not apply to railroad companies the same adjectives expressing moral qualities which we apply to men? Has not the Erie Railroad Company a character as well defined in the minds of men as its president or its cashier—a character into which its physical character and resources scarcely enter, but which is determined by moral qualities? Is not the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company a personality as distinct in the eyes of men as is General Sherman or Mr. Edmunds? “The railroad company has no soul” is the dictum of an atheistic political theory. On the contrary, we say, with the famous financial king, Jay Gould, what I admire most in the railroad company is its soul. Moral principles are the soul of a railroad company. The denial of the moral character and accountability of the railroad company is of the nature of atheism; it is practically a denial of God’s providential government—leads to the subversion of morals, and the destruction of the railroad itself. That a railroad company is possessed of moral character, that it is therefore a subject of moral law, and consequently accountable to God, is not theory but fact; not hypothesis, but science. That all men do not admit that a railroad company is a moral being, and accountable to God, does not prove that it is not an established principle of moral and political National Reform science. Therefore *the railroad company, being a moral person, must have a religion of its own, and must exercise itself about religious affairs*. {VNR 57.4}

This is a genuine National Reform argument. And we submit to any candid mind that it is just as good in proof of the personality and moral obligation of the railroad company as it is for that of the State. And not only for the railroad company and the State, but likewise, and equally, good for the personality and moral obligation of banks, insurance companies, steamship, gas, water, and publishing companies, lodges, benefit societies, clubs, corporations, and associations of all kinds; and the logic of the whole situation is that each one of these must in its corporate capacity “have a religion of its own, and must exercise itself about religious affairs.” If the premises of the National Reform Association be true, this conclusion and a number of others equally absurd inevitably follow, or else there is no truth in syllogisms. But if the logic of the thing be so absurd, it only demonstrates the absurdity of the principle. {VNR 59.1}

Now the National Reformers, being wedded to the principle, and wishing to be divorced from the inevitable conclusions, resort to the fallacy that railroad, bridge, steamboat, and other companies are “but creatures of the State,” and so are not moral persons. Dr. McAllister, in the Cleveland Convention, in trying to meet this point said:— {VNR 59.2}

“The nation is a moral person, created by God, and creation implies the authority of the Creator; but a company of the kind described, receives its charter *from the State, is subject to the laws of the State*.” {VNR 59.3}

With that, place the following from Rev. T. C. Sproul, in the same convention, speaking to the same resolution as was Dr. McAllister:— {VNR 59.4}

“If the nation is not a moral being, it *cannot be* subject to the law of God.” {VNR 59.5}

Accordingly, between the State and the company, we have the following {VNR 60.1}

Contrast:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The *nation* is created by God; therefore the *nation* is *a moral person,* and hence is *subject* to the *law* of God. | The *company* is created by the State; therefore the *company is not a* moral person, and hence is *not* subject to the law of God. |

Now if, as they say, the railroad and other companies are not moral persons; and if, as they also say, these *not* moral persons (or companies) “cannot be subject to the law of God,” then why is there so much ado made about these “*Sabbath-breaking* railroads,” these “*Sabbath-breaking* steamboats,” and so on through the list? Then why are the railroad companies told, as they are in the address of the International Sabbath Association, printed in the *Statesman* of February 7, 1884, pp. 2, 3:— {VNR 60.2}

“Your action in thus multiplying trains to *desecrate* the *day of rest* is in *direct violation of divine law*”*?* “In view of your responsibilities to God.... you cannot afford to do this.” {VNR 60.3}

We would respectfully submit to the consideration of the National Reform party the following: From your own premises there *is not*, and there *cannot be*, any such thing as a Sabbath-breaking railroad company, nor any other kind of Sabbath-breaking company. For you say, first (truly), the Sabbath is a part of the law of God; secondly, you say that a not moral person “cannot be subject to the law of God;” thirdly, you say that the *company*, as distinguished from the *Government*, is “not a moral person;” and then you inconsistently accuse the railroad companies of “direct *violation of divine* law! {VNR 60.4}

Now, how is it possible for a person, being, or thing which “cannot be subject to the law of God,” to violate that law? It is plainly impossible for a not-moral being to violate moral law. It is equally impossible for such a being to have any “responsibilities to God.” Because where there can be no *subjection* to law, there can be no *violation* of the law; and where there can be no *violation* of law, there can be no *obedience* to law; and where there can be no obedience to the *law of God, there is* no *responsibility to* God. Therefore it just as absolutely follows from your premises that a railroad or other company cannot break the Sabbath, as that two and two make four. And it is just as absolutely true that your resort to a fallacy to escape an absurdity, has involved you in a glaring inconsistency; for it is plainly inconsistent for you to hold a being subject to that to which you say it “cannot be subject.” {VNR 60.5}

But if you persist in holding the companies responsible to the law of God, you must admit that they are moral beings, and hence equally with the Government must profess a religion, and have a test, and with that logically admit an infinite number of other absurd conclusions; in short, admit that every combination of human beings for a common purpose must, as such combination, profess a religion and have a test. {VNR 61.1}

Here, then, is the dilemma of the National Reform party,—either an *inconsistency* or an *absurdity.* But we have no ground for hope that they will abandon either the fallacy or the absurdity. For as the fallacy was adopted for the express purpose of escaping the absurdity, for them to abandon either would be to abandon their cause. Therefore we have only to expect that they will act in harmony with the ways of error always, and hold to both the absurdity and the inconsistency, and when questioned about either, do as is suggested by Rev. R. C. Wylie, in the *Statesman* of February 14, 1884; that is, “adopt a plan that will prevent a repetition” of any such questions. {VNR 61.2}

The absurdity of the view that the State is a person distinct from the individuals that compose it, is made more apparent when we consider the obligations of a nation, or State, as such. Dr. Sloane, in the speech above quoted, instanced the fact that “Great Britain, France, Italy, and our own country owe enormous debts.” But we would inquire of the National Reform party, Does this personality, which you call the State of Great Britain, France, Italy, or the United States, owe this debt distinct from the people? and will it pay it distinct from the people? When Germany laid upon France the war indemnity of five *milliards* of *francs* ($1,000,000,000), was it laid upon a “personality” distinct from the individuals that compose the nation? and when it was paid was it paid by such a distinct personality? To the minds of all reasonable men, to ask these questions is to answer them. These National Reform religio-political economists know as well as anybody does, that of the war indemnity exacted from France by Germany, *every franc* came from the people who compose the State, and not from some hypothetical “individual personality” distinct from the people. They know full well that every dollar of the national debt of our own country that has ever been paid has been paid by the people of the United States, and not a cent of it by any such theoretical absurdity as the National Reform party defines to be the State. {VNR 62.1}

Does the National Reform party mean to say that, when it gets its iniquitous scheme framed into a law, and has thus perfected its idea of the personality of a State, it will have the State a personality so entirely distinct and separate from that of the people, that the State will pay the national debt without any help on the part of the people? No. That party itself, we do them the justice to suppose, would pronounce the idea preposterous. And so do we. But if it be so, where is the sense of all their arguments about the personality of the State as distinct from the personality of the people who compose the State? If the State has a personality, an individuality of its own, and a soul of its own as distinct from that of any or all of the people who compose it, as is that of General Sherman or Mr. Blaine, then why can’t it pay its debts distinct from the people, as General Sherman or Mr. Blaine pays his? The very idea is absurd. {VNR 62.2}

Again, Prof. O. N. Stoddard, in the Cincinnati Convention, said:— {VNR 63.1}

“If the character and liabilities of the State are not distinct from those of its individual members, then the State is punished hereafter in the persons of its subjects.” {VNR 63.2}

We would like Professor Stoddard, or any other of the National Reformers, to show where a State has ever been or ever can be punished, either here or hereafter, except in the persons of its subjects. When France was punished for its ill-advised declaration of war upon Germany, did the punishment fall upon the State distinct from the persons of its subjects? When Rome was punished for the fearfulness of her iniquities—when from the Rhine and the Danube to the deserts of Africa, and from the Black Sea and the Hellespont to the Wall of Antoninus and the Atlantic Ocean, the whole empire was swept by the successive and devastating waves of savage barbarism—did these terrors afflict some such figment of a State as is conjured up by the National Reform brain? Did they not rather fall upon every age, sex, and condition of the individuals that composed the State? Again we say that but to ask the question is to answer it. But it demonstrates to all reasonable men the wild absurdity of the National Reform theory of the personality of a State. There is not, and there cannot be, any such personality of a State. And we are certain that no such thing would ever be seriously advocated in this country, were it not essential to the success of a scheme of religious bigotry and priestly despotism, whose most perfect likeness is that of the Papacy. {VNR 63.3}

Webster defines a State to be:— {VNR 64.1}

“A political body, or *body politic; the whole body of people* united under one Government, whatever may be the form of the Government.” {VNR 64.2}

Chief Justice Chase defined a State as follows:— {VNR 64.3}

“It describes sometimes a people or community of individuals united more or less closely in political relations, inhabiting temporarily or permanently the same country; often it denotes only the country or territorial region inhabited by such a community; not unfrequently it is applied to the Government under which the people live; at other times it represents the combined idea of people, territory, and Government. It is not difficult to see that in all these senses the primary conception *is that of a people* or community. *The people* in whatever territory dwelling, *constitute the State*.”—*Great Decisions by Great Judges, p. 641*. {VNR 64.4}

Bouvier says that a State is:— {VNR 64.5}

“A sufficient body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights and to do right and justice to foreigners. In this sense *the State means the whole people* united into one *body-*politic.” “As to the persons who compose the *body politic*, or associate themselves, they take collectively the name of ‘people or nation.’” —*Law Dictionary*. {VNR 64.6}

A body-politic is:— {VNR 65.1}

“The collective body of a nation or State, as politically organized, or as exercising political functions; also a corporation.”—*Webster*. {VNR 65.2}

All this is in perfect harmony with the Scriptures. When God speaks of a nation he speaks of “the whole body of people” who form the nation. When he speaks to a State he speaks to “the people who constitute the State.” When he inflicts judgments upon a State, those judgments fall upon the people who compose the State. To prove this we need no better illustration than the text which, in this connection, is doubtless more used than any other by the National Reform party. It is this: “At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from *their* evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto *them.* And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit *them*.” Jeremiah 18:7-10. {VNR 65.3}

Thus it is *the people* who do the evil, and it is “unto *them*” that God pronounces to do evil, and when they “turn from *their* evil,” then he turns from the evil he pronounced “to do unto *them*.” In this same connection the Lord makes his own application of the principle which he has just laid down. Immediately following the text quoted, he says: “Now therefore go to, speak to *the men of Judah,* and to *the inhabitants* of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith the Lord: Behold, I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you; return ye now *every one* from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good.” Verse 11. Here God “framed evil” against the house of Israel, against the nation of the Jews, against the State of Judah, and the way to avert it was for the “men of Judah,” and “the inhabitants of Jerusalem,” “*every one*,” to turn from his evil way. It would be impossible to more plainly show that, in the mind of God, and in the contemplation of the word of God, a State or nation is the people who compose it; that it is they individually who sin; and that it is to them individually, “every one,” to whom the Lord speaks. {VNR 65.4}

When the Lord pronounced judgment against Babylon it was thus: “A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon the liars, and they shall dote; a sword is upon her mighty men, and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon their horses, and upon their chariots, and *upon all the mingled people* that are in the midst of her.” “The violence done to me and to my flesh be upon Babylon, shall the inhabitant of Zion say; and my blood upon *the inhabitants of Chaldea,* shall Jerusalem say.” Jeremiah 50:35-37; 51:35. {VNR 66.1}

To present other instances from Scripture would only be superfluous; the whole Bible is consistent herewith, and but confirms the correctness of the definitions given, and the truth of the position which we maintain, that the idea of a State having a personality, a will, a soul, and a moral responsibility of its own distinct from the individuals that compose it, is absurd. If a nation be wicked it is because the individuals who compose it are wicked; if it be righteous it is because the *people,* in their own individual moral a relation to God, are righteous. When God exclaimed, “Ah, sinful nation!” it was because the *people* were “laden with iniquity.” Isaiah 1:4. {VNR 66.2}

Thus it is clearly shown that the National Reform theory of a State is not only opposed to reason and common sense, but to established and authoritative definitions, and the word of God, as well. {VNR 67.1}

There is, however, in connection with a State, a body-politic, or a corporation, the merest shadow of that which the National Reform party pushes to such absurd conclusions. It is this: All bodies-politic, whether they be States, banks, railroads, or corporations of whatever kind, are, by a legal fiction and “for the advancement of justice,” given a personality, but this personality “has no existence *except in a figure*.” The definition is this:— {VNR 67.2}

“A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and *existing only in contemplation of law.* In certain respects and for certain purposes, corporations are deemed ‘persons.’ ... But a corporation *cannot be deemed a moral agent*, and, like a natural person, be subjected to personal suffering. Malice and willfulness cannot be predicated of a corporation, though they may be of its members.”—*Boone’s* *Law of Corporations*. {VNR 67.3}

Such, and such only, is the true doctrine of the personality of a State. And yet this “invisible,” “intangible,” “artificial” thing, this legal fiction, is the fundamental proposition upon which rests the whole National Reform movement! It is this sheer abstraction which that party proposes to push to such enormous conclusions—conclusions that are fatal to liberty, both civil and religious. Could anything possibly be more absurd? {VNR 67.4}

Professor Pomeroy says:— {VNR 67.5}

“The State, as separated from the individuals who compose it, has no existence except in a figure; and to predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction is *an absurdity*.” {VNR 67.6}

To predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction is exactly what the National Reform party does; therefore the demonstration is complete, by every principle of logic and of law, that the National Reform movement is an absurdity. {VNR 68.1}

And that all may understand precisely what this demonstration amounts to, we append Webster’s unabridged definition of an absurdity: {VNR 68.2}

“ABSURDITY—The quality of being absurd or inconsistent with obvious truth, reason, or sound judgment.” “ABSURD—Opposed to manifest truth; inconsistent with season or the plain dictates of common sense; logically contradictory.” {VNR 68.3}

That is what we mean in this connection, and that is exactly what the National Reform movement is. A. T. Jones. {VNR 68.4}

[CD-Rom Editor’s Note: Pages 69-80 is a section entitled “Bold and Base Avowal.” This material was not authored by A. T. Jones, so is not included in this collection.]

*The American Papacy*

Since the year 1856, a book entitled “Our Country” has been largely circulated, and it has excited a great deal of attention throughout the United States. The book was written for the American Home Missionary Society, its object being to present “facts and arguments showing the imperative need of home missionary work for the evangelization of the land.” In a startling as well as splendid array of facts, it presents the growth, the size, the resources, and the perils of our country. {VNR 81.1}

Among the perils to our country, the author rightly places Romanism, and by many excellent quotations proves that it is indeed a peril. We quote a passage or two:— {VNR 81.2}

“There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our Government with those of the Catholic Church. {VNR 81.3}

“The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience.* Nothing is clearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX., in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: ‘The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State.’ The same pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematizes ‘those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,’ also ‘all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.’” {VNR 81.4}

“The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O’Connor: ‘Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can he carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.’ ... The Archbishop of St. Louis once said: ‘Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.” ... {VNR 82.1}

“Every cardinal, archbishop, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the Pope, in which occur the following words: Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.’” {VNR 82.2}

“Cardinal Manning advises Romanists throughout the world to enter politics *as Romanists,* and to do this especially in England and the United States. In our large cities the priests are already in politics, and to some purpose.... We are told that the native Catholics of Arizona and New Mexico are not energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these Territories. True, but they are *energetic enough to be enough to be counted*. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often *much more*.” {VNR 82.3}

All this and much more is true of Romanism. And although there is just cause for fear that the principles of Romanism will let be legalized by the laws of this nation, we are certain that it will never accomplish this of itself nor in its own name. We are perfectly assured that if ever Romanism gains such power in this Government, it will be through the mediumship and by the instrumentalities of the National Reform party; for, as crafty, as crud, as bitterly opposed to our free institutions as Rome is, as this book shows she is, and as men know that she is, yet the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with her, and enlist her in the promotion of their scheme of so-called reform. {VNR 82.4}

In saying that the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with Romanism in America, we only state the sober truth, as proved by the following statement from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:— {VNR 83.1}

“Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.” {VNR 83.2}

What the *Statesman* designates as “political atheism,” is nothing more nor less than the present form of government and the present Constitution of the United States. To oppose National Reform is to them sheer atheism; and to oppose the kind of government, which they indorse is political atheism. That no religious test shall be required of a civil ruler, is declared by Rev. M. A. Gault to be “the infidel theory of government.”—*Statesman, December 24, 1885*. The theory of government taught in our national Constitution” is declared by Rev. A. M. Milligan to be “the infidel theory.”—*Speech in the New York Convention*. {VNR 83.3}

The *Statesman* of December 1, 1884, further says:— {VNR 83.4}

“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.” {VNR 83.5}

It is beyond question, therefore, that what the *Statesman* means is, that whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate with the National Reformers in the scheme for the establishment of national Christianity in the United States, the National Reformers “will gladly join hands with them.” But the Roman Catholics are always ready to co-operate in that thing. That is one of Rome’s clearest characteristics. Rome hates our present form of government and our present Constitution as heartily as do the National Reformers. Rome, too, would readily enough brand our present system of government as “political atheism,” if the National Reformers had not already done it for her. And every body may rest assured that the National Reformers will have the pleasure of “gladly” joining hands with Rome, just as soon as they shall have gained a position of sufficient importance to make it to the interest of Rome to join hands with them. In fact, this is exactly what Roman Catholics are commanded to do, in his Encyclical Letter published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. Says:— {VNR 84.1}

“All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church, and all Catholic writers journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the of the above prescriptions.” {VNR 84.2}

From the foregoing quotations from the *Statesman*, it is see, 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 he established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation in the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what “all Catholics” are by the Pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, all and not to lose sight of it for an instant. Therefore, 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 why should they not “gladly join hands”? {VNR 84.3}

But that the National Reformers will gladly join hands with Rome, is not all of the story—not near all. They actually and deliberately propose to make overtures to Rome for co-operation. They actually propose to make advances, and repeated advances, and even to suffer rebuffs, to gain the help of Rome in their Romish scheme of “National Christianity.” Proof of this is in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, where Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, says:— {VNR 85.1}

“This common interest [“of all religious people in the Sabbath”—Sunday] 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 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.” {VNR 85.2}

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the National Reformers. They are now only willing to make advances, but are willing to be subjected to “rebuffs,” and, being rebuffed, to make “repeated advances,” to overcome the coquetry and gain the treacherous favor of “the mistress of witchcrafts.” And why this willingness? Because “it is one of the *necessities* of the situation”—and the italics are his. Shades of Wickliffe, and Luther, and Zwingle, and Milton, and Wesley, and of all the martyrs! was there ever in the world a more humiliating, a more contemptible surrender to the papacy? How many of the American people are ready to join in it? But know of a surety that every one who joins in the National Reform movement thereby joins in a scheme for the delivery of this free land into the hand of the Papacy. Just here, please read again the quotations from Dr. Strong’s book, at the beginning of this article, and see whether the National Reformers in joining hands with Rome, do not equally with Rome show themselves the enemies of the United States Government, and of American institutions—the enemies of human right and human liberty. {VNR 86.1}

It is true, as Mr. Scovel says, the National Reformers now receive somewhat cool treatment, and perhaps sense rebuffs. The Catholic Church does not to any considerable extent directly aid in the National Reform movement. She is too crafty for that. She knows, as well as they, that “it is one of the necessities of the situation,” and she is determined to have the surrender come from them. We personally know a gentleman, who, riding in the railroad not long since, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, “What is your church going to do with the Religious Amendment movement? are you going to help it forward? are you going to vote for it?” “Oh,” said the priest, “we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants, we let them do all that. They are coming to us, and we only have to wait.” {VNR 86.2}

And when in December, 1855, the demand for a national Sunday law reached the point at which it was supported by *six millions* of petitioners, Cardinal Gibbons came out with a letter to Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, the leader of the Protestant side, heartily endorsing the national Sunday bill, and gladly adding his name to the number of petitioners. And on the strength of the Cardinal’s letter, Dr. Crafts and the W. C. T. U. added seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to the six million names already obtained. {VNR 87.1}

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and as the National Reformers find themselves more in need of help, and when, by repeated advances, and in spite of repeated “rebuffs,” they have come to her and made the proper surrender, she will let her power and influence be felt. Let the Reformers do the work, as they are doing, and bring the matter to the point of being voted upon, then there will be found at the polls every Catholic voter its the United States whom the political priests can rule, casting his ballot for the Religious Amendment, which, in the words of the Pope, will “cause the Constitution of” the United “States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true Church,” and by which, as the Archbishop of St. Louis says, “heresy and unbelief” will become “crimes,” and will be “punished as crimes,” as in the Christian countries” of Italy and Spain. {VNR 87.2}

It may be of interest to inquire, What was the subject which drew from Mr. Scovel this expression of willingness, it not anxiety, to gain the co-operation of Rome? He was writing of a movement of the Catholic Church in Europe, for the strict observance of Sunday; and it is to compel everybody to keep Sunday that the National Reformers want the Constitutional Amendment, and legislation under it. Now as the Catholics in Europe are earnestly engaged in it, the question occurs to the National Reformers. “Why shall we not join hands with the Catholics in American, so that we can win? True it is, we may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for time has not come when the Roman Church will strike hands with other churches—*as such;* but *the time has come* for *us* to make repeated advances and gladly accept co-operation *in any form* in which *they* may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation. For without the help of Rome, we cannot compel people to keep Sunday. But it we can enlist with us the powerful hand, and the masterly organization, of Rome, our success is assured.” That is the sum and substance of this proposition of the National Reformers. {VNR 88.1}

Then, when the time comes for the enforcement of the laws which they now demand, what is to hinder the Catholics from assisting in the work, and that, too, is the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our cities and at our very doors, defends the “Holy Inquisition.” And when, by Constitutional Amendment, the refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from acting a prominent part in rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to call on the Catholics for help to make the laws, it would not be in Catholics; so there would then be nothing left but the *enforcement* of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case alone ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party. {VNR 88.2}

It is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by “the necessities of the situation” to unite with Rome, having, by the help of Rome, gained those ends, it will be impossible, *without* the help of Rome, to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy. {VNR 89.1}

In a resolution at a meeting in Glasgow, Scotland, October 5, 1875, Dr. Joseph. P. Thompson well declared that “the papacy, as exemplified in the Vatican Decrees, is the most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny.”—*Our Country, page 50*. And Lord Macaulay made no mistake when he wrote the following:— {VNR 89.2}

“It is impossible to deny that the polity of the church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom.... The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.”—*Essays, Von Ranke*. {VNR 90.1}

And it is into the power of this “most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny;” it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression, that the National Reformers deliberately propose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, of anything else, cart of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone. {VNR 90.2}

Many people think that those who are directing attention to the dangers of religious legislation, are exerting themselves to no purpose, some claiming that there is no possibility of the success of National Reform, and others declaring that there is no danger if it does succeed. But as the National Reform party is *allied with Rome*, there is danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday, the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims —and the danger is increased, and is imminent. In view of these facts, there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws will be induced, with ill-informed zeal, to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it; and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it. {VNR 90.3}

If the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. If they have not religion enough to lead them to do it without the aid of civil laws to compel themselves to do it, then let them have laws to compel *themselves* to do it. But Heaven forbid that they shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask, by which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome. {VNR 91.1}

The success of the National Reform movement will be the success of Rome. Therefore, to support the National Reform movement, is to support Rome. How many of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme? A. T. Jones. {VNR 91.2}

[CD-Rom Editor’s Note: Pages 92-124 are sections entitled “What Think Ye of Christ?” starting on page 92, “The Republic of Israel” starting on page 98, “Evils of Religious Legislation” starting on page 104, “The Salem Witchcraft” starting on page 111, and “Religious Liberty” starting on page 118. These were not authored by A. T. Jones, so are not included in this collection.]

*NATIONAL REFORMED PRESBYTERIANISM*

The National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics. The principles of the so-called National Reform, or Religious Amendment Association, are only the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. In proof of this we have the following facts:— {VNR 125.1}

*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—Mr John Alexander. {VNR 125.2}

*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. Besides these its leading advocates have also been, or are, Reformed Presbyterian preachers, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D. (now dead), Rev. A. M. Milligan (now dead), Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, Prof. S. F. Scovel, J. M. Armour, and others. And “District Secretary” Rev. M. A. Gault says he is “proud to belong to a denomination which appropriates $10,000 of its funds for political agitation each year.” {VNR 125.3}

*Third fact*. Both of the editors of the Christian Statesman—Dr. McAllister and T. P. Stevenson—are Reformed Presbyterians. Dr. McAllister was not long since a professor in a Reformed Presbyterian College, and is now pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church in Pittsburg; and Mr. Stevenson is pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. {VNR 126.1}

*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 Reform Presbyterian Synod’s “Financial Agent for National Reform.” {VNR 126.2}

*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. {VNR 126.3}

*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:— {VNR 126.4}

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 Presbyterian 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.” {VNR 126.5}

2. “The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, and the only principles, of National Reform.” {VNR 127.1}

3. “The proposed amendment of the Federal Constitution is an acknowledgment by the Government that God is the author and source of all authority and power in civil government; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that his revealed will contained in the Bible is the supreme law of nations. Now the association for National Reform proposes to have *these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church* adopted into the Constitution of the United States, and annulling *any part of that Constitution* that may be consistent with these principles.” “The adoption of this amendment into the Constitution would be the Government’s doing ... the highest honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the greatest benefit to our church.” {VNR 127.2}

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.) {VNR 127.3}

*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:— {VNR 127.4}

“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. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and that civil government is a divine ordinance, and one of the ‘all things’ put under him as the mediatorial ruler of the universe, and that to him the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse close incorporation with any Government which does not in some form recognize these principles, and give them effective expression in its legislation. On examination of the United States Constitution, that remarkable document is found to contain no recognition of God as the source of all legitimate civil authority, nor of his law as supreme above all human laws, nor of his Son as governor among the nations... The Constitution does not recognize the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, Christian morality, Christian qualifications for civil officials, and gives no legal basis for any Christian feature in the administration of government.... 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.” {VNR 127.5}

*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.” {VNR 128.1}

Therefore the sum of all this matter is the Undeniable Fact that National Reform is nothing under heaven but Reformed Presbyterianism—and that in politics. {VNR 128.2}

The principles of National Reform, then, being “the *distinctive principles* of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,” when these “distinctive principles” shall have been adopted into the Constitution of the United States, then what will that be but a union of Church and State? Can anybody tell? And when they shall have succeeded in “annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles,” then what will the United States Constitution be but a Reformed Presbyterian creed? Then how can this be anything but a union of Church and State? {VNR 128.3}

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 Presbyterian 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.” {VNR 129.1}

The logic is perfectly easy. By their own words we have the following syllogism:— {VNR 129.2}

MAJOR: Reformed Presbyterianism “originated the National Reform cause.” {VNR 130.1}

MINOR: “The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, and *the only principles, of National Reform*.” {VNR 130.2}

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, in their own words, to do “the greatest benefit to *our church*.” {VNR 130.3}

It is, therefore, as clear as a sunbeam that the National Reform movement is an effort to put into the Constitution of the United States, and make practical there, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and that the National Reform party is doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. And when the United Presbyterian Church, the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Prohibitionists, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, or any other church, party, or union, lends its support to the National Reform party, it is but doing the work of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,—it is simply aiding to make of practical application in the civil affairs of this nation, the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. {VNR 130.4}

In short, to condense the whole subject into a single sentence, the National Reform party is only the cat’s paw by which the Reformed Presbyterian—well, the Reformed Presbyterian Church—proposes to draw our national chestnut out of the fire of “political atheism. For be it known that the Reformed Presbyterians refuse to count themselves citizens under our present Constitution. It is a disciplinary offense for a member of that church to vote, or hold office, under our Constitution. So she has created the National Reform party to do the political work, and stir up, or persuade, others to vote for and accomplish the subversion of the Constitution, and then she will take to herself all the glory—and dismal glory it will be. But as she proposes to “gladly join hands” with the Catholic Church to obtain it, she may also allow Rome to share with her the glory. It will well be worthy of both. {VNR 130.5}

And yet, knowing that the principles of National Reform are the peculiar principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; knowing that the attack upon the secular character of the Constitution is the distinctive principle of that church, “the one in which she differs from *all* others;” knowing that the success of the National Reform movement will be but to make practical, in the affairs of this Government, these principles which are peculiar to the Reformed Presbyterian Church—knowing all this, Dr. McAllister, T. P. Stevenson, W. J. Coleman, M. A. Gault, R. C. Wylie, J. M. Foster, and all their Reformed Presbyterian National Reform associates, in National Convention assembled, will stand before the intelligent people of this nation and “affirm” and “re-affirm” that this movement does not tend, “in the least degree,” toward a union of Church and State! but “will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment.” But suppose the Catholic Church were to openly avow her purpose to have the distinctive principles of the Catholic Church adopted into the Constitution of the United States, annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles, is there anybody in this broad land who would not set that down as a project to unite Church and State in this Government? Not one. But if such a movement on the part of the Catholic Church would threaten a union of Church and State, how is it that this movement of the Reformed Presbyterian Church threatens no such thing. If such a thing by the Catholic Church *would be* a union of Church and State, how is it that the same thing by the Reformed Presbyterian Church would not be? To ask these questions is to answer them. {VNR 131.1}

But let us look into this thing a little further. Everybody who is acquainted with the Reformed Presbyterian Church knows that it claims to be the direct and only lineal descendant of the Covenanters, and prides itself upon being the modern representative and the sole conservator of genuine Covenanter principles. In fact, this is plainly shown above in No. I of the quotations from Mr. James Wallace and the *Reformed Presbyterian*. Besides this, the title of what was then the *Reformed Presbyterian* is now the *Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanter*. Therefore, by studying the Covenanter principles and their practical application, we may form some idea of what the result would be if the National Reform party should succeed in making “practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian [Covenanter] Church” in this nation. {VNR 132.1}

The best summary on the subject of these principles that we have seen is an article by “A Presbyterian Minister” in the New York *Independent* of November 11, 1880, entitled, “Is it Right—a Protest.” And the best summary of the application of the principles that perhaps anybody has ever seen is Chapter V of Buckle’s “History of Civilization.” {VNR 132.2}

The Covenants which embody the principles of the Covenanters, and, perforce, of the National Reformers, are entitled, “The National Covenant or Confession of Faith,” and the “Solemn League and Covenant,” and are both of Scotch Presbyterian origin. The first of these, “The National Covenant or Confession of Faith,” was “first subscribed in 1580; again, by all persons of all ranks in 1581; again, in 1590; again, in the language of its title, ‘subscribed by Barons, Nobles, Burgesses, Ministers, and Commons; in 1638, approven by the General Assembly, 1638 and 1639; and subscribed again by persons of all ranks and qualities in the year 1639, by an ordinance of Council upon the supplication of the General Assembly, an act of the General Assembly, certified by an act of Parliament 1640;’ and, finally, in compliance with the urgent demands of Scottish Presbyterians, subscribed by Charles II., in 165o and 1651, as being, along with the ‘Solemn League and Covenant,’ the one prime and only condition of their restoring him to power.” {VNR 133.1}

The following act will show the purpose of the Covenant, and will give some idea of the means by which that purpose was to be accomplished:— {VNR 133.2}

“Assembly at Edinburg, Aug. 30, 1639, Ses. 23. {VNR 133.3}

*“Act Ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly’s Declaration.* {VNR 133.4}

“The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from *a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom*, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the king’s Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having by our great oath declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings, and having withal supplicated his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty’s honorable Privy Council, to enjoin, by act of Council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession or Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty’s honorable Privy Council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty’s lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: *that our union may be the more full and perfect*, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure, That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons *suspected* of Papistry, *or any other error;* and, finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription, ‘The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; we subscribe according to the determination foresaid.’ And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be insert in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and presbyterial, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility, supplicate his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and enjoin the same, *under all civil pains;* which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King’s Majesty’s honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom.” {VNR 134.1}

What does that act propose?—“A full and perfect union of this kirk [church] and kingdom;” “that our union may be more full and perfect.” The principles of the Covenant and the Covenanters therefore are clearly the principles of a union of Church and State. Now, as the principles of National Reform are the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and as the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles of the Covenanters, and as the principles of the Covenanters are the principles of a full and perfect union of Church and State, it stands proved to a demonstration that the National Reform movement aims directly at a union, yes, a full and perfect union, of Church and State. And whenever you read or hear of the National Reform Association, or the National Association for the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, you may understand that that means the Church and State Association. We could easily continue this indictment through half a dozen different counts, but that is not our object here. This, however, is enough to justify us fully in branding upon the brazen face of this association the inscription—National reform is Church and State, and that alone. {VNR 135.1}

Among many other like things, that Covenant declares in approval of various acts of the Scottish Parliament, in these words:— {VNR 135.2}

” ... do condemn all erroneous books and writs concerning erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies papistical, ... the home-bringers of them to be punished, ... and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault as idolators.” {VNR 136.1}

The religion “presently professed,” remember, was the Covenanter—the National Reform—religion. And note, all opposition to that religion, in doctrine or in worship, in books or in rites, was to be punished for the second fault as idolatry. What then was the punishment for idolatry? John Knox had already laid down the law on this point, and here it is in his own words and in his own spelling:— {VNR 136.2}

“None provoking the people to idolatrie oght to be exempted from the punishment of death.... The whole tribes did in eerie dede execute that sharp judgment against the tribe of Benjamin for a lesse offense than for idolatrie. And the same oght to be done wheresoever Christ Jesus and his Evangill [Gospel] is so received in any realme, province or citie that the magistrates and people have solemnly avowed and promised to defend the same, as under King Edward [VI.] of late days was done in England. In such places, I say, it is not only lawful to punish to the death such as labor to subvert the true religion, but the magistrates and people are bound to do so onless they will provoke the wrath of God against themselves.”—*Knox’s Works, Laing’s Edition, Vol. 4, pp. 500-515; or Leeky’s History of Rationalism, Vol. 2, pp. 50, 51, note 6*. {VNR 136.3}

For the protection of the religion “presently professed” the covenant further declares of it:— {VNR 136.4}

“Which by manifold acts of Parliament, all within this realm are bound to profess, to subscribe the articles thereof, to recant all doctrine and errors repugnant to any of the said articles, ... and all magistrates, sheriffs, etc., ... are ordained to search, apprehend, and punish all contraveners; ... that none shall be reputed loyal and faithful subjects to our sovereign Lord or his authority, but be punishable as rebellers and gainstanders of the same, who shall not give their confession and make their profession of the said true religion.” {VNR 136.5}

Again the Covenant declares that it is the duty of the magistrates to— {VNR 137.1}

“Maintain the true religion of Jesus Christ.” “And that they should be careful to root out of their empire all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God who shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the aforesaid crimes.” {VNR 137.2}

So much for the “National Covenant or Confession of Faith;” but by this all may understand the meaning of the National Reform declaration that the duty of the nation is “an acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national covenanting with” God. {VNR 137.3}

*THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT*

The “Solemn League and Covenant” is of the same tenor, and came about in this way: In the trouble between the English nation and King Charles I., Presbyterianism arose to power in England, and they called on their Covenanter co-religionists of Scotland to help them out of the trouble. This the Covenanters would do only upon the English complying with the “imperative demand of the Scot’s Parliament that the religious system of Scotland should be adopted as that of England.” The Covenanters of course proposed the Covenant, but Vane, the chief negotiator for England, “stipulated for a league,” as well as a covenant, and so was formed the “Solemn League and Covenant.”—*Knight’s England, chap. 92*. This, as the basis of union and of action, was entered into in 1643, and was to be “the perpetual bond of union” between the kingdoms. In it, it was declared:— {VNR 137.4}

“That we shall, in like manner, endeavor the extirpation of popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.” {VNR 138.1}

In 1639 there had been passed an “Act Ordaining by Ecclesiastical Authority the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly’s Declaration,” in which this is found:— {VNR 138.2}

“And having, withal, supplicated His Majesty’s High Commissioner and the lords of His Majesty’s honorable Privy Council to *enjoin* by act of Council all the lieges in time coming to subscribe to the Confession of Faith and Covenant.” {VNR 138.3}

The way in which it was to be enjoined, was this:— {VNR 138.4}

“And in all humility supplicate His Majesty’s High Commissioner and the honorable Estates of Parliament by their authority to ratify and enjoin the same, under all civil pains.” {VNR 138.5}

In compliance with these humble supplications the Edinburg Parliament, in June, 1640, passed an act to “Ordain and command the said Confession and Covenant to be subscribed by all His Majesty’s subjects, of what rank and quality soever, *under all civil pains*.” {VNR 138.6}

In compliance with these humble supplications the Edinburg Parliament, in June, 1640, passed and act to— {VNR 138.7}

“Ordain and command the said Confession and Covenant to be subscribed by all His Majesty’s subjects, of what rank and quality soever, *under all civil pains*.” {VNR 138.8}

“All civil pains” includes everything that a Government can inflict, even to death itself. These were ordinances of the Scotch Parliament, but the English Parliament during the Covenanter *regime* was not one whit behind. {VNR 139.1}

Under the “Solemn League and Covenant,” the Presbyterian Parliament of England dealt “the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received.” {VNR 139.2}

“An ‘Ordinance for the Suppression of Blasphemies and Heresies,’ which Vane and Cromwell had long held at bay, was passed by triumphant majorities. Any man, ran this terrible statute, denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of Scripture are the ‘word of God,’ or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of Judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his heresy, ‘shall suffer the pain of death.’ Any man declaring (among a long list of other errors) ‘that man by nature hath free will to turn to God,’ that there is a purgatory, that images are lawful, that infant baptism is unlawful; anyone denying the obligation of observing the Lord’s day, or asserting ‘that the church government by presbytery is antichristian or unlawful,’ shall, on refusal to renounce his errors, ‘be commanded to prison.’”—*Green’s Larger History of England, book VII, chap. 10, par. 11*. {VNR 139.3}

The execution of Charles I. severed the League, and Charles II. was immediately proclaimed in Scotland, with the proviso, however, that “before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern The security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant.” This was made known to Charles in Holland, but he refused to accede to it. The next year, however, 1650, he sailed to Scotland, and before landing he accepted the terms, consented to subscribe to the Covenants, and receive the test. But all the while he was devising schemes for the subversion of the Covenants and the whole Covenanter system, of which the whole history of his reign, as well as of that of his brother, James II., is but a dreadful illustration. When James II. had deprived himself of all allegiance of his subjects, and William and Mary came to the English and Scotch thrones in his stead, Presbyterianism was finally established as the religion of Scotland. But it was Presbyterianism without the enforcement of the Covenants, for honest William declared in memorable words that so long as he reigned there should be no persecution for conscience’ sake.” Said he:— {VNR 139.4}

“We never could be of that mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party.”—*Green’s England, Book VIII, chap. 3, par. 36*. {VNR 140.1}

And when William and Mary were inaugurated as sovereigns of Scotland, when it came to taking the oath of office, William refused to swear to the persecuting part of it. {VNR 140.2}

“A splendid circle of English nobles and statesmen stood round the throne; but the sword of State was committed to a Scotch lord; and the oath of office was administered after the Scotch fashion. Argyle recited the words slowly. The royal pair, holding up their hands towards Heaven, repeated after him till they came to the last clause. There William paused. That clause contained a promise that he would root out all heretics and all enemies of the true worship of God; and it was notorious that, in the opinion of many Scotchmen, not only all Roman Catholics, but all Protestant Episcopalians, all Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, all Lutherans, nay, all British Presbyterians who did not hold themselves bound by the Solemn League and Covenant, were enemies of the true worship of God. The king had apprised the commissioners that he could not take this part of the oath without a distinct and public explanation; and they had been authorized by the convention to give such an explanation as would satisfy him. ‘I will not,’ he now said, ‘lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor.’ ‘Neither the words of this oath,’ said one of the commissioners, ‘nor the laws of Scotland, lay any such obligation on Your Majesty.’ ‘In that sense, then, I swear,’ said William; ‘and I desire you all, my lords and gentlemen, to witness that I do so.’”—*Macaulay’s England, chap. 13, par. 63*. {VNR 140.3}

As the acts of settlement adopted under William, and the oaths taken by him, not only failed to adopt and enforce the Covenants, but were in express contradiction to the persecuting clauses of them, the Covenanters “regarded this as a compromise with Satan,” and “accordingly occupied an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William, and acted on by the church,” that is, by the great body of the Scottish Church, which accepted the principles of William and the acts of settlement. “They maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both “the church and the sovereign, from the principles and the obligations of Covenant, and, says Macaulay, many of them “would rather have been fired upon by musketeers, or tied to stakes within low-water mark, than have uttered a prayer that God would bless William and Mary.”—*Id., par. 61*. {VNR 141.1}

The Covenanters then standing as dissenters from the Government that would not adopt the persecuting part of the Covenants, and as the sole defenders of the ultra doctrines of the Covenants, adopted the name of “Reformed Presbyterians.” Thus the Covenanters are the Reformed Presbyterians, and Reformed Presbyterianism is National Reform. {VNR 142.1}

As the principles of the Covenants and the Covenanters, which we have here set forth, are the “distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,” and for the spread of which that church is set; and as “National Reform is simply the practical application” of these principles “for the reformation of the nation,” it is important that we understand what the “practical application” of these principles amounts to. It is important that we know how these principles are applied in the “reformation” of a nation. Material for the illustration of this point is abundant. We have space for only a small portion, yet enough to give an idea of what may be expected if the power to apply these principles practically should fall into the hands of the National Reform conservators of them. {VNR 142.2}

Of the rule of the Covenanter—the National Reform—preachers in Scotland, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:— {VNR 142.3}

“For the spiritual tyranny which they introduced the reader should refer to Mr. Buckle’s famous chapter; or, if he thinks those statements to be partial or exaggerated, to original records, such as those of the Presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar. The arrogance of the ministers’ pretensions and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted, the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expression of opinion, the intrusions on the domain of the magistrate, the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was ‘borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. ‘We acknowledge,’ said they, ‘that according to the latitude of the word of God (which is our theme) we are allowed to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king’s throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant’s balance that should be used in faithfulness.’ The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading.”—*Article Presbyterianism*. {VNR 142.4}

Mr. Buckle, to whom we are here referred, has certainly given this subject the “minute reading” which is said to be requisite. And we are certain that no one can justly charge him with partiality or exaggeration, because for every statement that he makes, he gives direct quotations and the clearest references in proof of even to hundreds. The edition from which we quote is Appleton’s, of 1885. No one who is acquainted with National Reform doctrines and literature can read this and fail to see that the National Reformers are the literal descendants of the Covenanters, or that the principles of the Covenanters of the seventeenth century are the principles that the National Reformers are trying to revive in the nineteenth, and that too in free America. {VNR 143.1}

The following quotations are all from Chapter V of “Buckle’s History of Civilization.” The references to notes, in brackets, are from Buckle’s footnotes in proof of statements in his texts. We quote:— {VNR 143.2}

“According to the Presbyterian polity, which reached its height in the seventeenth century, the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen on whom they could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his councillors, or rather the ministers of his authority. They, when assembled together, formed what was called the Kirk-Session, and this little court, which enforced the decisions uttered in the pulpit, was so supported by the superstitious reverence of the people, that it was far more powerful than any civil tribunal. By its aid, the minister became supreme. For, whoever presumed to disobey him was excommunicated, was deprived of his property, and was believed to have incurred the penalty of eternal perdition.” {VNR 144.1}

“The clergy interfered with every man’s private concerns, ordered how he should govern his family, and often took upon themselves should the personal control of his household. [Clarendon, under the year 1640, emphatically says, “The preacher reprehended the husband, governed the wife, chastised the children, and insulted over the servants, in the houses of the greatest men.”—*Note 26*.] Their minions, the elders, were everywhere; for each parish was divided into several quarters, and to each quarter one of these officials was allotted, in order that he might take special notice of what was done in his own district. Besides this, spies were appointed, so that nothing could escape their supervision. Not only the streets, but even private houses, were searched, and ransacked, to see if anyone was absent from church while the minister was preaching. [In 1652, the Kirk-Session of Glasgow “brot boyes and servants before them for breaking the Sabbath and other faults. They had clandestine censors, and gave money to some for this end.” And by the Kirk-Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, it was “thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the Session pas throw the towne everie Sabboth-day, and nott [note] sic as they find absent fra the sermones ather afoir or efter none [either before or after noon]; and for that effect that thay pas and *sersche sic houss as they think maist meit,* and pas athort the streittis.” “Ganging throw the towne on the ordinar preiching days in the weik, als weill as on the Sabboth-day, to cause the people to resort to the sermones.” “The Session allous the searchers to go into houses and apprehend absents from the Kirk.”—*Notes 28, 29*.] {VNR 144.2}

“To him [the minister], all must listen, and him all must obey. Without the consent of his tribunal, no person might engage himself either as a domestic servant, or as a field laborer. If anyone incurred the displeasure of the clergy, they did not scruple to summon his servants and force them to state whatever they knew respecting him, and whatever they had seen done in his house. [In 1652, Sir Alexander Irvine indignantly writes, that the Presbytery of Aberdeen, “when they had tried many wayes, bot in vaine, to mak probable this their vaine imaginatione, they, at lenthe, when all other meanes failed thame, by ane unparalleled barbaritie, enforced my serwandis to reweall upon oathe what they sawe, herd, or knewe done within my house, beyond which no Turkische inquisitione could pase.”—*Note 31*.] To speak disrespectfully of a preacher was a grievous offense; to differ from him was a heresy; 1 even to pass him in the streets without saluting him, was punished as a crime. His very name was regarded as sacred, and not to be taken in vain. And that it might be properly protected, and held in due honor, an Assembly of the Church, in 1642, forbade it to be used in any public paper unless the consent of the holy man had been previously obtained.” {VNR 145.1}

“The arbitrary and irresponsible tribunals, which now sprung up all over Scotland, united the executive authority with the legislative, and exercised both functions at the same time. Declaring that certain acts ought not to be committed, they took the law into their own hands, and punished those who had committed them. According to the principles of this new jurisprudence, of which the clergy were the authors, it became a sin for any Scotchman to travel in a Catholic country. It was a sin for any Scotch inn-keeper to admit a Catholic into his inn. It was a sin for any Scotch town to hold a market either on Saturday or on Monday, because both days were near Sunday. It was a sin for a Scotchwoman to wait at a tavern; it was a sin for her to live alone; it was also a sin for her to live with unmarried sisters. It was a sin to go from one town to another on Sunday, however pressing the business might be. It was a sin to visit your friend on Sunday.... On that day horse-exercise was sinful; so was walking in the fields, or in the meadows, or in the streets, or enjoying the fine weather by sitting at the door of your own house. To go to sleep on Sunday, before the duties of the day were over, was also sinful, and deserved church censure. [The records of the Kirk-Session of Aberdeen, in 1656, have this entry: “Cite Issobell Balfort, servand to William Gordone, tailyeor, beeing found sleeping at the Loche side on the Lord’s day in tyme of sermon.”—*Note 186*].” {VNR 145.2}

The prayers were nearly two hours long; and the regular sermons, on an average, about three and a half hours in length, and yet it was a great sin for even the children to feel tired of them. {VNR 146.1}

“Halyburton, addressing the young people of his congregation, says: ‘Have not you been glad when the Lord’s day was over, or at least, when the preaching was done that ye might get your liberty? Has it not been a burden to you, to sit so long in the church? Well, this is a great sin.’”—*Note 186*. {VNR 146.2}

These things appear bad enough, but they are mere trifles when compared with the enormities of their tolerance of heresy or “pretended liberty of conscience.” {VNR 147.1}

[“Rutherford’s Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience” says: “We hold that toleration of all religions is not farre from blasphemy.” “If wolves be permitted to teach what is right in their own erroneous conscience, and there be no ‘Magistrate to put them to shame,’ Judges 18:7, and no King to punish them, then godliness and all that concernes the first Table of the Law must be marred.” “Wilde and atheisticall liberty of conscience.”—*Notes 199, 200*.] {VNR 147.2}

“They taught that it was a sin to tolerate his [the heretic’s] notions at all, and that the proper course was to visit him with sharp and immediate punishment. Going yet further, they broke the domestic ties, and set parents against their offspring. They taught the father to smite the unbelieving child and to slay his own boy sooner than to allow him to propagate error. [“A benefit (which is a branch of the former), is zeal in the godly against false teachers, who shall be so tender of the truth and glory of God and the safety of church (all which are endangered by error), that it shalI overcome natural affection in them; so that parents shall not *spare their own children*, being seducers, shall either by an heroick act (such as was in Phinehas, Numbers 25:8), *themselves judge him worthy to die, and give sentence and execute it*, or cause him to be punished, by bringing him to the Magistrate.... The toleration of a false religion in doctrine or worship, and the exemption of the erroneous from civil punishment, is no more lawful under the New Testament than it was under the Old.”—*Hutcheson’s Exposition on the Minor Prophets, the Prophets, the Prophecie of Zechariah—Note 201*.] {VNR 147.3}

“As if this were not enough, they tried to extirpate another affection, even more sacred and more devoted still. They laid their rude and merciless hands on the holiest passion of which our nature is capable, the love of a mother for her son. Into that sanctuary, they dared to intrude; into that they thrust their gaunt and ungentle forms. If a mother held opinions of which they disapproved they did not scruple to invade her household, take away her children, and forbid her to hold communication with them. Or if, perchance, her son had incurred their displeasure, they were not satisfied with forcible separation, but they labored to corrupt her heart, and harden it against her child, so that she might be privy to the act. In one of these cases mentioned in the records of the church of Glasgow, the Kirk-Session of that town summoned before them a woman, merely because she had received into their own house her own son, after the clergy had excommunicated him. So effectually did they work upon her mind, that they induced her to promise, not only that she would shut her door against the child, but that she would aid in bringing him to punishment. She had sinned in loving him; she had sinned, even, in giving him shelter; but, says the record, ‘she promised not to do it again, and to tell the magistrates when he comes next to her.’ {VNR 147.4}

“She promised not to do it again. She promised to forget him, whom she had borne of her womb and suckled at her breast. She promised to forget her boy, who had ofttimes crept to her knees, and had slept in her bosom, and whose tender frame she had watched over and nursed.... To hear of such things is enough to make one’s blood surge again, and raise a tempest in our inmost nature. But to have seen them, to have lived in the midst of them, and yet not to have rebelled against them, is to us utterly inconceivable, and proves in how complete a thralldom the Scotch were held, and how thoroughly their minds, as well as their bodies, were enslaved. {VNR 148.1}

“What more need I say? What further evidence need I bring to elucidate the real character of one of the most detestable tyrannies ever seen on the earth? When the Scotch Kirk was at the height of its power, he may search history in vain for any institution which can compete with it, except the Spanish Inquisition. Between these two there is a close and intimate analogy. Both were intolerant, both were cruel, both made war upon the finest parts of human nature, and both destroyed every vestige of religious freedom.” {VNR 148.2}

We do not set forth these things for the purpose of condemning the ancient Covenanters before all other people. It is true they were fearfully intolerant, but they were no more so than any other body of religionists who ever did, or who ever shall, grasp for civil power and get it. We write and reproduce these things simply to show to the American people what National Reform really is, and what the practical application of National Reform principles will be in the United States so surely as its advocates shall secure their coveted “full and perfect union of *this* Kirk and Kingdom.” We tell these things that the American people may know exactly what it is that the “evangelical churches,” the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, the Third-party Prohibitionists, and others are doing when they lend their influence, and exert their energies, to help forward the work of National Reform. For, as these are the very principles which this Reformed Presbyterian National Reform Association declares its purpose to make of “practical application” “for the reformation” of this nation, all people may rest perfectly assured that the practical application will be made as surely as these men ever secure a shadow of power or authority to make it. {VNR 149.1}

This all may rest assured of, because persecution for conscience’ sake is the essential quality, the very reason of existence, of the National Reform Association. For, it was because William III. declared that “so long as he reigned there should be no persecution for conscience’ sake;” because he would not allow his “authority to be made a tool of the irregular passions of any party;” because in taking his kingly oath as sovereign of Scotland he would not lay himself “under any obligation to be a persecutor;”—it was because of these things that the rigid Covenanters “occupied an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William. So “protesting,” in their descent, they became Reformed Presbyterians; and because the Constitution of the United States embodies the very principles avowed by William,—because our National Constitution will not sanction “persecution for conscience’ sake; because that Constitution will not allow that its “authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party;” because that Constitution will not lay any of its officers under any obligation to be a persecutor—*that* is why the “special and distinctive principles” of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the one in which she differs from all others, is her practical protest against the secular character of the United States Constitution.” At the first she protested against the principles avowed by William; she now protests against the same principles as embodied in the United States Constitution. For this cause at the first she refused close incorporation with the Government of William and Mary; for this cause now she refuses “close incorporation with” the United States Government. These are the “distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church;” and these “are the principles, and the only principles, of National Reform.” Therefore, as Reformed Presbyterianism “originated the National Reform cause,” and as “National Reform is simply the practical application of the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the nation;” it stands proved to a demonstration that *the essential quality, the very reason of existence*, of the National Reform cause is Persecution for Conscience’ Sake.
A. T. Jones. {VNR 150.1}