

The American Sentinel 1 (1886)

January 1886

"Note" *The American Sentinel* 1, 1 , p. 7.

DR. A. M. MILLIGAN was one of the main spokes in the National Reform wheel. He died not long since, and, in writing of him afterward, Mr. M. A. Gault, a secretary and one of the chief speakers of the National Reform Party, said:—

"I heard him once remark that he was mainly indebted to his theological professor, Dr. James R. Wilson, for his inspiration on National Reform. I can say that I received my inspiration on that subject from Dr. A. M. Milligan."

We think that this is just the correct statement of the scheme of National Reform inspiration. We are satisfied that that is the exact size of the channel along which the stream of National Reform inspiration flows. And we are sure that the religio-political aspirations of ambitious clerics is the highest point to which the source of National Reform inspiration can ever be traced.

A. T. J.

February 1886

"National Reform and the Rights of Conscience" *The American Sentinel* 1, 2 , pp. 11, 12.

THE avowed purpose of the National Reform Party is to secure an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which every man will 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 Oct. 2, 1884, says"—

"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.*"

"*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.

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 any one for it; they pretend to be so merciful that they will not imprison any one for it; but they are neither so kind, so liberal, nor so merciful but that they *will disfranchise* every one who will not acknowledge, and submit to, the provisions which they choose to embody in their Religious Amendment to the Constitution.

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 amongst a free people, and in this instance a citizen of the best Government or 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; and that in their own words.

Mr. W. J. Coleman is one of the principal exponents of the National Reform religion. In the *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 1, 1883, Mr. Coleman replied to some questions that had been put by a correspondent who signed himself "Truth Seeker." We copy the following"—

"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 toward 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."

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 illogically *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.

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.

Thus much merely in passing, as it is not so much our purpose in this article 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:—

"The worst result will be to disfranchise them."

But this is *not* the worst result which they

12

wish, nor which they intend shall be to such. Just read carefully the following extract from an address delivered by Rev. E. B. Graham at a National Reform Convention held at York, Neb., and reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885:—

"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."

Exactly; dissenters must not only be disfranchised, 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 a

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.

This, too, is all to be done 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:—

"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 con-science in this matter."

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 every one but them.

And so, 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.

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 who could exert a more positive influence. In a complete list given in the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 2, 1883, we read the names of *thirteen* Bishops of such of the evangelical churches as have bishops, *fifteen* College Presidents, *thirteen* College Professors, *ten* Justices of Supreme Courts. As printed in the *Statesman* of Dec. 24, 1885, we find *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 Hon.'s, Rev.'s, and D. D.'s, that we cannot attempt now to count them.

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, 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.

And because we distrust their movement, because we see the result of it when they shall have secured the power, they choose to think us possessed of a wonderful "compound of folly and fanaticism." (See editorial comment in *Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884.) But from their own words, fairly quoted in this article, we are justified in saying that the success of their 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 the AMERICAN SENTINEL is set for the defense of the genius of American institutions. A. T. J.

March 1886

"Church and State" *The American Sentinel* 1, 3 , pp. 19, 20.

THE fifth resolution of the Cleveland National Reform Convention reads: "*Resolved*, That we *re-affirm* that this religious amendment, instead of infringing on any individual's right of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment, and form

the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens."

It is apparently necessary for that party to constantly "re-affirm" that this movement does not tend to a union of church and State; for as their actions and writings all betray that very tendency, a blind must be kept up by each convention *re-affirming* that it does *not* so tend. That such is its direct tendency we propose to prove.

Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the chief speakers in the movement, in explaining to "Truth Seeker" the change that will have to be made in the existing Constitution when the proposed amendment shall have been adopted, says:—

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

"There should be religion, but no church." What religion should there be? the Christian religion, to be sure. No idea of any other is for a moment entertained by the National Reform party. But the Christian religion is embodied in the Christian church. Apart from the Christian church there is no Christian religion in this world. Christ did not say, On this rock will I build my *religion*; but he *did* say, "On this rock will I build my *church*," and in that church is his religion. The church is the "body of Christ" (Col. 1:18); the members of the church are members of Christ (1 Cor. 6:15); members of his body—the church (Eph. 5:29, 30). Out of Christ no man can live a Christianly religious life; for he himself said, "Without me ye can do nothing." But to be in Christ is to be *in his church*, for we have proved that the church is his body in this world. We repeat therefore that apart from the Christian church there is no Christian religion. This is exactly what the National Reform party believes; and it is the Christian religion *as embodied in* what they call *the Christian church* that the party wants this Government to make the fundamental law of the nation. And that will be church and State. For the nation to unite with the Christian religion as embodied in the Christian church is to form a union with the Christian church and is therefore a union of church and State.

If they deny our deduction from their proposition as quoted, and insist that they mean literally that there can be "religion [the Christian

religion], but no church," then it follows that they mean that the religion of Christ can be separated from the church of Christ. Then there follows upon this the absurd conclusion that there can be—a church of Christ with no religion, and a religion with no representatives! But if the religion of Christ have no representatives in the world, then there is no religion of Christ in the world. If it be claimed that this is so as far as our nation is at present concerned; and that now our nation must adopt this religion, and by constitutional amendment embody in the nation's fundamental law the doctrine of God and of Christ, and enforce its observance; that will be simply for the State to create for itself the Christian religion, and so will be nothing else but a union of church and State. It is plain, therefore, that by their own proposition, whatever they may claim under it, there is literally no escape from a union of church and State.

If this reasoning is, by the National Reform party, considered unsound, if the deduction which we make from their premise is not logical, then we verily wish that that party would show us where the line shall be drawn between the Christian religion and the Christian church. Will they show us where the line shall be drawn which will shut the Christian religion in the State, and shut the Christian church out? They will never show it. They know just as well as we do, and we just as well as they, that practically they never intend to make any such distinction. And their claim of such distinction is nothing but a piece of Jesuitical casuistry by which they would hide their real intention.

Further, it is a fact that what used to be the Presbyterian *Church* is now only the Presbyterian *branch* of the *Christian church*. That which once was the Methodist or Baptist Church is now merely the Methodist or the Baptist branch of the church of Christ, or the one true church. And it is a subject of constant rejoicing to them that all the differences that once made them antagonists, are being accommodated, and that the one grand object of the "unity of the church" and its work, is about to be realized. And even the Catholic Church is not excluded, but is recognized by some of the leading religious papers of our land as a part of the true church, and is recognized by the Reform Association in its work (not in its theory) as an efficient helper. That this is the position of the National Reform party the following is proof:—

"But these divisions are a fact, and they have been overruled so that they are not inconsistent with the unity of the church. All upon

whom the name of Christ is named have their calling. The Methodists have their vocation in the history of the church to arouse Christian life; the Presbyterians their vocation to conserve Calvinistic principles; and the Reformed Presbyterians their vocation to keep unfurled the blue banner for Christ's crown and covenant.' We are different divisions of Immanuel's army. The Methodists are the charging cavalry, the Presbyterians the fighting infantry, the Covenanters the batteries upon the heights. We have one Commander-in-chief; and under him we go forward, one united phalanx against the common enemy. And when the victory is gained, the army will be one as the Leader is *one*."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 7, 1884, page 6.

So then, if, as they claim, all these are but *branches* of the *one* church, of course it requires all of them to make up the church. And if it

20

requires all of them to make up the Christian church, and the representative of Christianity in the earth, when they all unite, as they are doing, and all work to the one point of securing this religious amendment to the Constitution, and under it enforcing their united views, what is that but church and State?

But as they insist that their movement does not tend "in the least degree to a union of church and State," it may be well to lay before our readers the National Reform idea of what is union of church and State. In the Pittsburg convention, in 1874, Professor Blanchard gave their definition of a union of church and State. It is as follows:—

"But union of church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers, and oversight of its doctrines. For such a union none of us plead. To such a union we are all of us opposed."

Let us accept this definition, and see what it proves. Here it is plainly declared that "the selection by the nation of one church" as the recipient of its favor is the union of church and State. In the quotations that precede this it is just as plainly declared that the different denominations *are one church*. Therefore, according to their own words, when this nation selects this one church, and by Constitutional amendment espouses her to itself as the especial object of its favor, *that* will be the union of church and State.

But let us examine the point which is doubtless intended in this last quotation, and see whether they fare any better. In the phrase "the selection by the nation of one church," the meaning is, no doubt, that the selection by the nation, for instance, of the Methodist, or the

Baptist, or the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as the object of its favor, would be the union of church and State. But if this would be the union of church and State, how is it that the other would not be? If the selection by the nation of one church is union of church and State, we should like to know how the difficulty is in the least relieved by the selection of a dozen or fifty *as one*. Will some one of the National Reform advocates point out the distinction and draw the line of demarkation?

Once more: In one of the foregoing quotations from the *Statesman*, the Methodists, Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterians are said to be but ""different divisions of Immanuel's army,"—the Methodists, the cavalry; the Presbyterians, the infantry; and the Reformed Presbyterians, the artillery, in "one united phalanx" in the one army. Now in the Declaration of Independence our fathers charged that the king of Great Britain had affected "to render the military independent of; and superior to, the civil power." What a great pity it is that George III. did not have for his advisers some of these National Reform statesman(!) If he only could have had these, he could have shown to a "candid world" that this charge of his American colonies was altogether false, and foreign to the subject of their grievances. With the assistance of these profound statesman, he could have projected into the controversy this magnificent and most conclusive disclaimer: "We *re-affirm*" that the establishment of our military forces in America, instead of tending in the least degree toward making the military superior to the civil power, will afford the fullest security against such a corrupting establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of the liberties of all citizens. But what *we* mean by making the military superior to the civil power is the selection by the king of one division of the army, the *artillery*, for instance, and making that the depository and the expositor of the king's will. For *such* a superiority no one pleads. To *such* a superiority all of us are opposed. For the king to thus select and favor *one division* of the army would indeed be to make the military superior to the civil power; but for him to so select the *whole army* together—cavalry, infantry, and artillery—would not tend "in the least degree" to make the military superior to the civil power.

Now these National Reform advocates, as well as all others, know perfectly that for the king of Great Britain to have offered to the American colonies such an excuse as that for his military occupancy here, would have been only to make himself supremely ridiculous in

the eyes of all civilized people. Yet when we charge, as we distinctly do, that the National Reform party aims directly at the union of church and State, and affects to make the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power in the Government of the United States, that party, apparently in all soberness, offers just such an absurdly ridiculous plea in justification of its course,—a plea that is worthy only the casuistry of the veriest Jesuit. However, we do not see how we can expect anything else of that party. Its *cause* is worthy only of Jesuitism and the Inquisition, and can only be justified by such casuistry as a Jesuit might envy. We shall have something more to say on this subject.

A. T. J.

April 1886

"Church and State" *The American Sentinel* 1, 4 , pp. 28, 29.

WE have already proved, on two distinct counts, that the movement represented by the National Reform Association carries in itself "the promise and potency" of a union of Church and State in the United States. We shall here present additional proofs to the same purpose.

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, January 31 and February 1, 1872, Mr. Francis E. Abbot presented a remonstrance against the object of the convention. Rev. A. D. Mayo, D. D., of Cincinnati, replied to it. In his remarks he said:—

"One would think the gentleman had come all the way from Toledo to Cincinnati to utter a prophet's warning against some future danger threatened by us. Why, he is now living as a citizen of Ohio, under a Constitution that substantially includes every idea we propose to place in the national charter. The Constitution of Ohio begins with a confession of dependence on Almighty God as the author of the liberties it is made to preserve. It declares that 'religion is essential to good government.' And by 'religion' *it means just what this proposed amendment means*,—that in order that a State shall endure, its citizens should be religious men; should live according to the highest idea of morality, which, in this State, is the moral system of Jesus Christ; and that the State itself should conform to that idea of morality in its legislation and character, as it hopes for life. *That's all there is in this thing.*"

Dr. Mayo also cited the new Constitution of Missouri, formed after the war had closed, as another example, and said:—

"Just what the people of the State of Missouri did will the people of the United States finally do. They will plant in their great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation's dependence on Almighty God, and its duty to conform to the laws of religious or Christian morality."

Here is a plain argument that the Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri contain and mean all that the religiously amended Constitution of the United States will mean; that the Constitution of Ohio "substantially includes every idea" that the National Reform Association proposes to place in "the national charter;" that the Constitution of Ohio embraces "all there is in this [National Reform] thing." Very well, be it so. From this it follows that in the State of Ohio, under that Constitution, there should be found a condition of government and society such as is expected to be formed in the whole nation by the Religious Amendment to the National Constitution. That is the theory; how stands the fact?

The Constitution of Ohio declares that "religion is essential to good government," and *that* "means just what this proposed [National Reform] amendment means." Now how much more religion, or how much better government, is there in Ohio than there is in any other State in the Union? How much purer is politics in Ohio than it is anywhere else? Let the late elections in the State testify.

The Constitution of Ohio means just what the Religious Amendment means; and under this proposed amendment the National Reform party insists that our rulers must be "Christian men;" if not actually church members, they must be "men who believe in Christianity" (*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 8, 1877). How does this work under the Ohio Constitution? Why, in 1883 Hon. George Hoadly, *an avowed infidel*, was elected governor. And under the title of "An infidel Elected Governor," the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, Nov. 1, 1883, said"—

"By a decision of the popular will, Mr. Hoadly, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion, is governor-elect of the great State of Ohio. His record on this point is unmistakable, not merely in that he was counsel against the Bible in the schools, for a professed Christian like Stanley Matthews stood with him in that effort, but in that he has been for years one of the vice-presidents of the Free Religious Association. He is well known also to favor the programme of the Liberals as to the complete secularization of the State by the abolition of all vestiges of Christian usages from the administration of government. The Christian people of Ohio, therefore, believers in the supreme authority of the Christian

religion, are to have for their chief magistrate a man who denies that the Christian religion is revealed from God, and who looks elsewhere for the grounds of moral obligation."

The Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri mean, on this subject, just what the Religious Amendment means; and one of the chief, avowed purposes of the Religious Amendment is to secure forever the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the nation. Now, at the very time when Dr. Mayo uttered these words in Cincinnati, there was then pending in the courts of the State of Ohio this very question of the Bible in the schools. The case went to the Supreme Court of the State. And under that Constitution which they say means just what the proposed National Amendment means, the Supreme Court affirmed *the legality* of the Cincinnati School Board, *prohibiting prayer and the reading of the Scriptures* in the public

29

schools. In St. Louis, also, under their model Missouri Constitution, the Bible has been excluded from the schools. We might thus go through the whole list of subjects which they make prominent in the work; but these are enough to expose the sophistry of the National Reform advocates.

Therefore, if it be true that, on the subject of religion, the Constitution of Ohio means just what the proposed Religious Amendment to the National Constitution means; if in that there is "all there is in this," then it is positively proven that when they shall have secured their Religious Amendment to the United States Constitution, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion," a man who is "well known to favor the abolition of *all vestiges* of Christian usages from the administration of government,"—in short, a man who is opposed to every principle which they advocate, may be president of the great nation of the United States. Under their religiously amended Constitution, the Bible may be excluded from all the schools in the land. Then, too, politics may be just as corrupt everywhere as they are now in Ohio. Where, then, will there be any practical difference between the workings of government under the amended Constitution, and those workings under the Constitution as it now is? None at all. If then they mean what they said at Cincinnati, where lies the efficacy of their movement? Ah! there is the point; they do not mean at all what they said by Mr. May, at Cincinnati. They know that the Ohio Constitution does *not* substantially include every idea which they propose to place in the national charter. They know that that is

not "all there is in this thing." Says the *Christian Statesman* of November 1, 1883:—

"An acknowledgment of God does not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience, nor fix a single law requiring obedience. We have it in our State Constitutions, and it has little or no force. It would be complimentary, but not itself binding. . . . But we *do not stop here*. This is simply the foundation for an imposing structure. These principles are only premises, the conclusion is yet to come, and it has this dangerous character of the syllogism, that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

And what is the conclusion? This:—

"That such changes with respect to the oath of office, 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.—*Memorial to Congress, in 1864.*

Exactly; and one of the very first changes that will have to be introduced into the body of the Constitution to *give effect* to the Christianized preamble, will be to so alter the First Amendment that Congress shall make laws establishing religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and the Sixth Article will have to be changed so that religious tests shall be required as qualification for office.

But in the almost endless discussion that will necessarily arise in regard to the changes with respect to the oath and *all other matters*, where shall the final decisions be made upon what changes shall, or shall not be made? By what shall these questions be tested? That is easily enough discovered; here is the wonderful touchstone that is to detect all false legislation and prove the true.

"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 decisions* 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.*'"

Again:—

"We will not *allow* the *civil Government* to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."—*Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884.*

To be sure, the united churches are "Zion;" "the law shall go forth of Zion;" "the *final decisions* will be developed there," and "We *will not*

allow the civil Government" to do this or that. And when the churches as one body, under the title of the National Reform Association, shall have reached that place where they can say in the plenitude of their power, "We will not allow the civil Government" to do so and so, there will be no single element lacking to the perfect union of Church and State. However often they may declare by word that their movement does not contemplate such a union, all their affirmations and re-affirmations in denial cannot hide the evidence of their works, nor disprove the fact that the National Reform Association affects to render the ecclesiastical "independent of, and superior to, the civil power," in this Government.

A. T. J.

May 1886

"Persecution or Nothing" *The American Sentinel* 1, 5, p. 37.

THE National Reform Party has by resolution affirmed, and even re-affirmed, that their work does not tend in the least degree to a union of Church and State; that it does not threaten the liberty of any people, but that, on the contrary, it will furnish the strongest safeguard to the liberties, both civil and religious, of all citizens; but their actions contradict their words. And not only so, their words contradict themselves. This can be clearly seen by any one who will read the publications of the National Reform Association. The fact of the matter is, that under the National Reformed Constitution there would be no real liberty at all, either civil or religious. The *Christian Statesman* says:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us, the laws of Christian morality."

To *enforce* is to *force*; to constrain; to *compel*; this then, being interpreted, means, force all, compel all,—infidels, atheists, Jews, heathen,—to keep the laws of "Christian morality." Says Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the secretaries of the Association:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

They propose first to force all to keep the laws which they shall establish as being those of Christian morality; then those who will not be forced, will be disfranchised. And then what? Oh, the gradation is easy. Rev. E. B. Graham says:—

"If the opponents of the Bible [that is, the National Reform views 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."

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

"Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

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.

The liberty, then, 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 that the world has ever seen.

And 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. 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 of 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 that, we need have no fears, and, they would not hurt a hair of our heads. But even if we had all 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.

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 cause of their sorest lamentations. But if the law shall be enforced, then there persecution, for compulsory conformity to religious opinions is persecution. So the sum of the matter is this: If the laws which they shall 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.

A. T. J.

June 1886

"Personality of the State" *The American Sentinel* 1, 6 , pp. 44, 45.

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 they use it, their whole scheme is a fallacy. That it will not hold good is certain.

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, 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 itself 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, having each 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 its own, and exercise itself with that religion, but it must exercise itself about everybody else's religion, and must see to it especially that the religion of everybody else is the same as its own.

A State, as pictured by Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., in the Cincinnati Convention, is as follows:—

"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."

But that is not all; they even go so far as to give it a soul! In this same speech Professor Sloane said:—

"'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.'"

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:—

"*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."

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 others, 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.

The Doctor proceeds:—

"A still more practical view of the 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 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?"

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:—

"The nation being a moral person, must have a religion of its own, and exercise itself about religious *affairs*."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 28, 1884, p. 5.

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.

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 Sheridan 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 priest, James Fisk, Jr., 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

45

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.*

There, that 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 companies, gas companies, water companies, steamship companies, gas companies, water companies, publishing companies, lodges, benefit societies, clubs, corporations, and associations of all kinds; and the logic of the whole situation is that each and every 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 other equally absurd inevitably follow, or else there is no truth in syllogism. But if the logic of the thing be so absurd, it only demonstrates the absurdity of the principle.

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, etc., 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:—

"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*."

With that, place the following from Rev. T. C. Sproull in the same convention, speaking to the same resolution as was Dr. McAllister:—

"If the nation if not a moral being, it *cannot be* subject to the law of God."

Accordingly, between the State and the company, we have the following

CONTRAMST

HThe *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, and which is manifestly true, 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 Feb. 7, 1884, pp. 2, 3:—

"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."

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 a 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*"!

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 law; and where there can be no *violation* of law, there can be no *obedience* to law; and where there can 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."

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.

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 Feb. 14, 1885; that is, "adopt a plan that will prevent a repetition" of any such questions.

A. T. J.

July 1886

"National Reform and the Chinese" *The American Sentinel* 1, 7 , pp. 50, 51.

EVER since Congress passed the Chinese Restriction Act, the *Christian Statesman* has been in great tribulation, because of the great wrong committed by the nation in that piece of legislation. Now in this article we propose no discussion of the righteousness or unrighteousness of that act of Congress, or whether it was just or unjust in itself. Our controversy is with the *Christian Statesman*, on its own published propositions, all of which are editorial utterances, and therefore stand as authoritative principles of National Reform.

By act of Congress the importation, or emigration, of Chinese laborers was prohibited for a period of ten years. This act the *Christian Statesman* denounced at the time. In its issue of Sept. 25, 1884, among "the gravest of moral evils, evils which threaten the very life of the nation," "*injustice to the Chinese*" is named. In its issue of Oct. 23, 1884, it says that "the un-christian Chinese policy of the two great parties is part of the indictment which the better conscience of the country is charging upon them." Again, in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, we read:—

"The two leading political parties have vied with each other in displaying their readiness to exclude the Chinamen from our shores, and have declared for the policy of exclusion, in their respective platforms. This policy, on the other hand, is felt by large numbers of Christian men to be *in violation of the natural rights of men*, as well as *contrary to the spirit and teachings of the religion of Jesus*, and increases the dissatisfaction with which, on other grounds, these parties and their platforms are regarded."

But what do the *Statesman* and the National Reform Party propose instead of this? We read:—

"We may not shut the door in the face of any one who wishes to come and dwell with us. No nation has the right to do this, even for the preservation of religious character." "Make all men welcome to our shores, but 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.*"

Let us analyze this position and see wherein it differs from the position of the political parties which it condemns. By the term "laws of Christian morality," the *Statesman* means the ten commandments. With this definition then it says, "Enforce upon all that comes among us the ten commandments." Now "enforce," according to Webster, means "to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor." Therefore the *Statesman* says: "*Force, compel*, all that come among us to keep the ten commandments." "*Execute with vigor* the ten commandments upon all that come among us." But the second commandment forbids men to make, to bow down to, or to serve, graven images; and this bears with particular force against the Chinese, for they do make and worship graven images; so that it may fairly be said that of all the Chinese who should ever desire to come to this country, they would be, without exception, idolaters. Now when, by constitutional amendment, this shall have been declared a Christian nation, and notice shall have thus been given that all who come here will be compelled to keep the ten commandments, will that be a sufficient argument to induce the Chinese to abandon their idols that they may come here? Allowing all the wondrous efficacy that has been ascribed to National Reform, such could hardly be expected of it, for the Chinese are just as sincere in their worship, idolatrous as it is, as are the National Reformers in theirs; and it certainly will require something more than an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to convince them that their worship is wrong. So it is easy enough to tell what the Chinese will do when the time comes that they shall have to choose whether they will abandon their worship or come to the United States. With such an alternative, they will never come to this country. Therefore the success of the National Reform policy will just as absolutely exclude the Chinese from this country as does the act of Congress which is now in force, and which is so unsparingly denounced by that party.

Now to show that the force that is given to their expressions, by the definitions before given, is not more than they intend, we give

some more of their words on this subject. In the San Francisco *Chronicle* of September 24, 1884, appeared an account of a Chinese procession in that city, in honor of their god How Wong in the *Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1884, under the caption, "Idolatry Publicly Tolerated," the account is copied in full, and then commented on as follows:—

"The remedy lies, not in the exclusion of the Chinese from our shores, where they have from God a perfect right to come, but in the legal prohibition of their public idolatry, which they have from God no right to practice, and which *no Christian Government ought to tolerate* on its soil." "Odious it is, offensive to Christian sen-

51

sibilities, provoking the anger of Heaven against the nation which tolerates it. But . . . the American people generally would doubtless be shocked by the suggestion that such open idolatry *should be suppressed by law*. But if this is, as claimed, a Christian nation, and if Jehovah is our God, why should the suggestion be considered as strange or impracticable?"

It is plain, therefore, by their own declarations, that the Chinese cannot come to this country and bring their worship with them, and that, as we have seen, works the exclusion of the Chinese as effectually as any other means that could be employed. And all this must be done, the *Statesman* says, to "maintain our Christian character;" and this, too, after stating explicitly, as above, that "no nation has the right to do this even for the preservation of religious character." The *Statesman* may talk of the servility of political parties all it pleases, but if there ever was a political party that exceeded the National Reform Party in hollow pretense, or sham principle, we should like the *Statesman* to point it out.

There is another phase of this question. Suppose that while the United States refuses to "tolerate" the worship of the Chinese, they should refuse to "tolerate," in their country, the worship of the Christians. Suppose that when this nation has "suppressed by law" worship of the of the Chinese, they should retaliate and suppress by law the worship of the Christians. What could this nation do? Remonstrance would come with very poor grace from the nation that first committed the intolerance. And so the sword of National Reform would cut both ways; it would not only shut the Chinese out of this country, but would shut Christianity out of China.

Now let us draw a comparison between the action of Congress which the *Statesman* condemns, and the action of the nation which it would approve.

IT CONDEMNNS

An act of Congress which excludes the Chinese.

An act which excludes the Chinese for *ten years*.

An act of Congress which might be repeated by any subsequent Congress.

An act which excludes only one class of Chinese— laborers.

An act which excludes only one class of one nation for ten years.

IT APPROVES

An Amendment to the Constitution, the effect of which will be the same.

An act which would exclude them for *all time*.

An act, the effect of which would be the same, and which could not possibly be effected by less than three-fourths of the whole nation.

An act which will exclude all classes of Chinese but one—Christian Chinese.

An act which, with one exception—Christians—excludes *all* classes of *all* nations for *all time*.

Therefore if the action of Congress and the political parties are by the National Reform Party to be condemned seven times, surely the National Reform Party itself must be condemned seventy times seven.

A. T. J.

"The National Reform Movement an Absurdity" *The American Sentinel* 1, 7 , pp. 53, 54.

IN the discussion of the National Reform theory of the personality of the State, in our June issue, we showed conclusively that the theory is absurd; and that in the endeavor to escape the absurd consequences of their position, the National Reform Party resort to a fallacy which involves them in the inconsistency of holding beings subject to that to which, according to the theory, they cannot be subject. But we say again that we see no ground for hope that that party will ever abandon either the fallacy or the absurdity. For, as the theory is absurd, and as they affirm that the theory is fundamental to this whole movement, it is evident that absurdity is inherent in the whole National Reform system. That is not only the logic of the question, but it is strictly in accordance with all the facts in the case.

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. Doctor Sloane in a speech on this subject in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, instanced the fact that "Great Britain, France, Italy, and

our own country own 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, own 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, 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.

Does the National Reform Party mean to say that, when it gets its iniquity framed by 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 argument 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.

Again, Prof. O. N. Stoddard, in the Cincinnati Convention, said:—

"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."

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.

Webster defines a State to be:—

"A political body, or *body politic*; *the whole body of people* united under one Government."

Chief Justice Chase defined a State as follows:—

"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.

Bouvier says that a State is,—

"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*.

A body-politic is:—

54

"The collective body of a nation or State, as politically organized, or as exercising political functions; also a corporation."—*Webster*.

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 I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit *them*." Jer. 18:7-10.

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.

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." Jer. 50:35-37; 51:35.

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 relation to God, are righteous. When God exclaimed, "Ah, sinful nation"! it was because the *people* were "laden with iniquity." Isa. 1:4.

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.

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:—

"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 'person.' . . . 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 Corporations*.

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?

Professor Pomeroy, the eminent law writer, says:—

"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*."

To predicate 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.

And that all may understand precisely what this demonstration amounts to, we append Webster's unabridged definition of an absurdity:—

"ABSURDITY—The quality of being absurd or inconsistent with obvious truth, reason, or sound judgment." "ABSURD—Opposed to manifest truth; inconsistent with reason or the plain dictates of common sense; logically contradictory."

That is what we mean in this connection, and that is exactly what the National Reform movement is.

A. T. J.

August 1886

**"The Golden Opportunity of National Reform" *The American Sentinel*
1, 8 , pp. 58, 59.**

THERE is a glorious field open and white already to the harvest of National Reform. There is a tree whose fruit is so lusciously ripe for National Reform, that the tree needs but to be shaken for the fruit to fall into the mouth of the National Reform eater; and we urgently call the attention of the *Christian Statesman* to it, and through it the attention of all the National Reformers.

Rev. J. H. Pettee, of Okayama, Japan, reports in the May number of the *Missionary Herald* that Japan is so amazingly eager to become a Christian nation, that there is danger that she will adopt "some low, loose type of Christianity," and that "in a mere formal way." He says there is danger that she may adopt the Roman Catholic, or the Russo-Greek form of Christianity, because "Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, or other Protestant denominations will not, or cannot offer her a short road to" her longed-for goal—the name and place of a Christian nation. Now the National Reform Party furnishes just the short cut to the place of a Christian nation, which Japan in her heathen blindness is groping about to find. The National Reform Party, we believe, owns the right of way to this road which now Japan so long has sought, and mourned because she found it not. How can the National Reformers sit still, and lend no helping hand to poor, pleading Japan? We do not

wish to interfere in any way with the internal workings of that Party, but if we might be allowed the privilege of making a suggestion, we would recommend that Rev. E. B. Graham and Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., be sent at once as National Reform missionaries to conduct Japan along the National-Reform short-cut to the place where she may stand before the world a Christian nation. here is an opportunity for them to fairly rival St. Francis Xavier or Gregory Thaumaturgus.

We would advise them that, for the success of their particular movement in this case, delay is dangerous; for Mr. Pettee reports that "the most progressive secular paper in the sunrise

59

kingdom" has already "openly advocated baptizing the emperor and a few of the nobles, that Japan may be considered a Christian nation." It declares, "Christian blue is the fashionable color, and not Buddhist brown; therefore let us put on a blue coat." So if the National Reform Party would have the glory of starting Japan in the race of Christian nations, it is essential that its missionaries be sent speedily.

Let not our readers suppose for an instant that Mr. Pettee asks for any such thing as the National Reform movement would supply, or that he would indorse it. He has too much respect for Christianity for that. He rightly gives this subject the title of "A New Peril in Japan;" and declares in words of solid truth, "The last thing a true Christian desires to see in Japan is, Christianity proclaimed the State religion." So say we, in Japan or in any other country; least of all in our own. But that is exactly what the National Reform Party proposes to establish in this country, and aims to create here the identical condition of affairs as that into which Japan is about to plunge. And were its purpose accomplished, that would be the darkest day that Christianity has ever seen in America.

A. T. J.

"National Reformed Presbyterianism" *The American Sentinel* 1, 8 , pp. 60, 61.

AT its recent session at Rochester, New York, the Reformed Presbyterian Synod adopted a memorial to Congress, urging upon that body the necessity of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, advocated by the National Reform Party. The memorial "is to be signed by all adult members of the church both male and female, and laid before the National Legislature." We have not space

to print the memorial entire; suffice it to say that it presents the usual National Reform complaints about the present Constitution having in it "no acknowledgment of God nor of the moral laws of his Government;" that this "encourages the false doctrine that civil government has no moral nor religious duties to perform;" that the refusal of this nation to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as king, and to accept his law, "involves the Nation in unspeakable guilt and exposes us to the chastising and destroying judgments of God," etc., etc., and closes with these words:—

"That we who present this petition are unable, for these reasons, to accept the Constitution as a right fundamental law for the nation, and are, therefore, debarred on conscientious grounds from participation in the Government. We can neither take office under it ourselves, nor by voting for others, lay this Constitution upon them as the rule of their official conduct.

"We pray you, therefore, to propose such an amendment to the National Constitution as shall suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority in national affairs, and so place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

It will be seen at once that this is a regular National Reform document. Indeed, the National Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics. The first step that was ever taken, the first paper that was ever presented in behalf of the National Reform movement, was by a Reformed Presbyterian, Mr. John Alexander, of Philadelphia. The leading, active workers in National Reform, called District Secretaries, are, with two exceptions, Reformed Presbyterians. Rev. W. J. Coleman, Rev. M. A. Gault, Rev. R. C.

61

Wylie, Rev. J. M. Foster, and Rev. N. M. Johnston, with Rev. D. McAllister and Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editors of the *Christian Statesman*, are all Reformed Presbyterians. The other two District Secretaries, Rev. J. H. Leiper and Rev. Wm. Weir, are professedly United Presbyterians, but in advocating the National Reform they clearly violate the United Presbyterian creed, and stand as avowed Reformed Presbyterians. All the arguments for National Reform are Reformed Presbyterian arguments; all the principles are Reformed Presbyterian principles. We repeat, therefore, that the National

Reform movement is nothing else than Reformed Presbyterianism in politics.

That this is the truth will be plainly apparent to any one who is acquainted with the two bodies; and the more closely the subject is studied, the more evident this truth will appear. We have room here for only a few points in proof. A catechism of the distinctive features of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, by William L. Roberts, D.D. in presenting the supposed claims of Christ as king in the civil affairs of nations, and the duties of nations to acknowledge him as civil ruler, declares this to be "*a peculiar principle* of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the *grand doctrine* of their Testimony." And "their Testimony" condemns as an error, the statement, "That there is any creature *or institution* which is not subject to Christ, *for the good of his church.*"

In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Rev. J. R. W. Sloane says of the Reformed Presbyterians:—

"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 those 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."

The report on National Reform in the late Synod referred to above, says:—

"It is ours to hold up the ideals of God *which have originated* the National Reform cause."

In the *Reformed Presbyterian* for January, 1870, James Wallace says:—

"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 Reformed Presbyterian Church* adopted into the Constitution of the United States, and *annulling any parts of that Constitution* that may be inconsistent with these principles."

Again he says:—

"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."

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.

According to these principles, what is the duty of the State? Rev. J. M. Foster tells us:—

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

Now take even the phenomenal definition given by the National Reform Party itself, as to what constitutes a union of Church and

State, *i.e.*, "the selection of one church, *the endowment of such a church*, the appointment of its officers, and *the oversight of its doctrines*," and if this Reformed Presbyterian National Reform scheme does not sufficiently meet the definition, then nothing can; and if such would not be a union of Church and State, then there has never been any such union in this world.

And yet, knowing that the principles of National Reform are the peculiar principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; knowing that the distinctive point of their attack—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 Presbyterians 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!

A. T. J.

September 1886

"Significant Facts" *The American Sentinel* 1, 9 , p. 67.

THE *Christian Statesman* reports that the Church of the United Brethren has put a National Reform preacher into the field, Rev. R. Rock by name, and will support him; and that a preacher, Rev. J. P. Mills by name, from the Methodist Episcopal Church, will enter upon the National Reform work, on the same terms, about Sept. 1, 1886.

The late General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, by its Committee on National Reform, expressed its gratification "to learn that the presentation of the Christian theory of civil government by the advocates of National Reform, is educating the people to recognize that civil government is an ordinance of God; . . . that Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, is . . . the Ruler of nations, and has laid down in his word the fundamental enactments by which the enactments of our civil code are to be tested; and that *this word ought to be recognized as the fundamental law of the Nation*, and be incorporated

into its very Constitution." It regards "the continued advocacy of this Reform as imperatively necessary;" and by resolution commends "to the generous financial support of our people the secretaries and advocates of this movement."

The Ocean Grove Assembly set apart Wednesday, July 21, as National Reform Day, which, say the *Statesman*, "will afford a fine audience of the best people, without effort or cost on the part of the friends of the cause." Likewise the Chautauqua Assembly management granted the morning and afternoon sessions of Friday, July 23, to National Reform. This the *Statesman* correctly called "another magnificent opportunity for the presentation of the principles of the National Reform Association."

Nor is this all. For more than a year the National Reform party has been specially and assiduously courting the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and it has succeeded in so far rhyiming itself into these ladies' favor that we are quite certain it will never reason itself out again. Joint conventions are now being held by the two bodies, and we see their vital union virtually consummated. Already in their joint convention held at Canonsburg, Pa., May 19, an address of welcome was delivered "by Mrs. Rev. J. F. Hill, in which *the oneness of the two organizations* was very ably set forth." Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. West, and Mrs. Hoffman, are all Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association. Mrs. Woodbridge made a straight-out National Reform speech both at Ocean Grove and at Chautauqua, on the occasions referred to above.

Besides this Mrs. Woodbridge was appointed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to carry to the Cleveland Convention of the Knights of Labor, last May, "the salutations of the Union, and a brief argument in behalf of the cause of temperance"; but the lady allowed her National Reform zeal to carry her beyond her appointed mission and she closed her speech to the Assembly with these words:—

"Thus would the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union join hands with the Knights of Labor in placing this 'Government upon the shoulders of Him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' and in crowning Christ, our Lord, as the Ruler of nations."

This the *Christian Statesman* pronounces a "cause for rejoicing," and "an especial gratification to the friends of National Reform."—See *Statesman June 8, 1886*.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done noble work, in which we have rejoiced and should ever rejoice, while she kept in the line of her legitimate and chartered work. But just as soon as she proposes to sell herself to work the iniquity of lifting the National Reform party into power in its union of Church and State, and the establishment of its hierarchy in this country, then we are prepared to write of her, "The glory is departed."

The Prohibition Party also is coming up to the work. The New Jersey Prohibition Convention, and that of Washington County, Pa., adopted resolutions which the *Statesman* says read like the resolutions of a National Reform Convention. The Maine Prohibitionists declare that "we aim, in a word, at the application of Christian principles to political life. . . . The application of Christian principles to politics would secure an equal voice, without regard to sex, in making laws which all must alike obey." The Illinois platform declares that, "We reverently recognize the supreme authority of Almighty God. . . . We regard the Christian Sabbath as a boon so valuable to humanity, that the State cannot be true to its trusts which neglects to guard it from desecration."

The Reformed Presbyterian Church, which from the beginning has borne the National Reform party upon her sides and dandled it upon her knees, contributed to the work last year "almost \$7,000;" and at its late Synod, held at Rochester, New York, it recommended "that the sum of \$10,000 be raised for the treasury of the National Reform Association, by the churches under the care of this Synod," the coming year.

Besides all these distinct organizations, the churches, as such, almost all favor it; and the National Reformers are willing, if not anxious, to make advances even to the Catholic Church to gain her favor—and they will get it. Now we say: With the general breaking up of parties, and the casting about for new issues upon which to catch the votes of the multitude, let this movement be agitated for but a very few years at most, and then brought to a vote upon some one leading question under which can be veiled the real issue, and we should like to see the one who can show what is to hinder the success of the National Reform movement, and in that the union of Church and State with all that that involves as the ultimate result.

In view of these facts, which simply show the fast-growing power, and the wide-spreading influence of the National Reform movement, we submit to any candid mind whether the AMERICAN SENTINEL has not a mission, in its determined opposition to that movement. Do we not well to expose the fallacies, to lay bare the sophistries, and to

uncover the insidious iniquity of this scheme of Church and State? Do we not well to call the attention of the American people to this menace to human liberty and human right? We know precisely what it is about which we are talking. We know exactly what we are doing. But we very much fear that the American people will not realize till it is too late, the danger that lies in the National Reform movement. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but Americans have forgotten it. May God help the people to awake and be vigilant.

A. T. J.

"The Principles of National Reform" *The American Sentinel* 1, 9 , pp. 69, 70.

IN our August number we showed by indubitable proofs that the National Reform movement is nothing but an effort to place this Government on a foundation of Reformed Presbyterianism, and to subject it to the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. We showed in their own words that, "National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the Nation."

Now the Reformed Presbyterian Church 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. Therefore by studying 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. We have not space for one-twentieth, no not one-one-hundredth, part of the evidence that might easily be given in illustration of the "practical application" of these principles. Our quotations must be few and brief. 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 Nov. 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." It is the principles rather than their application which we shall here discuss; for in reading these it can readily enough be seen what their application would be in the hands of the National Reformers, when clothed with power to make the application.

The Covenants which embody the principles of the Covenanters, and, per force, 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, approved 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 1650 and 1651, as being, along with the Solemn League and Covenant; the one prime and only condition of their restoring him to power."

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

"... do condemn all erroneous books and write concerning erroneous doctrine against the religion presently professed, or containing superstitious rites and ceremonies papistical, . . . and ordains the home-bringers of them to be punished . . . and ordains the users of them to be punished for the second fault as idolaters."

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:—

"None provoking the people to idolatrie oght to be exempted from the punishment of death. . . . The whole tribes did in verie dede execute that sharp judgement against the tribe of Benjamin for a lesse offense than for idolatrie. And the same oght to be done wheresoever Christ Jesus and his Evangil [Gospel] is so receaved 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." —See *"Knox's Works, Laing's edition, vol. IV., pp.*

600ñ515;" or *Lecky's History of Rationalism,*" vol. II., pp. 50, 51, note 6.

For the protection of the religion "presently professed" the Covenant further declares of it:—

"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."

Again the Covenant declares that it is the duty of the magistrates to—

"Maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus."—"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."

So much for the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith;" but by this may be understood the National Reform declaration that the duty of the Nation is, "an acknowledgment and exemplification of the duty of national Covenanting with" God.

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."—*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:—

70

"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."

As to how that should be done the following will show. 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:—

"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."

The way in which it was to be enjoined, was this:—

"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*."

In compliance with these humble supplications the Edinburgh 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*."

"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 *rÈgime*, was not one whit behind.

Under the "Solemn League and Covenant," the Presbyterian Parliament of England dealt "the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received."

"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; any one denying the obligation of observing the Lord's day, or asserting 'that the church government by presbytery is anti-Christian 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.*

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 received 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:—

"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.*

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.

"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. 18, par. 63.

As the acts of settlement adopted under William, and the oaths taken by him, not only failed to adopt and enforce the Covenant, but were in express contradiction to it, the Covenanters, "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 the 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. 64.*

The Covenanters then standing as dissenters from the church and the Government that would not adopt the Covenant, and as the sole defenders of the doctrines of the Covenants adopted the name of "Reformed Presbyterians." Thus the Covenanters are the Reformed Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterianism is National Reform. 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 "National Reform is simply the practical application" of these principles "for the reformation of the Nation." These are the literal, solid facts in the case, and we ask the American people whether they are ready just yet to be "reformed" by "the practical application" of such principles?

A. T. J.

October 1886

"A Political Gospel" *The American Sentinel* 1, 10 , pp. 74, 75.

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

"Shall we not amend our National Constitution, that the world shall know that we acknowledge Christ as Ruler? as the Head of our Nation? and in his name, and for his glory, shall not 'We, the

people, in order to form a more perfect union,' thus 'ordain'? While we render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, shall we not render unto God the things that are God's?"

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

In these words Christ established a clear dis-

75

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

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

his business. And when he seeks to make it his business he is meddling with that which in no wise concerns him. One of the unbecoming and irreverent results of such action is well expressed by Gibbon, in speaking of Constantine and his sons:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

"An amendment to the National Constitution requires the endorsement of two-thirds of the States, to become law. Although the action must be taken by State Legislative bodies, let such an amendment be submitted, and it would become the paramount issue at the election of legislators, and thus God would be in the thought, and his name upon the lip of every man. May not this be the way opened to us? How to bring the gospel of Christ to the masses, has been, and is, the vexing problem of the church. Would not the problem be solved? . . . In considering the submission of such an amendment, we may use the very argument used by Moses, in his song containing these words of Jehovah, 'For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life: and through this thing ye

shall prolong your days in the land.' How prayerfulness would be stimulated! Conscience would press the words, 'If the Lord be God, follow him, but if Baal, then follow him.' Then would there be searchings of heart, as David's, of which we learn in the fifty-first Psalm. Prayer would bring faith and the power of the Spirit: and when such power shall rest upon the children of God, there *will* be added to the church daily such as shall be saved."

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

But the illustrations are hardly needed to show how entirely foreign to the gospel of Christ are such propositions and such arguments as we here present from the Chautauqua National Reform Speech.

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

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

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

A. T. J.

"A Precursor of National Reform" *The American Sentinel* 1, 10 , pp. 77, 78.

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

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

"Elder R. M. Kilgore (Seventh-day Baptist) is thus reported in the *Inter Ocean*, July 19: 'What is the significance of the National Reform movement which is agitating our country from center to circumference? What is the aim of this great party? It is to unite Church and State. It is to change our Constitution so as to restrict the rights of conscience.' And further on: 'Already persecution has

broken out in Arkansas, Tennessee and Pennsylvania, and those who worship God according to the teachings of God's word are suffering under this [Sabbath] law.'

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

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

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

"EDITOR *Christian Cynosure*: In your issue of

78

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

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

"We are Seventh-day Adventists not Seventh-day Baptists, and as I am now on the ground where our brethren are feeling the

effects of this bitter spirit of persecution, I am glad to give you and your readers the desired information.

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

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

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

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

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

If it be true, as the *Cynosure* says, that this persecution is "abhorrent" to President Brunot, the editor of the *Cynosure* and the one hundred or more other vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, then it is high time for them to take their names from the list of officers, and separate themselves from the work, of that Association. To force all people in these United States, without any distinction at all, to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, is the purpose of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution and the laws

that shall be enacted under it. And that is simply to make possible in all this Nation the enactment of such scenes as these which have been enacted in Arkansas. That President Brunot and his associate officers in that association would abhor such persecution, does not help the matter a particle. They are doing their very best to establish a system of government and laws under which it will be possible for such persecution to be inflicted by those who do not abhor it, but who on the contrary are bigoted and fanatical enough to enjoy it.

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

Again we say, It is true that nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than is such persecution. But it is the purpose of the National Reform party to subvert the Constitution so that such

persecution shall become national. And that is why we abhor the principles and the work of the National Reform Association. And they ought to be abhorred by all men who love liberty and human right.

A. T. J.

November 1886

"The Principles of National Reform and of the Turk" *The American Sentinel* 1, 11 , pp. 83, 84.

REV. JUNIUS H. SEELYE, D. D., is President of Amherst College, one of the leading scholars and educators of the United States, and a Vice-President of the National Reform Association. In a late number of the *Forum* he discussed the question, "Should the State Teach Religion?" in which he presented the following as sound doctrine on that question:—

"Religion is not an *end* to the State. It is simply a *means* to the advancement of the State, and is to be used like any other means. To the individual person the sole question about a religion is, whether it is true; but the State only inquires whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming. From this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and religious intolerance. What kind of a religion it should employ, and how far it should carry religious instruction in its schools, is a grave question of statesmanship, respecting which Governments may very easily make mistakes—very grave mistakes. . . . But the greatest mistake any Government is likely to commit respecting religious instruction is to have none. And faith for a people is better than no faith. What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters; and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*. . . . If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and, if it is wise, it will not falter."

If a State is to adopt a religion at all, it is impossible to see how it could adopt any but the religion of the majority. Because, mark: the rule, the State is not to inquire whether the religion is true, but only, "whether it is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." Religion therefore being to the State a mere matter of policy, the religion adopted by the State must be the religion of the majority. And in that case the State is brought to the inevitable alternative, either to change its religion with every change of the majority, or else to exert

its power to keep the religion which it has adopted, the religion of the majority. Where-

84

fore it is a most curiously interesting problem to know just how that "from this point of view the State is equally preserved from religious indifference and from religious intolerance"? And further, if this rule be such a safe preservative, how happens it that of all the States that have been on this earth, that have acted upon the Professor's theory, not one has been preserved from religious intolerance?

The fact is, that under this theory, preservation from religious intolerance is impossible. The impossibility is inherent in the theory. Of this no better proof is needed than is furnished in President Seelye's own words. He says, "To the individual person *the sole question* about a religion is whether it is true;" this is very properly said as to the individual, but to the State, whether a religion is true or not does not enter into the case. With the State the sole question concerning a religion is, Can it be used? Is it politic to adopt it? This at once sets the more *policy* of the State against the *conscience* of the individual, and this too upon the very point, and the only point, where conscience or principle is or can be involved. With the State the question is not one of conscience nor of principle, but of policy solely; while with the individual the question is solely one of conscience, and of principle. And when the State goes about to set itself thus against the individual upon a question, about the truth of which it is not to inquire at all but which is to be the solo inquiry of the individual, then says Mr. Seelye:—

"What faith shall be employed, and in what way, are points respecting which wise statesmanship will direct, as it does in other matters, and wise statesmanship will keep in view here as elsewhere the maxim, *the law cares not for the few*.

And then, as though to prevent all possibility of a misunderstanding of his doctrine, he adds:—

"If the conscience of the subjects approve, well; if not, the State will be cautious, but courageous also; and if it is wise, it will not falter."

Was ever persecution or oppression for conscience' sake more plainly argued or more coolly stated?

But there is no better way of putting a theory to the test than to see it in actual practice, and this theory is now in practice in Turkey; not to the perfection, however, that it would be in this country if the National Reform party should succeed; but all it lacks is the energy of the

officials whose duty it is to enforce the law. In the *New York Independent* of September 2, 1886, is a clear account of the "Turkish policy toward the Christian schools" in which we find the following practical illustration of Professor Seelye's theory:—

"It has enforced upon its Christian subjects the tax for the support of public schools, and it has opened a great number of primary and high schools for Moslems in all parts of the empire. But it has not opened a single school for Christians as provided by the law, so that the funds raised from the Christians, by taxation, go to the support of the Moslem schools of the empire. If a Christian wishes to send his children to one of the Government primary schools, he finds that the course of study consists mainly of the Koran and the biography of Mohammed; or, in case of a high school, he finds in addition to these some elementary sciences and a little history, carefully emasculated to avoid any impression on the mind of the pupil, that there is or can be any country in the world so glorious, or so peaceful and generally happy, as the empire of Turkey. He finds also that his children must give up the study of their own native language, and must be content to study Turkish and Arabic. If, with these drawbacks, he still wishes to profit by the schools which are supported by his taxes, he finds that, except in two or three of the largest cities, no Christian will be allowed to study in a Moslem primary or high school, because the Moslems feel that it is wrong for infidels to read so holy a work as the Koran, which is the chief text-book in these schools."

Now we should like for President Seelye, in accordance with his theory, to point out any wrong in this action of the Government of Turkey. In the Government of Turkey the Koran embodies the religion which it has settled as the one which "is adapted to the end at which the State is aiming." The Christians are taxed for the support and propagation of that religion. And if children of the Christian are to receive any benefit from the taxes which he is forced to pay, they must receive it from the Koran in the schools where the Koran and its religion is taught. Now the conscience of no Christian subject, there nor anywhere else, will approve of such a system in Turkey thus enforced upon Christians. But the State of Turkey is "courageous," it does not "falter," and therefore upon Mr. Seelye's theory it must be "wise." If the few Christians there, or anywhere in behalf of those who are there, lift up their voices against this practice, then the Turkish Government may say in Mr. Seelye's own words, "We keep in view here the maxim, *de minimis non curat lex*." And what reply can be made by Mr. Seelye or those who favor the National Reform movement in this country?

Now, if this theory is wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? But the practical working of this theory is precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to establish in this country. Are the Americans ready for it? To what is this country coming when such monstrous doctrines are so plainly avowed by such men as Professor Seelye? Is America ready to copy after the "unspeakable Turk"?

A. T. J.

"Some Features of the Reformed Constitution" *The American Sentinel* 1, 11 , pp. 84, 85.

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 every one, and will do so more and more, as the National Reform party grows in influence and power. In this matter of reforming the Constitution, and thereby the nation, these National Reformers begin with the Preamble. At the first National Convention ever held by the National Reformers—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:—

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."

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:—

"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."

To present some of these changes, which will be necessary to make the body of the Constitution conform to the reformed Preamble, is the purpose of this article. 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 in the Government must be Christians. Therefore Section 1 of Article X1V of Amendments to the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read thus:—

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.

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:—

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.

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

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.

In relation to the President, Section 1, Article II, will have to read about as follows:—

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.

In the matter of the oath this same Section will have to be reformed so as to read something like this:—

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.

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:—

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;"*

86

AND THE TEST OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION SHALL be required as a qualification to every office or public trust under the United States.

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

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.

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. In the

Christian Statesman February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan writes on this subject, as follows:—

"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."

But that the National Reformers *expect* such a condition of affairs as this, is not all. They are 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:—

"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.'"

Exactly! the churches are "Zion," and "the law shall go forth of Zion." Therefore in the national canvass of "the whole frame-work 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:—

"There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy, than the leaders and teachers in our churches."

In connection with these words 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." Prov. 27:2. "For men to search their own glory is not glory." Prov. 25:27. "Not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom

the Lord commendeth." 2 Cor. 10:18. 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 in 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."

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 according to the dictates of his own conscience, but all must worship (?) according to the dictates of the hierarchy.

Then when these "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:—

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."

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."

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. We do not say that the work is at all complete, but this is all that we have space to present at this time. We have not forced a single point, for every change which we have marked, we can sustain by the writings of the National Reformers themselves. We have simply presented the logic of the National Reform propositions. If the National Reformers object to our conclusions, they will have to lay propositions. If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask them to wait till the next issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, when we promise, if the Lord will, to present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt. A. T. J.

December 1886

"Infidel Views of the 'Logic of Christianity'" *The American Sentinel* 1, 12, pp. 90, 91.

THE following letter was received at this office September 29. As the SENTINEL aims to do full justice to National Reform, we insert the letter entire.

SPARTA, Ill., Sept. 20, 1886.

THE SENTINEL EDITORS—*Gents*: I have received several numbers of your journal. I do not intend to become a subscriber. I have met with your best arguments before, in the contest with infidels. When I want to refresh my mind I will send for the Boston

Investigator, or some paper of that class. I would rather have the strong statement of the infidel argument as infidels put it, and not the feeble statement of infidelity as made by Christians. You are in the wrong company. You are fighting your own side of the cause. Abbott, of the *Index*, said in my hearing, "The logic of Christianity is under your movement. If I were a Christian I would be with you, but as I am not, I oppose you with all my might." (I give his words from memory.) In the judgment of most Christians you are on the wrong side; so also in the judgment of honest infidels. Better shinny on your own side. But if not, I prefer to get the Simon-pure infidel arguments against national Christianity. You can add nothing to them, so please stop the paper. I have had samples enough.
Yours respectfully, D. O. FARIS.

Mr. Faris is, of course, a National Reformer, and thinks, even as he says, that we are "in the wrong company." And to prove that we are in the wrong, he quotes Mr. Abbott's statement that "the logic of Christianity" is behind the National Reform movement. The value of Mr. Faris's proof can be better appreciated when it is understood what Mr. Abbott considers the logic of Christianity. According to Mr. Abbott's estimate, then, what is the logic of Christianity? Everybody who is at all acquainted with Mr. Abbott's opinion of Christianity, knows that what he holds to be the logic of Christianity is the destruction of all liberty, cruel oppression, and persistent and bloody persecution. With such a view as this of what the logic of Christianity is, we say that Mr. Abbott is literally correct when he says that the logic of Christianity is behind the National Reform movement. This, all opponents of that movement will realize as surely as the movement shall prove a success.

But the Christianity which Mr. Abbott sees is not the Christianity of Christ, nor that of those who follow Christ: the Christianity which Mr. Abbott sees, in common with Colonel Ingersol, the *Investigator*, and all other of Mr. Faris's "honest infidels," is the Christianity (?) of Romanism, of the Inquisition, of the torture-chamber, of the thumb-screw, the rack, and the stake. Everybody knows that this is the Christianity, and that this is "the logic of Christianity," which these "honest infidels" never weary of holding up before the world. That such is the view that Mr. Abbott holds in relation to what Christianity is, we prove by his own words, in the very speech to which Mr. Faris refers. The speech was made at the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, February 1, 1872. We quote from *the record*. In that speech Mr. Abbott said:—

"The reaction you will create will open the eyes of millions to *the fact that Christianity and freedom are incompatible.*"

With such views of Christianity we do not wonder at all that infidels say that if they believed in Christianity they would take their stand by the side of National Reformers. If we believed that "Christianity and freedom are incompatible," and then believed in Christianity, we should instantly take our stand by the side of Mr. Faris and his fellow "reformers;" for the utter destruction of freedom in free America is the logic of National Reform. Now, if National Reform represents Christianity, then "the logic of Christianity" does lie behind the National Reform movement. If Mr. Faris accepts Mr. Abbott's definition and views of Christianity, he is at perfect liberty to do so, and we freely yield to him and to National Reform all the comfort they can get from such Christianity, and from Mr. Abbott's hypothetical Christian indorsement of the National Reform movement. As for us we accept no such definition, nor any such views, of Christianity nor of the logic of Christianity; and because we do not, but believe in Christianity with all our heart, we oppose National Reform with our might. Nor do we expect to fall into the mistake into which Mr. Abbott seems to have fallen, of confounding Christianity and National Reform.

Further, Mr. Faris kindly informs us that "in the judgment of most Christians" we "are on the wrong side." Mr. Faris may be correct in his estimate of "the judgment of most Christians." But that is nothing to us. We are not trying to shape our course according to the judgment of the multitude, even though that multitude be composed of "most Christians," that would be contrary to the principles of both the Bible and sound journalism. "The judgment of most Christians" is not the final judgment. Our sole endeavor in all our work and in all our ways, is to so conform to the word of God that we may at the last receive the approval of the judgment of God. Besides this, we know full well that "in the judgment of most Christians," William Lloyd Garrison was "on the wrong side" when he declared that slavery was wrong and should be abolished. "In the judgment of most Christians" John Wesley was on the wrong side. "In the judgment of most Christians" Martin Luther was on the wrong side. "In the judgment of most Christians" of the popular and powerful religionists of the day, the apostles of Christ were on the wrong side, and were commanded "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right *in the sight of*

God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." And so say we to Mr. Faris, and to all those whose "judgment" he seems to be empowered to express.

And, too, our correspondent courteously invites us to "stop the paper." This paper *started* expressly to expose the iniquity that lurks in the National Reform movement, and to awake the American people to the danger that threatens their liberties should that movement succeed. The paper has now been running but a year, yet it has had a total circulation of more than 136,000 copies, and we are happy to know that its influence is being felt even in

91

National Reform circles, and *we do not propose to stop the paper*. Sorry are we, Mr. Faris, that we cannot please you, but in our judgment and perhaps "in the judgment of most Christians" in this matter, "you are on the wrong side"—at least as yet. A. T. J.

"The American Hierarchy" *The American Sentinel* 1, 12 , pp. 91, 92.

IN our remarks on the "National Reformed Constitution," in the SENTINEL for November, we closed with these words: "If there are any of readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask them to wait till the next issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, when we promise, if the Lord will, to present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt." We now propose to fulfill our promise.

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. In a word, the ten commandments will then be the Constitution of the United States. This is what the National Reformers propose, and here is the proof. In the *Christian Statesman* of February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan presented an article in which he asked the question, "How is the Amendment to be carried out practically?" And in the answer to this question he made this statement:—

"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."

Now the ten commandments are the law of God. The ten commandments are, for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. It is 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." Matt. 5:21, 22, 27, 28. And "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." 1 John 3:15.

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 (Rom. 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 illy or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so.

Let it also be observed that the National Reformers not only propose to make the moral law, the supreme law—the Constitution—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:—

"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*."—*Christian Statesman*, February 21, 1884.

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.

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,

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, because the ten commandments will be the Constitution. Then everybody in the United States will have to keep the fourth commandment, for to refuse to do so will be rebellion. Now 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.

Suppose then 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:—

"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 man-servant, 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 is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

Even now there is no little discussion about the meaning of this commandment. There are the Jews 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.

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 the 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.

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:—

"The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import."

The first question then is, Are the words of the fourth commandment such as are of common use? Look at them and see. The only

92

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.

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:—

"When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction. They must be followed."

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.

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 simply from the standpoint of law, and not of theology. We are simply 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 are 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, everybody in these United States *will have to*

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 after 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 every one who has any regard for human right and liberty of conscience.

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. J.

"The American Papacy" *The American Sentinel* 1, 12 , pp. 92, 93.

DURING the past year, there has been largely circulated a book entitled "Our Country," that 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.

Among these perils the author rightly places Romanism, and by many excellent quotations proves that it is indeed a peril. We quote a passage or two:—

"The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience*. Nothing is dearer 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, anathematized 'those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,' also 'all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.'"

"The pacific tone of Rome in the United State 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 be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.' . . . 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.'"

"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 as energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these territories. True, but they are *energetic enough to be counted*. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often *much more*."

All this and much more is true of Romanism. And although there is just cause for fear that Romanism will yet wield civil power here, and that the principles of Romanism will yet be allowed by the laws of this nation, yet 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 cruel, 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.

We are not in this bringing against the National Reformers a railing accusation; we simply deal with facts, and the logic of facts. And in saying that the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with Romanism in America, we only state the sober truth. Please read the following statement from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman*, of December 11, 1884:—

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

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*.

Again the *Statesman* says:—

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

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 of 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 everybody 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 published only last year, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"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 and journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the view of the above prescriptions."

NATIONAL REFORM AND ROMANISM IDENTICAL

From the above quotations from the *Statesman* it is seen that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity. National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be re-modeled before this National Christianity can be established; to re-model our Constitution and legislation is the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what "all Catholics" are by the Pope *ex-cathedra* commanded to do, and not to lose sight of it for an instant. 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"?

But that the National Reformers will gladly join bands 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." Now to the proof of this. In the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, says:—

"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 cooperation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation."

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the National Reformers. They are not only willing to make the 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," "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth"! 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 bloody hands 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

94

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.

It is true, as Mr. Scovel says, the National Reformers do now receive somewhat cool treatment, and perhaps some 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 on 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 all coming to us, and we only have to wait."

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and such it will to all appearances remain until the National Reformers have done the work; till they, by repeated advances and in spite of repeated "rebuffs," have come to her and made the proper surrender. Because she knows that were she now to actively engage in the enterprise, it

would arouse suspicion, and the success of National Christianity would be seriously compromised. But 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 in the United States, 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.

It may be of interest to inquire, What was the subject which drew from Mr. Scovel this expression of willingness, if not anxiety to gain the co-operation of Rome?—He is writing of a movement of the Catholic Church in Europe, for the strict observance of Sunday, or, as Macaulay says of the Puritan reign under the Commonwealth, Mr. Scovel "will call it Sabbath." 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 this enterprise, and as the National Reformers in America are engaged in it, the question occurs to the National Reformers, "Why shall we not join hands with the Catholics in America, so that we can win? True it is, we may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for the 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 amend the Constitution; without the help of Rome, we cannot compel people to keep Sunday. But if 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.

SOLD INTO THE HANDS OF ROME

Although the Catholic Church apparently takes no very active interest in this movement itself, we may rest assured that there is not a single writer, nor a single official, of the Catholic Church, from the Pope to the lowest priest in America, who ever "for an instant" loses

sight of the movement, or of the "prescriptions" which the Pope has given in view of it.

Then when the matter comes to the enforcement of the laws, what is to hinder the Catholics from doing it, and that, too, in the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our own 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 rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to surrender to the Catholics, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws; 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.

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, *either* 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.

Lord Macaulay made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

"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.*

And 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, or anything else, out of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

We know that a good people have regarded the AMERICAN SENTINEL as exerting itself to no purpose, because they think there is no danger of the success of National Reform. But in the National Reform party *a link with Rome*, there *is* danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more vigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday—the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—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, the ill-informed zeal of thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws, will be induced 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.

We say that 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 forefend 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.

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, then of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme?

A. T. J.