

The American Sentinel 13 (1898)

January 6, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 1.

RELIGIOUS freedom is the soul's Declaration of Independence.

ONLY that which is purely secular can be truly non-sectarian.

HE who would be like Christ, cannot make himself a judge of his brethren.

"LORD, what shall this man do?" is a question the Saviour refused to answer. Nor will he answer it now.

IF the Sabbath is the Lord's day, why take it out of the Lord's hands, and make it subject to state regulation?

HE who makes it his object to set other people straight, is very sure to set himself crooked in the attempt.

IF the "Christian" state would want to join the Christian church, how could the Christian church consistently refuse?

THE modern "reformer" is willing to try almost any scheme for the reformation of his fellow-beings, except that of setting a good example.

IT would be time well spent if a great many people in the country would learn the distinction between the terms "secular" and "godless."

IT is the object of the civil law to keep men civil; but when a person undertakes to make men moral by civil law, he himself becomes most uncivil.

AMS regards the "civil Sunday," it is to be remarked that it is singular indeed that a secular institution should have sprung from a pedigree wholly religious.

THE church should remember that when she is joined with one of the powers of earth, it will be proper for her to change her name. If she wishes to retain her name, she must remain single.

"The 'Infallible' State" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , pp. 1, 2.

AT the late National Reform convention in Philadelphia, Rev. David McAllister, a leading exponent of National Reform ideas, spoke of a state as being "the infallible interpreter of and the active agent in

applying moral law." This he said was the conception and aim of the National Reform movement.

Let us look for a moment at this "infallible" state.

Where shall we find it? Where is there any record of on, or where is there one that claims to be infallible at the present time?

There is none; but Dr. McAllister doubtless does not claim that there ever was an infallible state or even that there is one in existence now. Yet the National Reform idea is that the state is to become "the infallible interpreter" of moral law.

But how is the state to become infallible? If it never was infallible in the past, and is not infallible now, how is it to acquire infallibility in the future?

Is it to acquire this by being made the "interpreter of an active agent in applying moral law"?

2

Can the National Reformers and their allies who would make it such, confer infallibility upon it? How can they if they are not infallible themselves?

And if no person in the state is infallible, or can become infallible, how can the state, as representing the ideas and judgment of the people in it, become infallible?

If all the people of the state, not one of whom is infallible, or a majority of them, were to decide that the state is infallible, would it therefore be infallible? If the National Reformers and their allies, all being fallible persons, were to declare that the state in carrying out their program is infallible, would it be infallible?

No one person is infallible, of course; no individual in this country claims to be infallible. But when a large number of persons get together and speak with a common voice, is there not infallibility in it then?

If you add fallibility to fallibility, can you not after a time get enough fallibility together to produce infallibility?

That is just the idea which has come down to us from paganism and the Dark Ages. The old Romans said, "The voice of the people is the voice of God;" and the later representatives of Rome, assembled in ecumenical council in A.D. 1870, declared that the pope when speaking "ex-cathedra," is infallible. Out of their fallibility came the pope's "infallibility." The idea of the infallibility of the voice of the people is twin with that of the infallibility of an ecumenical council; and the perfect similarity of the doctrine of the "infallible state" to these

two, shows its close relationship with them and thoroughly pagan character.

The "infallible state," as the interpreter of morals, means simply a state pope. But if we are to have a pope, let it be Leo XIII. Certainly he will do as well as any.

"What Is the State?" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 2.

THE *Christian Citizen* takes delight in repeating as certain truth that expression of Professor Herron's—"Except the state believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, it cannot be saved." In view of this, we some time ago asked the *Citizen* to be so kind as to tell the people what the state is. It replies that "the state is just what we [the people] make it."

This answer is true enough in its place; but it is in fact no answer at all to the question that was asked. Put the two sentences together.—

"The state is what we make it." "Except the state believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, it cannot be saved."

The only logical or possible conclusion to be drawn from these statements is that "we"—the people—can, and indeed that "we" really do, make something which is capable of believing in Christ unto salvation."

"We" it is who make this. And who are "we"?—The people—you and I and the other man. And what are we?—Simply mortal, dying, human beings, whose life is "a vapor," and whose frame is but dust. Yet "we" by vote can make a thing having personality, intelligence, will, conscience, and which by faith can attain unto salvation. In other words "we" can *create*.

And that thing which "we" "make," and which "is just what we make it" is "the state." Now a proper question is, Who ever saw one of these personalities? Who ever knew one to be preached to, and to be persuaded to believe on the Lord Jesus and obtain salvation? If the editor of the *Christian Citizen* or Professor Herron were to start out to-morrow to find this personality which "we" have made that he might preach to it and persuade it to believe and be saved, where would he go? What would he do? Where would he begin?

Would he begin in his own town, and with his next-door neighbor?—He would not find there anybody but the "we" who it is said have made this other thing—the state—which is separate from ourselves, a distinct personality. But "we" are not the ones who are to be preached to and persuaded to believe and be saved; it is this

other person which "we" have made—the state. Yet he would find nothing of the state there, separate from the "we," to whom he might preach his new gospel.

Would he go then to Washington City to find this thing? Is so, where would he go when he arrived there? Where would he find the state there?—Ah! there, too, he would find this supposed state as vague, airy, intangible, and elusive a thing as it was in his own home town. He could find nothing there separate from the "we," to whom he could preach his new gospel.

Yet there as well as at home the "we" would not be the one to whom this must be preached: it would still be this which "we" have made. But behold there the thing essential to be preached to cannot be found any more than at home.

Then what becomes of this new gospel of the *Christian Citizen*?—Oh, it is seen at once to be as vague, intangible, and elusive a thing as is the thing to which they propose to preach it. Apart from the individuals of a community or of a nation, there is no such thing as the state. So also the message "Except ye believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, ye cannot be saved," can never be preached to any but the individual people who compose a community or a nation. Without the particular human individual, whom we meet everywhere, whom we see with our eyes, and to whom personally we speak, there is no such thing, and there can be no such thing, as the state. And without the particular human individual whom we meet everywhere, whom our eyes see, and to whom personally we speak, there can be no believing in the Lord Jesus to be saved.

The *Christian Citizen* has not yet answered our questions, What is the state? Will the *Citizen* please try again, and be more explicit and direct?

A. T. J.

"The Religious State" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 3.

NOBODY in this country is, professedly, in favor of a union of church and state; but there are a great many people here who say that the state ought to be religious.

But how is the state to be religious without favoring a church? And what attitude will the church maintain toward the state when the latter professes religion?

Will the church stand off and forbid the state to come within her fold? How would it look for the Christian church to forbid a Christian to unite with her?

When therefore the state becomes Christian, how can the Christian church consistently close her doors against the state?

"The Proper Thing" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 3.

A CONTRIBUTOR to the *Christian Herald* a short time ago, writing from Washington, D. C., a historical and descriptive sketch of the church with President McKingley attends, took occasion to state as though it were a very remarkable thing, that when at church Mr. McKinley partakes of the communion, kneeling at the altar "with the humblest member" of the congregation.

Why this should be considered by anybody as remarkable, is the point to which we would call attention. As a church member he who is the president, is but plain William McKinley. And as a church-member there is no distinction, in standing, between him and the humblest member. The only thing that could consistently be expected, then, is just what was seen, that in his place as a church-member he should receive the communion with the humblest member.

But what is really expected by entirely too large a class of people is that when a church-member is elected president of the United States, or is chosen to some other position in the state or nation, he shall carry with him in the exercise of his privileges of church-membership all the distinction, dignity, and officialism that attaches to him as an officer of the state.

Therefore they expect a governor of a State to be a governor in church and as a church member, and to be addressed as "Governor" by his church brethren; a judge of a court, they expect to be a judge in church as a church member, and to be addressed as "Judge" by his church brethren; and a president of the United States, they expect to be president in his place in church as a church-member, and to be addressed as "Mr. President" or "Your Excellency" by his church brethren.

But this is altogether a mistake. It is nothing else than that insidious ever-lurking spirit of the union of church and state that is always begging for permission to manifest itself. No; though in the White House, or in the Capitol, or as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, William McKinley is "Mr. President" or

"Your Excellency;" yet in his place as a church member, he is only plain "Brother McKinley."

The country is to be congratulated in that Brother McKinley recognizes this vital difference and so disappoints the aristocratic expectations of spectators, by kneeling at the altar and receiving the communion "with the humblest member."

A. T. J.

"Loyalty to Country" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 3.

THE *Boulder* (Col.) *News* thinks that we do not believe in loyalty to the country in which we live, and as regards such loyalty says:—

"Being loyal does not mean that one must go to war whenever the call comes or that he must indorse all the abuses that may exist, or bad laws that may be enacted. He may devote himself to the country by removing those abuses, securing the change or repeal of bad laws, or in any way than he thinks would better the condition of the people."

This is true; and we never meant to be understood as advocating anything to the contrary. This is the loyalty we believe in exactly. He who is loyal to God will be loyal to his fellow men; and this means loyalty to country in the best and truest sense.

"That Flag Salute" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , pp. 3, 4.

WE did not imagine, when we devoted some space to the subject of the flag salute in our issue of November 25, that we were considering anything more than a local issue. But we were not long in discovering that we had touched a chord which awoke responsive echoes all over the country.

This is very significant. The flag salute is neither local nor accidental. The Boulder incident is but the outcropping of an influence that is at work all through the land. Since noticing that, the news comes that the same salute is being practiced in the Iowa State Normal school, where the young people are trained in the art of teaching, the design being that the graduates as they go out to teach shall introduce the salute in their respective schools. In Pennsylvania the same influence is at work, and experiences similar to those in Boulder have already occurred. Thus the forces are gathering for an attack upon the principles of religious freedom in the public schools; and this will bring the test of loyalty to principle right home to parents

everywhere. They will not need to wait till they shall be brought before the courts for breaking Sunday.

But who knew that all this was brewing in our midst?

4

That is the question. Who knew that the enemy was quietly stealing a march upon the friends of freedom? Did you, reader, know it? And now that it is known, how do you feel about it? Will it pay to know what is going on in this great contest of the principles of liberty and of despotism? or is it the better way to wait and be confronted suddenly by the issue when you are not prepared to meet it?

You had not expected the issue to come in this way? Of course not; that is just the point. For you may be sure of this: the issues which you will be called to face in this contest will not come as you expect them to come. You must be prepared for them not as you expect them to come, but as you do not expect them.

WHEN the civil law undertakes to suppress immorality, it finds no logical stopping place short of the Inquisition.

"The Vital Question" *American Sentinel* 13, 1 , p. 4.

THE *Boulder* (Col.) *News* says that in objecting to the flag salute in the public schools, the SENTINEL has made a mountain out of a mole hill. It says that we "totally misapprehend and misinterpret the spirit of the whole matter;" and this statement it explains by saying that the salute—"We give our heads and our hearts to God and our country"—"was not intended to be taken in a narrow, technical sense, not as a declaration of conversion or religion, but as a general expression of reverence for deity and loyalty to country."

Now this salute consists of a statement so plain and simple that it had not occurred to us that it could be taken in a "narrow, technical sense." When an individual says he gives his heart to God, we take the expression as meaning just what it says, with no thought of anything technical about it. How would it do as a defense in a breach of promise suit, to plead that although the defendant did say that he gave his hand and heart to the complainant, this was not meant to be taken in a narrow, technical sense, but only as a general expression of esteem?

But aside from this, it should be noted that the real point involved in this matter is not the question of what was meant by the originators of this salute. It is not the question of their motives in introducing it into the schools, or of what good they thought it would accomplish.

Doubtless their motives were excellent; we do not question these in the least. Nor is it probable that they themselves saw in it any confession of religious belief; at least, it is quite possible that they did not. But the question is, What did they actually do? What does the flag salute actually require, and what is its real effect?

We are quite ready to believe that the authors of this salute did not know that their gun was loaded, and did not mean to shoot anybody. "I didn't know it was loaded" is a very common excuse; but the question is, What was the actual result? Besides this, the mere question of what was intended sinks into insignificance.

The *News* goes on to say that the word "God" in the salute "does not necessarily mean the God of the Bible; it may mean the god of nature, or nature itself, as some put it—even the pagan's god, if there should be a pagan in the schools." Well, well! How many gods do the Boulder school authorities want the children to give their hearts to? How many different gods do they believe in themselves? Do they believe that all gods are on an equality, so that the children may with equal propriety be required to give their heads and hearts to any one of them? If not, which one do they mean shall be honored by this flag salute? These are points concerning which the public may well ask for explanation.

If the salute does not mean anything definite, or if it does not mean what it says, it would better be dropped for that reason alone. And if it does mean what it says, then it is a direct invasion of the domain of conscience, whether its authors intended it as such or not.

January 13, 1898

"Which is the Worse?" *American Sentinel* 13, 2 , p. 18.

IT is admitted on every hand that a union of church and state in this country would be a very bad thing.

That is, it would be very bad if the state should become joined with *one* of the churches or denominations professing the Christian religion.

But the surprising thing in connection with this is, that while the people are against this thing, as constituting a union of church and state, they are quite generally in favor of a union of the state with religion, as represented by the churches in general.

If it is wrong for the state to unite with one church alone, is it right for the state to unite with all the churches? If even marriage between church and state is wrong, what must be said of church and state polygamy?

"Dangerous Models" *American Sentinel* 13, 2 , p. 19.

THE *Endeavor Herald* remarks:—

"The old Puritans would have made good members of our citizenship committees. They had the courage of their convictions, and advanced to the attack of anything which they regarded as evil with a confidence of victory that is inspiring."

Thus the Endeavorers adopt the Puritans as their model and their ways as their example in the matter of citizenship. And then they think themselves very much outraged when we say that their Endeavor citizenship movement means the union of church and state with its essential accompaniments—religious despotism and persecution!

There is nothing truer nor more palpable in history than that the principles of government and citizenship of the "old Puritans" were essentially theocratical, and their practices therein essentially despotic and persecuting. With them and in their government no man could be a citizen of the commonwealth except he be a member of the Puritan Church. Members of other churches were persecuted to death. All this is notorious. And it is equally notorious that as to government and citizenship these are the only principles that received any recognition from them. And yet the Christian Endeavorers who now propose to remodel citizenship and reform the nation, adopt these same theocratic, despotic, and persecuting Puritans as their model, and publish to the American people that "the old Puritans would have made good members of our citizenship committees;" and declare that the way in which these old Puritans did these things "is inspiring"!

Any governmental or citizenship movement of which the old Puritans would be a good part, is surely only to be dreaded by everybody who has any respect for either Christianity or humanity. And any inspiration that can be derived from either their principles or their practices can be nothing short of an inspiration to oppression and persecution, to death and destruction.

It has been well remarked that "if we are to be profited by the past, it is essential that we should study our history honestly and impartially. We cannot be true to ourselves if we begin by being false

with our predecessors. If we credit them with motives they did not feel and could not have understood; if we claim for them things which they never accomplished; if we defend their indefensible acts; if we seek to prove them in the right when they were in the wrong in their behaviour toward others,—it will follow that we will deal likewise in our own case, and prove dishonest and tricky as a nation and in our personal transactions." "We regret to read of the banishment of Quakers and the expulsion of 'papists' from soil procured for the settlers by one of the best patriot's check never kindles with shame till the story of the New England Puritans is told. Theirs alone is the dishonor of the torture, the mutilation, and the scaffold."

No man will ever be better, nor ever do better, than his chosen model. So long as "the old Puritans" shall be the chosen models of the Christian Endeavorers in government and citizenship, it is certain that every movement that they make in matters of government and citizenship will be a positive menace to free government and American citizenship, and is to be dreaded and opposed as such. And as just now the Christian Endeavorers are the leading and controlling influence among the National Reform elements of the country, so long as they hold "the old Puritans" as their models, they need to be carefully watched by the whole American people, in the interests of true Christian and civil liberty.

A. T. J.

"Which Shall We Believe?" *American Sentinel* 13, 2 , p. 20.

THE *Christian Citizen*, for December, in speaking of the prospective time "when the initiative and referendum are applied to municipal and State politics," says:—

"Then the voice of the people, which is the voice of God, will be heard."

So said the old pagans of ancient Rome, and to them, as far as it can be traced, the statement owes its origin. Upon their authority it rests. But the Bible says that the voice of God is heard through "holy men of old," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Which shall we believe, the pagans of ancient Rome, or the Bible?

January 20, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , p. 33.

NO individual can be compelled to walk in the pathway of righteousness.

GOD cannot accept any service that is sought to be rendered to him through Cesar.

THE preservation of individual rights is necessary to the formation of right character.

HUMAN law fights crime by shutting up the criminal; the divine law fights sin by liberating the sinner.

THERE is good conduct by law in the penitentiary; but this does not make a model community out of the inmates.

A SUNDAY law never developed anybody's moral courage, manliness, independence, honesty, or love of principle.

"THE kingdom of Satan failed because it was founded upon the love of power. The kingdom of Christ succeeded because it was founded upon the power of love."

THE effort to enforce Sunday upon the people by law is an effort to make one man's liberty judged by another man's conscience, which is directly contrary to Christianity. 1 Cor. 10:29.

IS it true that the church's power and her opportunities to do her appointed work are provided her by the Lord? or are they contingent upon the popular ballot and the action of legislatures?

THE difference between a Christian and a "Christian nation" is that a Christian is phenomenally slow to take offense at an injury or insult, while a "Christian nation" is phenomenally quick to do just the opposite.

THE theory that men can be compelled to be good by law, is the old pagan and carnal theory that a person must do good in order to be good. The truth, as embodied in the gospel, is that a person must be good in order to do good.

"For Conscience' Sake" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , pp. 33, 34.

THE Christian is in all things governed by the dictates of conscience. For conscience' sake he is careful to render to Cesar that which is Cesar's, as well as to give unto God that which is God's.

This is in accordance with the plain instructions of that Word which is the Christian's rule of life. "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord and not unto men," is the exhortation given in the epistle to the Colossians (chap. 3:23), and the apostle Paul makes a still more definite application of the principle in the thirteenth chapter of

Romans. There the Christian is enjoined to be "subject unto the higher powers," and it is said (v. 5), "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake."

Only conscientiously, therefore, can the Christian be subject to the "powers that be," in a scriptural way.

When a law is made, therefore, which conflicts with conscience, it strikes at the very mainspring of the Christian's action as regards his duty toward the state.

If he yields his conscience in deference to the demands

34

of the law, he cannot, "for conscience' sake," be subject unto the civil authority.

When the state wants a Sunday law, the Christian, believing it to be his duty to sanctify the seventh day and not the first, according to the fourth commandment, cannot, "for conscience' sake," render obedience to the state in it.

For the very sake of the duty he owes to the state, which is to be conscientiously rendered, he must refuse to yield his conscience to the state.

The Christian who parts with conscience can serve neither God nor the state. And no law can ever be in the interests of the state which brings any pressure to bear upon Christians in this direction.

"Which Is the Better?" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , p. 34.

THE gospel of God aims to lead an individual to the highest plane of heroism,—so to develop personal independence, courage, and love of truth and justice that he would dare do right though all the world should do wrong, and though he should suffer death for doing it. It aims to make of him a Moses, an Elijah, a Daniel, a Paul, a Luther.

The Sunday law (and all religious legislation) tends to make an individual move with the masses, to lean upon the crowd, to think that he cannot do right independently of others around him, or without a law to make it convenient and easy for him. It tends to make him go as all moral cowards go, to do as they do, and think as they think. It tends to make him more a moral coward than he is already.

No individual ever rose to distinction in this world who followed such a plan of action.

The one tends to elevate the individual to the highest plane of moral development, the other tends to sink him to the lowest level of moral cowardice.

Which is the better of these two systems? Which of these two classes of individuals does the nation want?

"Sunday Slavery" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , p. 34.

THE Constitution of the United States declares that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

This being so, the millions who are in the bondage of "Sunday slavery," about which so much is now said by the advocates of Sunday laws, have a plain remedy for their situation in an appeal to the fundamental law of the land.

Why, then, is not the Constitution invoked by somebody for this purpose? For that it never has been appealed to as a remedy for "Sunday slavery" is an evident fact, although the agitators for Sunday laws are not in ignorance of its provisions.

The plain reason is that these agitators know very well that the Sunday work about which they are talking is not slavery at all. They know that there is not a court in the land that would for a moment sustain the idea that the anti-slavery provision of the Constitution had any application to such labor.

This "slavery" is a myth. There is a great deal of moral slavery in the land, but only the gospel of God can deliver any person from that.

"Hypocritical Laws and their Enforcement" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , p. 34.

THE New York *World*, of the 12th inst., alludes to the operation of the excise and Sunday laws under the new Tammany administration, and says that "President York, of the Police Board, expressed the true idea in saying that the excise and Sunday laws should be 'broadly construed and liberally enforced.'"

We want no laws that have to be construed and enforced in this way. We want laws that are plain in their meaning, that mean what they say, and that will be enforced in exact accordance with their working. Anything less than this can be only hypocrisy and fraud.

"It Is a Union of Church and State" *American Sentinel* 13, 3 , pp. 34, 35.

THE *Christian Citizen* complains of "unfriendly critics" who "misrepresent" the Christian Citizenship League, "by assuming that Christian citizenship means a union of church and state." Then the *Citizen* sets up the following defense against that charge:—

"Now it ought to be so clear as not to require repetition that a separation of church and state does not separate the individual Christian from the state. Under the old absolute monarchies there was a difference between duties to the state and to God. Then the Christian only had to see that he 'render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' But in a republic like ours the individual is himself a part of the state, and becoming a Christian and a member of the church, which is separate from the state, does not make him any less a part of the state."

Now, whether we shall be counted an unfriendly critic or not (we think we are friendly), this defense needs to be analyzed. From what we *know* is in it, it is possible that there may be something there that the *Christian Citizen* has not seen.

First. "A separation of church and state does not separate the individual Christian from the state." And "the individual is himself a part of the State, and becoming a Christian and a member of the church, which is separate from the state, does not make him any less a part of the state."

The individual is originally a part of the state. He is originally not a Christian, and therefore has no connection, nor any part, with the church, because the church is separate from the state. Originally, then, the individual is wholly of the state alone.

But now he chooses to be a Christian. He wants to unite with the church. In other words, he desires to form a *union of himself* and the *church*. He "is a part of the state;" and the church "is separate from the state." Now the problem is, How can he remain "a part of the state" and form a *union of himself* and the *church* without *at the same time* and *in that very act*, so far as it is possible for him to do, forming a union of the church and the state?

The *Christian Citizen* says he can do it, but does not tell how. We say that he cannot do it, and tell how.

The church is composed of individuals, and the state is composed of individuals. The church is composed of individual *Christians*: the state is composed of individual *citizens*. The individual citizen is first: he is born to that; he is a "part of the state"—there is a *union of himself* and the *state*. He chooses to *form a union* of himself and the *church*.

He does so. The *Christian Citizen* says that when he does so, he is "not any less a part of the state;" and at the same time insist that the church is separate from the state. But *in that individual citizen* it is *not* separate from the state. In him the individual citizen and the individual Christian are the same identical person. And as he is still a part of the state, and has now become also a part of the church—it follows as certainly as that two and two make four, that *in that individual* there is a union of church and state.

"The church is separate from the state." The individual citizen is "a part of the state." He forms a *union* of *himself* and the *church*, still remaining "a part of the state." Then it is absolutely settled that *in himself* there is formed a union of church and state. It is therefore as impossible for an individual citizen to form a union of himself and the church and still remain a part of the state, without at the same time and in that very thing forming *within himself* a union of church and state, as it is for two bodies to occupy the same identical space at the same identical time, or for the same individual to be two distinct persons.

The great difficulty with this whole National Reform Christian Citizenship people is that they set up outside of and away from individual men a figment that they call the church and another figment that they call the state. Then, as they conceive that these two figments can never be united in what they are doing, so they insist that they as individual men can go on and do all that they choose without forming any union of church and state. But it is in the individual man where the union of church and state is always first formed. No union of church and state was ever formed, or ever occurred, outside of individual men, until a union of church and state was first formed *inside* of individual men. And the union of church and state was never formed inside of individual men, in any other way than that which is set forth in this defense of the *Christian Citizen*. This defense itself is essentially the advocacy of a union of church and state.

Second. "Under the old absolute [obsolete?] monarchies there was difference between duties to the state and to God. Then the Christian only had to see that he 'render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.'"

Now it was the Lord Jesus who first put this "difference between duties to the state and to God," as announced in the words "Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that

are God's." And this difference was made by the Lord Jesus Christ for Christians, for church members, for those who believe in him, as certainly as for anybody else in the world, if not more so. This commandment—"Render unto Cesar," etc.—was given for Christians, as well as for others, and for all time. It is a vital principle of the Word of God and of the religion of the Lord Jesus, and cannot be relegated to the old absolute (or obsolete) monarchies to pass away with them.

To say that this scripture relates only to the old absolute (or obsolete) monarchies, is only to say that the authority of God and the Lord Jesus Christ is that of an old absolute (or obsolete) monarchy.

The *Christian Citizen* allows that where this scripture applied, "under the old absolute [or obsolete] monarchies, *there was a difference between duties to the state and to God.*" And the only way in which the *Citizen* can save itself from that difference now is to fasten this scripture to "old absolute monarchies" and repudiate them both together. But any scheme that is compelled to repudiate the words of the Lord Jesus to save itself, is dangerous on the face of it. And any "Christians" or Christian citizens who are ready to repudiate the words of Jesus Christ to save their scheme, are not to be trusted in any pretensions that they may make in their efforts to make that scheme successful.

January 27, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , p. 49.

IN Christianity, faith is the only avenue of power.

GOOD intentions cannot charge the character of a bad deed.

THERE is nothing that can get above right, or occupy a higher seat than that of justice.

TO separate the interests of the state from those of the individual, is fatal to both alike.

BEWARE how you take hold of another man's conscience; for that conscience has God at the other end of it.

IT is a mistake for any legislative body to think it has the authority to define sin, or the power to punish it.

IF you are following the Lord yourself, your eyes are upon his perfection, and not upon your neighbor's imperfection.

THE more a government reduces its individual subjects to the condition of automatons, the more despotism will there be under it.

THE right to believe is nothing without the right to act upon belief; and to deny the right to believe is to deny the right to think at all.

THE nature and effect of a piece of religious legislation are not in any wise changed by its being labeled "civil enactment" or "police regulation."

FOR any human power to take from an individual that which divine power and authority has given him, is an act of amazing temerity, to say the least.

"AMS by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5:19. Neither sin nor salvation has any significance apart from the individual.

"The State and the Individual" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , pp. 49, 50.

THE doctrine that the State is everything and the individual nothing is exactly the opposite of that upon which all good and just government is established.

It is synonymous with the doctrine that government is instituted not to maintain the absolute inviolability of certain individual privileges known as "rights," but only to secure "the greatest good to the greatest number."

When the supposed interests of society or of the state come in conflict with individual rights, the latter are by this theory swept aside. "It is expedient that one man should die and not that the whole nation should perish."

So reasoned the Jews when they committed the most awful mistake that it was possible for any people to commit.

It is said that the preservation of the state demands the enforcement of Sunday laws, and that when the individual conscience conflicts with the "state conscience" in such a matter, the individual conscience must give way.

We are asked to believe that it is sometimes necessary

to sacrifice the individual for the good of the state or of society.

There is an illustration of this just now in France, where there is great excitement over the question of the innocence or guilt of an alleged traitor. The government seems to think that the good of France demands that the condemned individual should suffer his prescribed punishment, even though he may have been unjustly convicted.

In Russia, as notice elsewhere in this issue, little children and infants are ruthless torn from their parents' arms in the night, by the government police, and taken away to be brought up as orthodox members of the state church. And this is done for the preservation of the state.

But the government of God holds to no such principle. That government, the maintenance of which is essential to the welfare of every being in the universe; that government, as compared with which in importance all earthly governments are as nothing,—would dissolve and go out of existence sooner than it would perpetrate a wrong upon one individual, however small, obscure, or humble. Sooner than do this, God himself would abdicate the throne of the universe. Yet an earthly government, a mere human and temporal affair, tries to justify itself in doing what would never at any hazard be dared by the government of Heaven. That which would dissolve the government of the universe, these earthly governments do for their "preservation"!

But there is nothing in it but dissolution for any government that does it, under any circumstances. The interests of the individual and of the state cannot be separated. When the state cuts loose from the individual and holds only to "the masses," it cuts loose from safe principle, and starts upon the sure road to decline and ruin.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , p. 50.

THAT wicked spirit of enforced militarism—miscalled patriotism—is becoming more widespread, and becomes more bold, unreasoning, and vicious, as it spreads. At Appleton, Wis., there is an institution called Lawrence University that is making for itself a reputation in this species of despotism.

There is at this "university" a student who is studying for the ministry, and who, quite oddly for these days of military Christianity, has enough of the spirit of Christ to enable him to see that training for the ministry of Christ and training to kill people are not consistent; that the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of war are not in any sense compatible. He has therefore refused to engage in the military drills, or to belong to the militia, of the "university." For this he "is to be court-martialed" by the "university authorities."

The Milwaukee correspondent of the Chicago *Times-Herald* reports on the matter thus:—

"The parents of Otto Haefner, the student at Lawrence University, Appelton, who is to the court-martialed or [*sic.*] refusing to drill, live at 591 Reed Street in this city, and fully sustain their son in his action. When see to-day Mrs. Haefner said she could not understand why the university authorities should take such a step. 'My son,' she said, 'is studying for the ministry and has no taste for the militia. It does not seem fair that he should be obliged to drill when his inclinations are in an entirely different direction. He has been a good student, and the letters we have received from him have told how well he is getting along. He has worked hard in his studies, and certainly ought not to be punished for not being in sympathy with a military training. If he needs help, we will go to him.'"

Yes, and so should the people of the whole State of Wisconsin and of the whole United States, come to the boy's help. For it is perfectly evident that this evil spirit of enforced militarism, of despotic "patriotism," proposes to stop at nothing; but will override all individual right, all right of conscience, and even of God himself.

Wherever there yet remains any person who has any real respect for individual right, for the right of conscience, or of God, it is high time that his voice were being heard as far as it can be made to sound.

A. T. J.

"Who Provides the Sabbath?" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , pp. 50, 51.

IN the city of Boston, last month, representatives of the Presbyterian, Baptist, Unitarian, and Congregationalist churches met to discuss the question of Sunday observance, and passed a resolution saying, "We favor every wise effort to secure such speedy legislation as shall compel every transportation company to provide one day's rest out of every seven."

We believe as much as anybody does that people ought to have one day of rest in seven—the seventh day—but we have been under the impression that God himself has provided this rest for everybody; and if this is so, we do not see the force of asking the legislatures to provide it.

If the seventh day of rest is not yet provided for people, then it is no sin for the people to work on the Sabbath; for how can they have a rest which is not provided for them? and on the other hand, if the rest is provided, then it only remains for the people to take it, and there is no necessity for calling for legislative action in the matter.

Why should a legislature be asked to provide the people with something they already have?

Now there is a plain command of the Lord given in the Bible that all persons should "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," not doing any work upon it. But if God commands the people to take a rest which is not provided them, he is unreasonable and asks them to do an impossibility. This is altogether contrary to our conception of God.

"Freethinkers" and other non-Christians say that God is unreasonable and that his requirements are unjust; and when Christian bodies get together and gravely

51

pass a resolution calling upon the legislatures to provide the people a chance to do what God has enjoined upon them all to do, the contention of the "freethinkers" is sustained. But we would urge upon all Christians the propriety of giving no support by word or deed to the doctrines of infidelity.

The weekly day of rest is already provided; and all that any person who wants it has to do, is to take it. If you doubt this, try it, and be convinced. Accept God as the provider of all good things, and don't make a god out of the legislature.

"To Which Kingdom?" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , p. 51.

WE sincerely desire to help the *Christian Citizen* and all those who with it are becoming the Christian citizenship movement that is represented in the *Christian Citizen*.

We have no desire for controversy; and what we write on this subject is not written in the spirit of controversy. We simply desire, if possible, to fix the attention of these people upon certain Christian principles to which, from their attitude, it seems certain that they have not given due weight.

This is not a question of policy, but solely of principle. It is not a question of what men may think; but of what Jesus Christ says. It is not a question of what a professed Christianity may consider proper; but what does the Christianity of Jesus Christ teach and require.

It is altogether a question of Christianity. These people attach to their enterprise the term "Christian." In the name of Christianity they urge their movement. It is therefore not simply proper but essential that this thing which is urged upon the people as Christian, shall be brought to the test of the Christianity of Jesus Christ.

The principles of the Christianity of the Lord Jesus are given to the world in his Word. If this professed Christian citizenship movement will bear the test of the words of the Lord Jesus, all honor to it; but if it fails to bear this test, it is not Christianity and is not to be trusted at all. We have seen already that, in one instance at least, the *Christian Citizen* is obliged to set aside the words of Christ to save itself from destructive conclusions. This is not a promising prospect of bearing, throughout, the test of the Christianity of the word of Christ; yet it is only fair to examine the question further and as broadly as possible.

With this object and in this spirit solely, we ask the candid consideration of the *Christian Citizen* and its people to certain scriptures which from time to time we shall examine in the SENTINEL.

Here is one for this time: "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews."

His kingdom is not of this world. Then can any man belong to this world, and to Christ's kingdom at the same time?—Christ himself has answered this question. He said to his disciples of all time, "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." "I have chosen you out of the world." Again, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants *fight*." If his kingdom were of this world, then for what kind of a kingdom would his servants fight?—For a kingdom of this world. Then, what kind of kingdom is it for which men *do* fight, and for which alone they *can* fight?—For kingdoms of this world. But his kingdom is not of this world; therefore, in the sense in which Jesus here used the word "fight," no man can ever fight for the kingdom of Christ. And any kingdom for which any man can fight, in the sense in which Jesus here used the word, is not, and cannot be, a kingdom of Christ or of God.

Again, "If my kingdom were of this world then would *my servants* fight." This word testifies positively that the only possible consideration upon which the servants of Christ could fight, is that his kingdom were *of this world*. But it is positively stated by him, that his kingdom is *not* of this world. Therefore it is certain that the positive teaching of Jesus Christ is that when any who profess to be his servants do fight, they fight only for a kingdom of this world, whatever their pretensions may be. Any who fight for a kingdom that is of this world, who contend for place or power in any kingdom that is of this world, by that very thing plainly show that they are not of the kingdom

of Jesus Christ. And any who profess to be of Christ's kingdom who will fight for *any* kingdom, even His own, testify by that that they are not of his kingdom; for his kingdom is "not of this world," and only upon the consideration that his kingdom were of this world, could his servants fight at all.

Yet all this is precisely what those who are leading in this Christian citizenship movement propose to do. They do seek to get possession of the kingdoms of this world as such. They do aspire and work to put themselves into positions of power to rule the United States and the other governments of this world: and to fight, actually to fight, for governments of this world. And by all of this, they proclaim with the loudest possible voice that they are altogether of this world, and not of the kingdom of Christ at all; for he has proclaimed forever, "My kingdom is not of this world."

The kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world will not mix. The subjects of Christ's kingdom will never be mercenaries to fight for a kingdom to which they do not belong; and they cannot fight for the one to which they do belong.

A. T. J.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 4 , pp. 51, 52.

IT has been forcibly said, as regards the supposed physical needs of mankind for Sunday rest, that to eat heartier meals on Sunday than on other days, as is the prevalent fashion, while taking little or no physical exercise, puts a person in poorer physical condition than he was in before. This is the way most Sunday observers do, and yet they imagine they are getting great physical benefit from their Sunday observance, and that everybody else ought to be made by law to do likewise.

February 3, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , p. 65.

IT is better to stand alone on the truth, than with a crowd upon mere opinions.

THE patriot is he who strives not to plunge his country into war, but to preserve its peace.

HE who invades the rights of but one individual does that which God himself would not dare to do.

THERE is no surer and quicker way to dishonor Christianity than to try to compel people to observe Sunday, or any other professedly Christian institution.

IT requires superhuman wisdom to discern what are the real, vital, all-important issues before the people, at the time when there is time to prepare for them.

TRUTH is about as unpopular in the world to-day as it ever was. It is hard work to get people to recognize truth now when it is liable to cost them something to do it.

IS there any more effectual way to oppose wickedness than that in which Jesus Christ opposed it? Should not church people, at least, answer this question in the negative?

"ATTENTION to details" is essential in any business, but nowhere more so than in the business of government. And in government, the details are the individual citizens.

THERE is a great deal going on in the world to-day—so much that movements the most dangerous to liberty are able to make their way "in the crowd" almost unobserved. Eternal vigilance was never the price of liberty more truly than just now.

IT is easy enough to see now that Jesus Christ has a great mission to this earth—the greatest that could be imagined. But how many saw this at the very time when Christ was upon the earth?—Only a few, even of his own disciples. So if you do not see that the SENTINEL has any mission, or if the people generally do not see it it may still be true that it has one, and a very important one too.

"War and Civilization" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , pp. 65, 66.

IT is a very significant fact that in all civilized lands to-day there is the greatest activity in pushing forward preparations for war.

Whatever other branches of industry are idle, the effects of "hard times" and "over production" are never felt in the great workshops where are forged the nation's implements of destruction. They are usually running "over time."

One might imagine that civilization and war went hand in hand, or that war was an instrument of civilization, instead of being, as in truth it is, its destroyer.

Is civilization now preparing to commit suicide?

All Europe is an armed camp; and now the war agitation has involved the heathen countries of the far East, and extends its dark

shadow across the water, so that it covers the nations of both hemispheres: and we are compelled to face the prospect of a general war, which will inflict a blow upon civilization that will sweep away at once the fruits of centuries.

66

This is the actual situation: and in view of it, how unwise to foster a sort of "patriotism" which glorifies war, and covets the opportunity to demonstrate national prowess amidst death and carnage.

Let us have a different patriotism taught to our youth and children.

IT makes a great deal of difference whether you get satisfaction out of those things which tend to ennoble and prolong life, or out of things that tend to debase and destroy it.

"Christians Are a Sect" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , p. 66.

WHEN the Apostle Paul came to Rome, certain of the Jews came to him and said: "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." Acts 28:22.

No one will question the application of the words "this sect" to the Christians. Now, if Christians were a sect in Paul's day, at what time did they cease to be a sect? Obviously, they are as much a sect now as they ever were.

This being so, the term "non-sectarian" cannot apply to anything that is Christian; and the very common use that is made of it to designate some religious movement or undertaking that is backed by several or all the churches together, is without any warrant of fact.

It is nothing against Christianity that its adherents constitute a sect. But it is something against Christians when they try to get state aid for a religious enterprise, on the ground of its being "non-sectarian."

"The Bible Condemns It" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , p. 66.

"WHATSOEVER is not of faith, is sin." Rom. 14:23.

To observe Sunday by compulsion of law, is not of faith.

Therefore such Sunday observance is sin.

And a large part of the professedly Christian people of this country are calling on the legislatures for laws that would compel people to sin.

"Patriotism" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , p. 68.

WE believe in patriotism; and we believe in the teaching of patriotism in the public schools.

But we do not believe in the "patriotism" that—in many places—is being taught.

We do not believe in a kind of "patriotism" that glorifies war. War is against civilization, against national prosperity, against every interest of the individual and of the state.

We believe in a patriotism that seeks to save life, not to destroy it.

We believe in a patriotism that maintains—not denies—liberty of conscience.

We believe in a patriotism that proclaims that "all men are created equal," and that every individual has "certain unalienable rights."

This is the patriotism of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. This is the patriotism of the noble men who laid the foundations of this nation.

Why cannot the children in the public schools be taught something about individual rights? What could be more profitable than to teach them to prize their own rights, and to respect the rights of others?

What kind of patriotism is more truly American than that which prompted the writing of the Declaration of Independence?

To teach the children patriotism it is not necessary that they be taught how to kill people, and to believe that we are the "biggest" nation on earth, and can "lick" any or all of the others.

It is not necessary to teach them that the only proper place to show patriotism is amidst the smoke of gun-powder and the death and ruin of the battle-field.

If the American flag is to be held up before the children in the public schools, let them be taught that it stands for something else besides war.

Let them be taught the principles of individual liberty and independence upon which the government, represented by the flag, was established.

Teach the children to love peace, not war. Teach them that respect for right, that love of truth, that moral courage and self-reliance which are essential to true manhood. There will then be no danger but that they will grow up to be patriots.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , p. 69.

ONE man has at last appeared who favors the union of church and state in the United States, and who at the same time has the honesty to say so. He at the same time has the ability to discern, and the honesty to say, that the union of religion and the state is the union of church and state.

This open-minded man is Rev. Dr. Charles M. Lamson, the president of the American Board of Foreign Missions. In the reception and dinner of the Chicago Congregational Club, in Chicago, Monday night, January 17, 1898. Dr. Lamson spoke on "New-Englandism," in the report of which we find the following:—

"Another tendency is toward the union of church and state, or, better, of religion and state. Congregationalism is democracy. It is an inherent part of all true republicanism. The church has a great opportunity to assert its love for the land and to become patriotic. The time is coming when we shall place the obligations of citizenship in the forefront of our principles and inculcate the on all sides in the church work."

Another point in this to his credit, and to which we call the attention of the *Christian Citizen* is, that Dr. Lamson recognizes, and openly says, that the union of religion and citizenship is the union of religion and the state, which is the union of church and state.

That one such man is found, is a distinct gain. If there were about one or two thousand more such, the situation would be greatly relieved. We sincerely wish that every one of those who are so diligently working for the union of church and state in the United States would by some means get the courage to say so. Nothing is ever gained by trying to get one thing under pretense of something else.

A. T. J.

"Another Scripture Study with the 'Christian Citizen'" *American Sentinel* 13, 5 , pp. 69, 70.

"THERE was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest." Luke 22:24. The disciples were expecting Christ to set up a kingdom in this world and of this world. They expected that in this kingdom they themselves, as a matter of course, would have the chief places, because they were his first chosen disciples. But it was not enough for them that they should have the

chief places: the strife among them was as to which one of them should have the chief *place*. It was not enough that they should all be great and occupy prominent positions: they got up a strife as to which of them should be the greatest and have the most prominent position. Nor yet was the strife exactly as to who should *be* greatest: but who should be *accounted* the greatest.

Everybody can see that this was simply political ambition, and political strife for political position. Their conception regarding Christ's kingdom was altogether a mistaken one; yet that does not affect the fact that theirs was only political ambition and political strife for political position: and this all because their conception of Christ's kingdom was political. Everybody can see also that the conception which these men then held of Christ's kingdom is precisely the conception which the Christian citizenship movement entertains to-day. And the strife in which the disciples were then engaged with respect to their place in the prospective government is precisely that of the Christian citizenship folks to-day respecting their prospective government. These to-day contemplate nothing else than a grand national "strife" by an election campaign to decide "which of them shall be accounted the greatest." We know that these to-day sustain themselves with the idea that their work is all for the glory of God. But was it not so with those other disciples? Yet it was all wrong: it was sheer political, selfish ambition.

"And Jesus said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise au-

70

thority upon them are called benefactors. *But ye shall not be SO.*" Luke 22:25, 26.

"So" means "like," "after the same manner," "in the same way." What is the basis of this "so" here?—The kings, the rulers, of the Gentiles, of the nations, of those who are not of the people of God—these exercise lordship over them and exercise authority upon them: "but ye shall *not* be so." Ye, my disciples, ye, Christians, "*shall not*" "exercise lordship over them." Ye shall not exercise lordship over the nations, over those who are not of the people of God: ye "shall not" "exercise authority upon them." The kings of the Gentiles are so: but ye shall *not* be so. The kings of the Gentiles do so: but ye shall *not* do so. Yet everybody knows that this is precisely the thing that the Christian citizenship folks are planning both to be and to do. They *do*

design to *be* just so, and to *do* just so. While the word of Christ stands ever before them—"Ye shall *not* be SO."

Do you obey Christ, or do you not? Are you Christians, or are you not? "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

It will not do to try to dodge this by pleading that Christ meant that his disciples were not to exercise lordship over, or authority upon, Christians, their own brethren, as the kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over and authority upon the Gentiles, their own people. This is included *in* what he said, of course; but this is not all that he said in what he said. It cannot be claimed that under this world Christ's disciples could *not* exercise lordship over, or authority upon, their own brethren, yet *could* do so over and upon those who were *not* of their brethren, those who were altogether strangers to them. For if they could not do so with those who were of their own, and recognized fellowship with them, and held the same principles, how much less could they do so with those who were altogether separated and in no way of them nor of their principles or ways.

No: this prohibition of Christ's is universal. Kings of the nations exercise lordship and authority; "but ye shall not be so." The kings of the nations exercise lordship over them; "but ye shall not be so." The kings of the nations exercise authority upon them; "but ye shall not be so."

We know that the Christian citizenship folks insist that they must take possession of the government—municipal, state, and national for "the good of both government and people." They insist that those who now run the government are running it to the bad: but "we will run it only for the good; they are agents of evil, we will be agents of good."

Oh, yes! that is what those who exercise lordship and authority over others always said. "The people are only the better for being ruled, and we are the ones best fitted to rule; we do it for *their* good; we are only agents of good to the poor bad people."

All this is precisely what Jesus says that these kings all say of themselves: "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called *benefactors*." "Bene"—good. "Factor"—agent. "Benefactors"—agents of good. This is precisely what the Christian citizenship people propose to be in their political aspirations: they propose to be benefactors, agents of good, to the country and the people. They propose by their political ambitions to work the "redemption of cities, states, and the nation."

Thus they too in this day would be called the same kind of political "benefactors."

But what says Jesus to them and to all who bear the name of his disciples?—He says, "*Ye shall not be so.*" Those who exercise authority upon the nations are called benefactors; "*but ye shall not be SO.*"

Has not the fallacy of such ambition on the part of professed Christians been sufficiently demonstrated in history? Has not the thing been attempted over and over? And has not every attempt proved a most dismal failure so far as any kind of good is concerned? The thing was always productive of more and greater evils than were those which they proposed to remedy.

"Ye shall not be so," says the Lord Jesus Christ. Will our *Christian* citizens respect his authority, and obey his Word? A. T. J.

February 10, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , p. 81.

A SUNDAY law is a poor substitute for moral backbone.

"HONESTY is the best policy;" and this means to be honest with your conscience.

THE individual who rate policy above principle evidently imagines that time outweighs eternity.

THE modest demand of the National Reformers is that the people will please allow them to be conscience for the government.

IF people did not choose to be so independent of God, they would not be so miserably dependent upon their fellow mortals.

IF the Constitution is a godless document because it does not contain the name of God, is the Book of Esther a godless book?

DOES the "civil Sunday" prove the theory of evolution? No one can question that it evolved from something purely religious.

THERE is no danger that the world will ever cease to be religious, for it is human nature to be religious. But when people lost Christianity, their religion naturally allies itself with worldly power and fights its battles with carnal weapons. Worldly religion is worse than none at all.

THE purpose of legislation is not to grant rights, but to preserve them. The assume the authority to grant rights is to deny that rights inhere in the individual.

CAN anyone tell why it is that the ministers and religious societies can see better than any other classes of the people the necessity for a purely "civil" Sunday?

IF it were not for the love of money, a great many people would close their shops on Sunday who are now "forced" to keep them open, notwithstanding they feel very bad about doing business on that day.

"Christians Speak for All Men" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , pp. 81, 82.

JESUS CHRIST came into this world, as he said to Pilate, to "bear witness unto the truth."

The purpose which brought him here is the same which brings every individual into the world who is "born again." Christians, like their Master, are here to bear witness unto the truth.

It is because of this, which condemns the world, that the world has hated them and persecuted them.

Christians are not in this world to ask favors for themselves of the world. If the world leaves them free to enjoy the exercise of their rights, well and good. But in any case their enunciation of the doctrine of individual rights, as with any other Christian doctrine, is for the purpose of bearing witness to the truth, which concerns all man alike.

Before the bar of truth all men stand; by it all must be judged. Whether the Christian be in the private assembly, or before the legislature, or in court to answer for obedience to the dictates of his conscience, these con-

82

ditions remain unchanged. The real bar is the bar of truth. Christians are the witnesses; and by their testimony those who hear it are to know whether they themselves stand justified or condemned.

This was forcibly illustration in the experience of the apostle Paul. Brought before Felix in bonds, to answer for the crime with which he has charged by the Jews, Paul bore witness unto the truth, which, while vindicating him against the Jews, was of such magnitude and universal application that Paul the prisoner was lost to view before the overwhelming significance of the eternal principles of right conduct. The record is that 'as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, God thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee." Acts 24:25.

In bearing witness unto the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ, self is lost to view, and in its place all mankind appear as heirs of the inalienable rights which God has given them—rights by the exercise of which they are to determine their eternal destiny for weal or woe.

It is thus that Christians stand before the legislatures of the land, asking that no laws be enacted which will interfere with the individual prerogative of rendering to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's.

"Another Scripture Study for the 'Christian Citizen'" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , p. 82.

OF his disciples, Jesus says, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."

The state is altogether of this world. No state will ever see any other world than this.

Yet Christ says that Christians are not of this world; nor of the things that are in the world.

Now the problem is, How can a man be not of this world; and yet be a part of that which is altogether of this world? How can he be not of, and love not, the things that are in the world, and yet be a material, an active part of a thing that is solely of this world and can never possibly be of any other? The only fair, logical, or reasonable answer to these questions settles the question of the relationship of Christians to the states and governments of this world.

So completely is the state of a thing of this world that when a man is born, he is born into the world and into the state at the same time. So long as he remains a part of the world, he is a part of the state. And so long as he remains a part of the state he remains a part of the world. And all this by the very fact of his having been born at all.

But Christianity calls men to "be *born again*:" to be "born from above:" to be born of the Spirit. And when this is done he is born into another kingdom, into another government, into another world. And it is just as true that when a man is *born again*, he is born into another kingdom at the same time, as it is that when he is born the first time, he is born into the state at the same time.

When a man is born again, that birth is just as real as was the first one. When he is born again, that birth is as distinct from the first one as day is from night. And the realm, the government, the world, into which he is born when he is born again, is just as distinct from the realm, the government, and the world into which he was first born, as the new birth is distinct from the first birth. The two things are so essentially different in all their characteristics that they cannot possibly be blended.

The state is of nature wholly: Christianity is of grace wholly. The state is altogether natural: Christianity is altogether spiritual. The state is of the earth: Christianity is of heaven. Thus in nature and characteristics the two things are absolutely separate and distinct. They cannot be united nor blended in the same person, nor in the same things. No: "they are not of the world." "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity [sic.] with God? Whosoever therefore will be the friend of the world is the enemy of God."

But the Lord has given us an unmistakable standard of comparison: "They are not of the world, *even as I am not of the world.*" What was the attitude of Christ toward the states and the kingdoms of this world? It was one of total separation from all of them in every way. And this is not simply that he *did* not have any thing to do with them, but that he *would* not have it. It is not that he passively ignored it, but that he actually refused to have anything to do with the state. He was offered the kingdom of Judea, and he refused it. He was offered all the kingdoms of the world, but he refused them all. His kingdom was not, and *is* not, of this world.

And he is the standard of all Christianity. He is the sole example of all Christians. And *they* are not of the world, *even as he* is not of the world. They are not of the things that are in the world, *even as he* is not of the things that are in the world.

A. T. J.

"Christian Politics" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , pp. 82, 83.

CHRISTIANITY is not of this world.

To his followers Jesus Christ said (and still says): "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world;" and in his memorable prayer (John 17) he said of them, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Vs. 14, 16.

That which is of the world, the world loves, and that which the world engages in with all ardor may safely be set down as being congenial to worldly taste.

And in what does all the world engage more zealously than in politics?

83

The very acme of worldliness is represented in political organizations and methods.

The ballot is an instrument of worldly power. The agent of evil makes use of it as gladly and as freely as does anyone. Not so of the instruments of righteousness,—the weapons which are not carnal.

In the very nature of things, therefore, there can be no such thing as Christian politics.

"Christian politics"—that which we see developing in this country by that name—is politics in its worst and most dangerous form.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , p. 83.

THE Supreme Court of Kansas has legally recognized and sustained the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. A will by which money was left for the purpose of paying for masses for the dead was contested.

The will was sustained. There can be no fair objection to this in itself. For surely people have the right to do with their own money any harmless thing that they may choose. And if money was willed to pay some one for whistling a certain number of times over the grave of the one making the will, the will should be sustained. So with money willed to pay for saying masses. One is as harmless as the other.

But the court did not stop here. Indeed it did not begin here. It began with the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, as quoted from a Catholic book of doctrine *and from the Catholic Bible*. And it sustained the will first of all because of the "wholesomeness" of this doctrine: and secondly because the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of Kansas "interferes with no mere religious practices except such as tend to subvert the foundation of public morals and order."

How courts do love to wander off into the realms of religion, and then sustain their action in so doing by quoting the clauses of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution which forbid their doing so! A. T. J.

"Proof That This Is a Christian Nation" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , p. 83.

"IT is sometimes flippantly asserted that 'This is not a Christian nation;' you have no right to a Christian Sabbath protected by law, for the Constitution of the United States prohibits the establishment of religion." Thus begins an argument to prove that this is a Christian nation, which appears in Vol. 5, No. 1 of "Sunday Reform Leaflets," issued by the Sunday League of America, with headquarters at Columbus, Ohio.

The assumption that this is a Christian nation is the basis for many appeals for legislation, state and national, to enforce the observance of Sunday.

There are many facts which bear upon this question, and they are not so far beneath the surface of things that they cannot be readily pointed out for consideration. Let us examine a few of them for the evidence which they furnish upon this point.

Is this a Christian nation because the people spend some hundreds of millions of dollars every year for whiskey and similar liquors, and about five millions to carry the gospel to the heathen?

Are we a Christian nation because we prefer to give ten times as much for tobacco to smoke and chew as we are willing to give for foreign missions?

Is this a Christian nation because it maintains a great and growing navy for the purpose of inflicting death and destruction upon its enemies?

Is this a Christian nation because it always demands satisfaction for any real or fancied insult to its dignity?

Is this a Christian nation because it shuts up the transgressor in prison, instead of forgiving him the offense?

Are we a Christian nation because we are ruthlessly exterminating the beautiful birds—taking from them the life the Creator gave them—in order that our ladies may have feather-trimmed bonnets to wear to church?

Are we a Christian nation because our church-going people split up into a hundred irreconcilable divisions and sects?

Are we a Christian nation because nine-tenths of the people are twice as eagerly engaged in the pursuit of money and pleasure as in the pursuit of piety?

Which one of these perfectly evident facts demonstrates that we are a Christian nation? Or do they all unite to prove the point?

Will the Sunday League of America—or anyone for that matter—please inform us how this is.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 6 , p. 91.

THE New York *Independent*, of January 27, voices our sentiments in the following:—

"We sympathize with the converted Jew who has been told that he must eat pork as a testimony that he is a real Christian, and who publishes his protest in the leading poem of a Jewish Christian magazine. It brings:

'Oh, canst we eat the flesh of swine,
Because, Lord Jesus, we are thine?'
It is not at all necessary."

There would be a good many more Jews converted to Christianity if they were not given to understand they must as Christians do some things that Christ not only never commanded, but that are positively against his precepts.

February 17, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 7 , p. 97.

CHRISTIANITY is intolerant only of sin. It makes no account of crime, as such.

HE who renders to God the things that are God's, will not fail to give to Cesar that which is Cesar's.

WHEN Cesar dictates what shall be rendered to God, the latter gets only that which Cesar does not want for himself.

THE kind of legislation which debars the "Louisiana lottery" and sanctions church lotteries, will not benefit the country in the long run.

THERE is no reform worthy having that cannot be realized through that individual change of heart which is Scripturally described as being "born again."

THE papacy did not make the union of church and state; the union of church and state made the papacy. Such a union will make a papacy anywhere.

ONE of the greatest delusions of this day is that of moral reform through politics. Such reforms always manage to keep a little way ahead of the present realities.

IF only that missing Scripture text could be found which says that Sunday is the Sabbath, how much less state and national legislation would be needed to afford a basis for Sunday observance!

"IT is not the office of Christianity to remove men from temptation, nor temptation from men." And no legislation to secure either of these ends can be asked for in the name of Christianity.

NOTHING more utterly useless could be imagined than the forming of political organizations in the church with the object of trying to get the Lord to change his mind and accept the kingdoms of this world in its present state.

THE goal of military service is to destroy life; that of Christian service is to save life. And yet many people cannot see that militarism has no proper place in the Christian church, or in the Christian's heart.

"A Chimerical Project" *American Sentinel* 13, 7 , pp. 97, 98.

JESUS CHRIST refused to accept the kingdoms of this world.

Once the people came to take him and make him a king by force; but he departed and hid himself from them. John 6:15.

Upon another occasion the devil offered him all the kingdoms of the world if he would fall down and worship him.

Jesus did not deny that the devil had the control of these kingdoms as he claimed. In fact, at another time he acknowledged the truthfulness of the claim, by referring to Satan as "the prince of this world." John 14:30. But he refused the devil's offer.

It is evident that if Christ had accepted this offer, he would have taken the kingdoms of the world *under* Satan. The devil would not have been destroyed, nor

98

his works. But it was to destroy the devil and his works that Jesus Christ came to earth as the Saviour of men. 1 John 3:8.

The works of the devil must be destroyed before Christ can accept the kingdoms of this earth. But so long as the devil lives, and wicked men exist upon the earth, the the [*sic.*] devil's works will continue. For he is the spirit that "worketh in the children of disobedience."

And there are only two possible ways in which the world can be freed of sinners [*sic.*]. They can be destroyed, and they can be converted. If they refuse to be converted, then there remains but the one way of destruction.

And there is but one possible way in which sinners can be converted, and that is through faith, as revealed in the gospel.

It is therefore perfectly plain that no more chimerical project can be conceived than that of legislating the kingdoms of this earth, or any

one of them, into the hands of Christ. He cannot accept them while the earth remains in its present state.

And it rests entirely with the Lord to remove sinners out of the earth, so that the works of the devil will be destroyed. His power alone can convert sinners, and to destroy sinners is his prerogative alone.

Now, in his love and forbearance, he is appealing to men by his Spirit to become converted and thus fitted for his eternal kingdom. But his Spirit will not always strive with man; and when its work is done,—when man's probation shall have ended and the time of the appointed Judgment shall have come, then God will arise clad in the "garments of vengeance," to do "his strange act," of purging the earth of wickedness by the bolts of his wrath.

Then will be fulfilled the Apocalyptic prophecy (Rev. 11:15-18): "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. . . . And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou . . . shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Also that prophecy of the Psalms, in which God says to his Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Ps. 2:8, 9.

Yet notwithstanding the utterly chimerical nature of the project to legislate the kingdoms of earth into Christ's hands, as made plain by the facts here considered, there are millions of people enrolled in religious societies in this land who are to-day calling upon Congress and the state legislatures for laws which will "regenerate society," make this a "Christian nation," and "enthroned Christ on Capitol Hill."

Never by the remotest possibility can the movement succeed. It can never do any good; but it can—and will—do incalculable harm.

"To Legislators" *American Sentinel* 13, 7 , pp. 98, 99.

WE would call the attention of legislators everywhere to the fact that there are many people in this country who would like to be good, if the legislators would only give them a chance.

They would like to be good, but the laws of the country are not so framed as to make it an easy thing to be good. Hence they go on in sin.

They are waiting for legislation to be enacted which will make it easy to be good, and difficult to be bad.

For example, there are many people who would like to close their shops on Sunday; but if they should do so, without a Sunday law, some other persons would keep their shops open; and how can one person keep his shop closed on Sunday when another person—a rival in business, perhaps—is keeping his shop open and taking in money?

How can it be expected that an individual can afford to sacrifice money—actual cash—for mere religious principle?

Some legislation must be had so that a person can be true to the dictates of conscience without making any sacrifice of a cash value.

As things are now there is a broad way which leads down to ruin, and multitudes are traveling in it; while only a narrow way leads to life, and this is traveled by the few. There must be legislation which will hedge up this broad way, so that it will be narrow and difficult, and at the same time enlarge and smooth down the narrow road to life, so that it will be the easy road, instead of the other.

What do you think, legislators, of the task marked out for you?

Do you think that it is really difficult to be good in this world without the help of state legislation, or that such legislation can make people any better than they are?

The Bible says that it is impossible for any person to be good, under any circumstances, without a change of mind from the carnal to the spiritual.

It says too that it is just as easy for a person to be good after his heart has been renewed by divine grace, under any circumstances, as it was for him to be bad before that work of grace had been done. The testimony is that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Rom. 5:20. Where sin abounded in the heart, before conversion, making the individual do that which is contrary to righteousness, now, after conversion, grace does "much more abound." Certainly then it can be no less easy under the latter state to do right, than before it was to do wrong.

This is the testimony of Scripture; the Scriptural plan of doing right makes no account whatever of any aid from the arm of flesh.

It is always easy for God to do right; he cannot indeed do otherwise. And "Christ in you"—Christ, who is

God, in every one who believes—is the purpose of the gospel, and is the Scriptural and only way of changing from a life of sin to that of righteousness.

"Bible Study with the 'Christian Citizen'" *American Sentinel* 13, 7 , p. 99.

GOD brought his people out of Egypt. Forty years they wandered in the wilderness before they could enter the promised land. During this time, that people were "the church in the wilderness." Acts 7:38. They were out of Egypt, but not yet in their own land; therefore *they had no country* where they were. They were only strangers and pilgrims there. Their only country was the one to which they were going.

Now of Christ, and *in him* of all Christians, it is written, "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Matt. 2:15. Christ was out of Egypt, but he was not in his own land; therefore he had no country, no kingdom where he was: "My kingdom is not of this world." He was a stranger and a pilgrim, between Egypt and the promised land.

Christians are the sons of God. John 1:12; 1 John 3:2. They are called out of Egypt; for "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Christians are out of Egypt, but not yet in the promised land, not yet in their own land; therefore Christians have no country, no kingdom, where they are. Christians are "strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

You may say, "Israel should not have remained in the wilderness all that time." That is true. But they must necessarily be in the wilderness some portion of time; because the wilderness lay between them and the promised land, and they must needs pass through it to get to their own land. And being out of Egypt, and not yet in their own land, it is essentially true that in this interval they had no country and no kingdom where they were; but were strangers in that land, and pilgrims passing through to their own land.

It is true, however, that Israel of old, the ancient "church in the wilderness," should not have remained in the wilderness forty years. They should not have *wandered* in the wilderness at all: they should have gone straight onward from Egypt, from the Red Sea, to the promised land. All this delay and wandering was solely because they "in their *hearts* turned back again into Egypt." Acts 7:39. Bodily, outwardly, professedly, formally, they were out of Egypt. But *in heart* they were yet in Egypt. And being in heart yet in Egypt, they were

ever longing to be there in the body also: the flesh-pots of Egypt were the great object of their desire; and they were ever ready to cry, "Let us make us a captain and go back to Egypt." It was their longing and their failure to be separated *in heart* as well as bodily from that country, that kept them forty years wandering in the wilderness.

Likewise it has been this same thing that has kept the professed Christian church wandering up and down and round and round in the wilderness of this world so long since the time when first "out of Egypt" God called these his sons. From the days of the apostles till this hour the great difficulty and lack in the lives of Christians has been that, though professing to be Christians, and in this professing to have come out of Egypt, they have yet *in heart* been ever inclined toward Egypt. The flesh-pots of Egypt, the things of the country from which they profess to have "come out," have ever had for them a stronger attraction than has the country to which they profess to be going.

These Christians in the United States *profess* to be "strangers and pilgrims on the earth," merely passing through this country to that "better country." Yet in *practice* they take just as much interest in trying to "run things" in this country as though this country was their own, and the only one they ever expect to see. Their profession and their practice do not in any sense agree. If a few of these same "Christian citizens" of the United States were to make a tour of Europe, where they would be strangers and pilgrims, they would not count themselves citizens of the countries through which they passed. And however important and agitating were the affairs of those countries *to those who were citizens* there, yet these tourists—these strangers and pilgrims—would not consider these affairs to be of sufficient concern to them to require more than a mere passing notice. And if these folks were really inconvenienced by some occurrences in the countries through which they were passing, they would bear it gracefully under the comfort that as they did not belong there, it could not last long for they would soon be out of it.

That is the way these "Christian citizens" would act and consider matters if they were to become for a little time "pilgrims and strangers in Europe." Now they profess and proclaim, and sing, that they are "strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Why then do they not act thus in this country *on the earth*, when they know full well that they would act precisely that way in any country in Europe? Is it not perfectly plain that a pilgrimage in Europe would be to them a much more real

thing, than is pilgrimage on the earth which they profess and proclaim, and of which they sing?

But any "Christian" to whom earthly things are more real than are heavenly things—even his Christianity is not real. Any "Christian" to whom a pilgrimage in Europe would be more substantial and practical, than is his pilgrimage *on the earth*, is not in fact a pilgrim on the earth at all. His professing it, his proclaiming it, and his signing it, are all a fraud.

"Out of Egypt have I called my Son." Christians are the sons of God. They are therefore out of Egypt. But, through out of Egypt, they are not yet in "their own land." Therefore they are strangers and pilgrims on the earth, they are without a country in this world, and are active citizens nowhere but in heaven. "Our citizenship is in heaven."
A. T. J.

"Why Is It?" *American Sentinel* 13, 7 , p. 103.

THE greatest power in the universe is the power of God.

The greatest power is capable of accomplishing greater results than any lesser power.

In the direction of reform, therefore, the greatest results will be accomplished by the power of God.

"The power of God for the reformation of man is manifested in the gospel, and in that alone. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16.

There is now a great call made for moral reform and the regeneration of society.

Yet those who are sounding this call and organizing movements for its accomplishment, do not propose to make use of this power of God which is by faith, but of another power—the ballot.

Why do they propose to use the ballot in the place of the power of God? Why do they pass by the greatest power in the universe and select a power which is infinitely inferior to it?

February 24, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 8 , p. 113.

REFORM individuals, and there will be no need of "national reform."

RELIGIOUS legislation not only invades the rights of man, but those of God himself.

EVERY appeal made by the "Christian" church to the state is a denial of the power of godliness.

THE ballot stands for physical force, but physical force does not and cannot stand for morality.

ERROR is always asking the aid of the state to avert the danger of a collision with truth. But truth never fears such a collision.

A SUNDAY law is all right, upon the theory that it is proper for one person to sacrifice principle in order to save some other person's feelings.

THE only thing that force can accomplish with bad citizens is to put them in the penitentiary. There is not force enough in the world to reform one individual, even were it all concentrated upon him.

THE tendency of modern civilization is to destroy individuality; and the only sure refuge for individuality is in the gospel. Without individuality there could be no faith; and without faith, there could be no gospel.

ONE of the strangest things in this age of marvels is that Sunday can be commercially the first day of the week, and at the same time be religiously—as we are told—the seventh day! How this can be we do not understand.

IT is not according to the gospel that a person should be compelled to do what is right. Whether a thing is morally right or wrong, therefore, is a question with which civil government cannot concern itself; for civil government was not instituted to proceed contrary to the gospel. Its proper inquiry is, with respect to anything. Is it contrary to the preservation of individual rights?

"Bible Study with the 'Christian Citizen'" *American Sentinel* 13, 8 , pp. 113, 114.

THE people of Israel in the wilderness was "the church in the wilderness." Acts 7:38.

While they were yet in the wilderness, shortly before they entered the land of Caanan [*sic.*], God said of them, "Lo! the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23:9.

This was spoken of his church, when as yet it was a separate people: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

This was said of his church when they were about to enter the land of their permanent habitation. It was expressing his will concerning them, that they should not be reckoned among the nations.

Thus he never intended his people to set up a state, to establish a kingdom, or to have an part in any such thing. They were not to be reckoned among the nations.

His people then being the church, when he said, "The people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations," he simply said that it was his will that there should be forever a fixed separation between his church and any state or kingdom of the nations on earth. In that word he simply said that the separation which

114

then existed between that church from all nations, states, and kingdoms, should so continue forever.

That church, then, was never in his purpose to become a state or kingdom like the nations of the earth. It was not to be "reckoned among the nations." The people were not to mingle with the people of the nations, to learn their ways or follow their customs. Nor was the church—the whole body of the people—to become a state or kingdom like the nations.

The only organization of the people in the wilderness was church organization. They had nothing comparable in any way to a state or governmental organization. They had government: but it was *church* government. Jesus Christ was then the head of the church, as really as he has ever been. They had a Ruler; but he was a *religious* ruler, and religious only. Thus everything about them, all with which they had to do in the matter of government or organization, was altogether religious and churchly.

Such being the only government or organization that they knew; and in that at the time being already separated from all the nations; when the Lord said of them, "The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations," it was the plain declaration of the Lord's purpose that thus they should forever remain—knowing no kind of organization but church organization, knowing no kind of government but that of God, which is solely religious.

Thus the Lord taught then and for all time that the members of his church, those who profess to be his people, shall never be reckoned among the nations, shall never have any active citizenship, or connection with, the nations of the earth.

And that word which was then spoken of his church, is yet spoken of his church. There still stands that sentence in the revealed will of God to his church. That word speaks just as distinctly to the members of his church to-day as it did to his church that day. Whether his church at that ancient day heeded this word or not, does not affect the fact that such was God's plainly-declared purpose concerning them. And whether those who profess to be his church to-day regard that word or not, does not affect the fact that there stands the word declaring forever that the Lord's people, the church of God, "shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

Christian citizenship *on the earth* is a contradiction of the plain word of God. It is in fact a contradiction in terms.

Christian citizenship *in heaven*, even while sojourning on the earth, is the plain truth of the word of God. And it is a glorious fact in Christian experience.

A. T. J.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 8 , p. 114.

THE *Christian Citizen* says that "the teachings of history but emphasize the oft-expressed conviction of leading thinkers that the greatest crisis in our national history impends." That is true. And it is equally true that nothing is helping more to hasten this impending crisis, than is this same "Christian citizenship" in its persistent mixing up of Christianity and politics, of church and state.

"What May We Expect?" *American Sentinel* 13, 8 , p. 115.

WHAT is there about Sunday which leads its defenders to make such inexcusable blunders as that which appears in the following?:-

"When ought we to prepare for Sunday? Ex. 16:23.

"When God prepared food for the children of Israel, did he prepare any on Sunday? Ex. 16:27."

These questions are part of a "catechism on the Sabbath," which is printed in a late issue of the *Christian Endeavor World*, with the indorsement of John Willis Baer, the general secretary of the Endeavor organization. They amount to a definite assertion, that the

children of Israel kept Sunday during their wanderings in the wilderness.

Now everybody knows that the children of Israel in the wilderness did not keep Sunday, or the first day of the week at all. Everybody knows that it is not claimed even by the most ardent advocates of Sunday, that the Israelites kept it. The very phrase "Jewish Sabbath" which those advocates delight to repeat in controversy, and by which they refer to the seventh day of the week, is a standing evidence of their belief upon this point.

The Jews have kept the same weekly day ever since they first became known as a nation. This no one will seriously dispute.

And now the general secretary of the Christian Endeavor Society deliberately puts it out as truth that the Jews, back in their journey from Egypt to Canaan, kept Sunday; that it was Sunday that God designated by miracles in connection with the falling manna, as his Sabbath!

We mention this because it leads us to make the inquiry, To what lengths of error will the great Christian Endeavor body be led in their support of Sunday? If they will believe this, as they are of course expected to, being printed in their leading organ and indorsed by the official who stands next to the president, what will they not believe in the line of religious error?

And since it is true that people act in accordance with their beliefs, and since the Christian Endeavorers are expected to be young men and women of action, what mistakes may they not be expected to commit in action? This, in the case of such a body, is a very serious question.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 8 , p. 117.

THERE is no such thing as national Christianity, Christianity cannot be national; it cannot partake of any characteristics of earthly powers. There cannot be American Christianity and German Christianity, English, French, or Russian Christianity. Christianity changes that which it touches, but is not at all changed itself. It is the same everywhere, is altogether divine, and altogether what it was in the life of Jesus of Nazareth.

March 3, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 9 , p. 129.

IF you fear God, you will not fear anything else.

THE man who is least patriotic generally does the most belligerent talking.

THE Omnipotent himself could not successfully fight evil with the devil's weapons.

IN whatever thing there is justice, there is God. The two cannot be divorced.

THERE could be no worse exhibition of taking God's name in vain than that of parading it in the constitution of a civil government.

IT does not take very much to convince the man who wants legislation to regulate the religion of the country, that he is a successor of the prophets.

BECAUSE it would be a great gain if the people would all do right, it does not follow that anything would be gained by making laws to compel them to do right.

IN religion God is the governor, and there can rightfully be no other. How then can a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," rightfully concern itself with religion?

IF it be true that "figures won't lie," how is it that the apostles of "Christian Citizenship" figure that the saints in this evil world are going to be able to outvote the sinners?

DO you want your own religious practice to be regulated by a state or national legislature? And if not, are you willing that such regulation should be imposed upon your neighbor?

THERE is a great struggle among the various classes in this country to-day, religious and otherwise, to monopolize the application of that phrase of the Constitution which reads, "We, the people of the United States."

"To Preserve the Earth" *American Sentinel* 13, 9 , pp. 129, 130.

"YE are the salt of the earth." So said Jesus Christ to his followers, and the words remain true of his followers to-day. That is to say, the followers of Christ—Christians—are the preservers of the earth.

They are the preservers of the earth because they are Christians. And Christians are not of this earth, but have been "born from above." They are in the world, but not of the world. They have been "called

out" from that which is of the world. Christ has chosen them out of the world, and the world recognizes this fact by hating them. John 15:19.

Christians therefore are the preservers of the world by being unlike the world. They are the "salt of the earth" by being unlike the world in which they are, even as salt is unlike that in which it is placed.

But to this statement that Christians are the salt of the earth, the Saviour added: "but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Matt. 5:13.

If the salt loses its taste, so that its presence in the food cannot be distinguished, it is good for nothing; it will neither season anything nor preserve it. And if

130

Christians, in the world, become conformed to the world, they are good for nothing as preservers of the world.

And now for years it has stood forth as a fact before all the people, and one becoming ever more prominent, that those who profess to be follower of Christ, the members of the churches, are combining into organizations to work by political methods for the salvation of the state. Through methods which are of the world, and in the use of which they must be identified with the world, they propose to work for the preservation of the world.

While the Word of God which they profess to believe says that the world is preserved only by that which is unlike the world, they propose to preserve it only by that which is like the world.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that as certainly as the words of Christ are true, the Christians Citizenship and kindred organizations who are working to get control of the popular ballot and to shape legislation, for the preservation of the state, in these very things are working directly for the destruction of the state. In just so far as they make use of these methods they become identified with the world and lose their identity as Christians; for as Christians, they are to pursue methods of work for the uplifting of mankind which rest not upon the power and wisdom of man, but of God; not upon the power of law, but of love.

Why cannot Christians see that in their Christianity—their separation from the world, their nonconformity to it, their very lack of identity with it in anything—lies the only guaranty of the world's preservation?

"Bible Study with the 'Christian Citizen'" *American Sentinel* 13, 9 , p. 130.

BEFORE Israel entered the land of Canaan the Lord said of them, "Lo the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23:9.

This said to them as plainly as it was possible to say that they, God's people, were not to be formed into a nation, a state, kingdom, or government, as were the nations round. They were to "dwell alone," a distinct and separate people, individually and collectively, in character and in government.

However, after they had entered that land and dwelt awhile there, they set their hearts on having a king, a state, a government, like all the nations. Therefore they said to Samuel, "Make us a king, like all the nations." This greatly displeased the prophet, and he prayed unto the Lord.

But the Lord said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee; but they have rejected me that I should not reign over them." "Now therefore hearken unto their voice; howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them." "Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us: that we may be like all the nations."

For Israel then to have any other king than God; for them to have any government than that of God; was to reject God. It was sheer apostasy. Of course Israel then did not believe it, and professed Israel now will not believe it. Yet the Lord said it; and it was true then and it is true now.

Israel was then the church. When they formed themselves into a state, that was a positive union of church and state. And when the church to-day form themselves into the state, or into a part of the state, that is also a positive union of church and state.

Perhaps the *Christian Citizen* will insist that there was not a union of church and state in Israel when the same identical individuals were members of both! This is its plea on such a condition in the United States; why will not the plea hold good on the same condition in ancient Israel?

The simple truth is that Israel had been called out of Egypt, separated from the nations, and formed into the church. And it was simply impossible for them to form, or have any connection with, any state, without in that very thing forming a union of church and state. It

was impossible for any individual to do so without forming *so far* a union of church and state.

And still God is calling his sons "out of Egypt," separating them from the nations, and forming them into his church. And still it is impossible for these to have active connection with any state without in that very thing forming a union of church and state. It is impossible for any individual church member to have active connection with any state without *so far* and in himself forming a union of church and state.

The whole history of Israel, the whole history of the church in the Bible as well as out, the whole Bible itself demonstrates that this is everlastingly the truth.

For the professed people of God to interfere in the politics and affairs of the nations and attempt to decide these matters and to "run things," is to say to all people that the government of God is not enough for them; but they must make and run one of their own. They certify that the laws of God are not enough for them; but they must make a set of their own. It is only to say that the government, the kingdom, of God is not perfect, and that therefore its laws are not sufficient for them.

Of course all this is a clear repudiation of God as King, Governor, and Lawgiver; and a putting of their own selves in his place as all these.

Against the solemn protest of God ancient Israel did set them up a kingdom like all the nations. And the logical result was complete destruction.

Against the plain word and the same solemn protest of the Lord, the professed church of to-day persist in doing the same thing, And nothing can come of it yet but complete destruction.

So far as these "Christian citizen" folks are concerned, why was the Word of God written? What good are its lessons and warnings to them? "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?"
A. T. J.

"The Papacy Asking State Aid" *American Sentinel* 13, 9 , pp. 133, 134.

IN no wise abashed by the rising sentiment against state aid to sectarianism, as seen in the attitude of Protestant churches and in decisions of the courts, the papal authorities in this country continue to ask for Government aid for their sectarian schools.

The latest instance of this of which we have notice is a plea made by Archbishop Ryan, before a committee of U. S. Senators, on February 3 last. It has been the policy of the Government to gradually reduce the customary appropriations for these schools, and the archbishop asked that no further reduction be made in the amount appropriated for 1898.

He presented a number of arguments in support of his plea; but not one of them was based upon any principle of justice or free government. Of course, no such principle will support an argument of that nature. His arguments were based on policy purely, and from the standpoint of policy they were somewhat plausible.

But in government, as in other matters, "honesty is the best policy," always. Let the Government be honest with the people's money.

The archbishop touched at some length upon the subject of sectarianism, and his remarks upon this topic are interesting, if not convincing.

"This word sectarianism, gentlemen," he said, "is the most thoroughly misunderstood, and at present perhaps the most mischievous word in the English language. Properly speaking, sectarianism is the religion of sects, that is, of bodies cut away—as the term implies—from the original church. Unsectarian religion is the religion of that original church. But this is not the meaning popularly attached to it. Webster defines as sectarian 'one of a party in religion which has separated itself from an established church or which holds tenets different from those of the prevailing denomination.' Now as we have no established church, for union of church and state in our circumstances is out of the question, and there is a dispute as to which is the 'prevailing denomination,' a 'sectarian' is not easy to find. For a man to preach unsectarianism it is supposed that he must avoid all doctrines in which he may disagree with any one of his audience. Now as every doctrine of Christians has been denied by some one, unsectarian preaching is simply impossible when the audience is representative of all shades of religious opinion. What is called unsectarian teaching is attempted in some of our public institutions by what are known as 'moral instructors,' but it is sometimes the most sectarian of all teaching, as it represents simply the peculiar religious views not of a body, but of the individual who teaches."

"One can therefore easily see that what is so-called unsectarian religion is logically impossible; and even if it existed, could not practically affect individual morality."

As regards the logical impossibility of unsectarian religious teaching, the archbishop's remarks are sound. There is simply no religious body in the world to-day which must not, from the human standpoint, be regarded as a sect. And this being so, the archbishop's definition of sectarianism is of no practical value. As the Memorial of the Baptists and Quakers to the legislature of Virginia, truthfully said, "It is . . . impossible for the civil magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility." It remains for God to reveal to the individual, by his Word and the Holy Spirit, what is the true religion,—the religion of the "original church."

But as regards the appropriation of public money, it is not necessary to consider which is the original church and which of the religious bodies are sects; for it is not the province of civil government to give public funds to the original church any more than to a sectarian body. The principle upon which this fact rests is simply that it is not justice for the civil government to favor one party or class of the people at the expense of another class. This is a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and under it all classes must be treated alike. The believer must not be favored at the expense of the unbeliever. The latter must not be forced to contribute to the support of any religion, whether sectarian or otherwise.

A characteristic papal argument was presented by the archbishop in the following:—

"Gentlemen, we do not ask money from you to teach our religion, but to impart secular education, the value of which you can test by your own inspectors, as is done in Protestant England. If, in addition to this secular learning, we by the influence of religion make these Indian children purer and better now and more obedient to authority when they become men, will you reject our services simply because we teach the religion that has civilized the world?"

The chief quality of this paragraph is assumption. What religion is it that has "civilized the world"? Is it the Roman Catholic religion? or is it the Protestant religion? or the Jewish religion? Or has any religion done it? These are questions which cannot be settled by the word of an archbishop; nor is it the business of any committee of Congress to consider them. Congress has no more right to base an appropriation of public money upon the assumption that the papal religion has civilized the world, than it has to throw the people's money into the

sea. Congress has no business whatever to pronounce, either directly or indirectly, upon a religious question.

Will the papal religion, also, make the Indian children "purer and better" than they would be without it? This also is pure assumption, and one which many other people, both religious and otherwise, would deny. And that, as the archbishop stated, the papacy does not ask for state money to teach religion, but to impart secular education, is a piece of very thin sophistry. These Catholic

134

Indian schools are religious schools, and were it not for the religion which is taught in them they would not exist at all. For a prelate of the Catholic Church—or for that matter, of any church—to claim that religion is not the main thing in the eye of the church, is simply absurd. Religion is that upon which the church depends for her very existence; it is the mainspring of all her action.

Anyone familiar with Catholic literature knows that "secular education," apart from religion, is frequently denounced in it as being worse than no education at all. But if any person, despite all other proofs, were still inclined to regard Rome as the friend of secular education, he has but to look to those countries in which Rome rules, or has ruled until recently, to find evidence which will convince him if he is open to conviction. Where, outside of the wilds of central Africa, would one go to find ignorance and superstition so dense and presenting such an impassable barrier to right and reason, as in the priest-ridden districts of Ireland, Mexico, or South America? To any one familiar with geography, it is impossible to dissociate in the mind the mention of one of these countries from the thought of a land where the masses of the people spend their lives in ignorance, superstition, and poverty.

If the archbishop had presented a true statement of the case, he would have spoken like this: Gentlemen, unless the United States Government pays for the maintenance of our Catholic Indian schools, the church will have to maintain them herself. But the church does not want to do this. It is true they are church schools, wholly under the church's direction and control, and in which the foremost consideration is to bring the pupils into the Catholic fold; but we would like the Government to stand the expense, while we reap the benefit. Remember, gentlemen, that it is the bounden duty of the Government to educate these "wards of the nation"—in the Catholic belief. So, gentlemen, I ask that you will kindly appropriate the people's money

for this purpose: and if this is against their will, let it be remembered that the people ought not to have any will that is contrary to the Catholic Church.

And besides, it is a settled principle of our belief that the state ought to support the church; and this principle, which by the way is a very important one, seems in danger of being discarded here in the matter of these Government appropriations. Hence I particularly ask that the same be continued undiminished to the Catholic schools, since each such appropriation is a recognition of this principle as being just and right.

And remember also, gentlemen of the committee, that it will cost considerably more to build and maintain Government schools for the Indians than it costs to maintain our church schools, since these are already built and employ teachers who, having devoted their lives to the church, work for religion's sake and not for money. Therefore to proceed upon the principle of separation of church and state, will cost you thousands of dollars; and I ask you to consider, gentlemen, whether it will pay to revert to constitutional principles of government at the cost of so much money.

This is what truth would compel one to say, and substantially all that one could say, in asking state aid for the maintenance of sectarian schools. Such aid is simply a misappropriation of money,—a use of it never authorized by those to whom it belongs. The state in giving such aid does that which, in the case of a private individual, would be counted a crime to be punished by a term in jail. The papal authorities ask that the state shall continue to do this, notwithstanding it has begun the establishment of a contrary policy. The SENTINEL asks that the Government discontinue these misappropriations [*sic.*] and adhere to the foundation principles of free government, at whatever cost in money. The right way will be the cheapest way in the end.

We note, however, the statement made editorially in the journal which reported the archbishop's plea—the *Catholic Standard and Times*, of the 19th inst.—that "We have just learned that since his plea was delivered the Senate committee has decided to recommend an addition of ten per cent. to the appropriation already voted by the House." This certainly justifies calling the attention of the American people to the subject as one of practical interest to them at this time.

March 10, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 10 , p. 145.

THE primary object of proper legislation is protection to the individual.

AN appeal to precedent is often a convenient but never a justifiable means of ignoring duty

ANY religious institution which cannot be upheld by truth and love alone, would better go down.

IF you vote for a Sunday law or for any form of religious legislation, be assured it will hurt nobody more than yourself.

SO long as conscientious conviction remains independent of legislation or physical force, so long will the supervision of morality remain outside the sphere of the state.

THE law of God makes of the Sabbath a day of rest. The law of man can only make of it a day of restraint. There is no ease in restraint, and there can be no true rest without ease.

"GIVE me liberty or give me death," said Patrick Henry. A good many to-day say, Give me liberty and give me death. There is no real liberty in using or doing that which brings death.

IF the world is growing worse, it is because men are rejecting the Spirit of God; and only that which will remove the cause can effect a remedy. Obviously this can not be done by legislation.

"NOT by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." This is the watchword of all true reforms.

THE Sabbath law of Jehovah covers completely the whole subject of the duty and privilege of every individual with respect to a weekly day of rest. That law is still in force; and any human legislation on the subject must be superfluous and impertinent. The fact that God has enacted a Sabbath law affords the poorest possible reason for demanding that the state enact one also.

"Two 'Sabbath' Reforms" *American Sentinel* 13, 10 , pp. 145, 146.

THERE are in progress in the United States—and elsewhere—two movements which aim at a reformation in the observance of the "Sabbath."

One of these movements depends for success upon the enactment and enforcement of laws by which all persons will be compelled to observe the day. The other, representing but a small minority of the people, could not if it would call to its aid the arm of the

civil power. It depends for success wholly upon the spiritual power of truth.

Both of these movements are making progress; they are both marked. But the latter is, in principle, a direct contradiction of the former.

With the vast preponderance of numbers, influence, and wealth on its side, the movement for a stricter and more general observance of Sunday, claims that legislation and prosecution are necessary to turn the people to an observance of the Sabbath. On the other hand, the movement for the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath asserts that legislation, so far from being a help to Sabbath observance, is a positive and formidable hindrance

146

to it; and proceeds upon its way independently of legislation and of popular custom and belief.

It proceeds even in spite of legislation, and in the face of every obstacle which lies naturally in the pathway of that which is unpopular.

And by this very thing it is demonstrated beyond any possible question that Sabbath reform does not depend upon legislation in any form.

If a movement which has neither wealth, numbers, social influence, tradition or popular custom back of it, but must move against all these things, can do so without the aid of any legislation whatever, and even against the decree of the civil power, cannot a movement which has all these in its favor, proceed without the help of legislation?

If it cannot, it is certain that it is lacking in some vital point,—that it has some inherent weakness which is fatal to its life; so that at best it can only be a dead reform, instead of one which can impart moral life to the people.

The movement which calls people to observe the seventh-day Sabbath is unpopular. It calls upon men to sacrifice—to give up position, money, social standing, and everything savoring of worldly honor and advancement. Yet in spite of all this, it is moving on rapidly, both here and in almost all nations and peoples of the earth.

If the movement for Sunday observance were moving forward with a rapidity, as compared with that for the seventh day, proportionate to the greater numbers, wealth and influence which it represents, it would be moving almost inconceivably faster than it is.

And that it does not do this, is proof positive that it is lacking in that in which the seventh-day Sabbath movement is strong; that is, the spiritual power of truth. There is in it no power of divine conviction.

Such a "Sabbath reform" therefore—however good in purpose and honest in belief its promoters may be—must be set down as a sham and a delusion. And it is certainly not the proper business of any legislature to try to further the progress of such a thing among the people.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 10 , p. 146.

THE *Christian Citizen* says that "But for that government [the Roman government] Jesus himself could not have lived and taught till his work was finished."

Does not the *Christian Citizen* know that every child knows that "But for the Roman government Jesus himself" could not have been put to death when he was? and that "But for the Roman government" he could not have been put to death *at all* as he was—by crucifixion?

Does not everybody, unless it be the *Christian Citizen* know that the Jews said and truly, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death"? and that they had to repudiate God, and claim "no king but Cesar;" and under profession of loyalty to Cesar, charge Pilate with disloyalty to Cesar, and threaten him with the consequences of such disloyalty, in order to swing the Roman government so that Jesus should be killed?

And by these same tokens does not everybody, unless it be the *Christian Citizen*, know that "But for that government" Jesus could have lived and taught until this hour?

We do not suggest in any of this that government is useless in the world. Government is all right in its place. But when it is in the hands of religionists, or when its power can be swung by political religionists, it is the worst thing in the world; because then it is used for the destruction of the best people in the world, as was done in the case of the Lord Jesus. And it is the same record from Nimrod until now.

A. T. J.

"The Mormon Object Lesson" *American Sentinel* 13, 10 , pp. 147, 148.

THE Mormon object lesson is becoming more plain to the people of the United States as time goes on. Many who are in the best

position to judge, now realize that in its estimate of Mormonism the country has made a mistake; and that mistake is just this: **the great evil of Mormonism did not consist in its polygamy, but in its union of church and state.**

The country had its eye upon polygamy; that seemed to be the great evil pertaining to Mormonism that needed to be suppressed. To this public attention was directed. Books were written to expose its evil and arouse public sentiment against it. Finally, laws were enacted—and enforced—for the suppression of the practice, and apparently, after some opposition, they were successful. The president of the church promulgated a decree against it; the church promised to abandon it; the state constitution of Utah was made to expressly forbid it. Under these assurances Utah was received into the Union as a sovereign state.

But the people did not see deep enough. They did not understand the evil of a union of church and state,—or, as it may be said, of a union of the state with religion. And now they find, to their great concern if not to their consternation, that in the suppression of polygamy they have not cut the root of the Mormon evil, but only a sprout which it bore. *The root being left, the sprout may—and naturally will—grow out again.*

But we will present the situation as it is stated by Mr. Eugene Young, in the *Independent* (N. Y.), for March 3, as part of a symposium on "The Mormon Question," which this leading American journal deems a timely topic for consideration. We quote Mr. Young's article entire. It is worth a careful perusal:—

"Politics, not polygamy, have been responsible for all our troubles.' This remark was made to me during the heat of one of the church and state campaigns in Utah by a Mormon leader who had closely followed the history of his people. One who treads the same ground as he did will find much to corroborate his views. Through Mormon tradition runs the record of a temporal ambition, so dominating and aggressive that it has always aroused the enmity of those with whom the people have come in contact, either in a business or political way. It is an ambition that practically has no limit, its first idea being to bring within the pale of the church 'every nation, kindred, tongue and people' on the earth.

"Mormonism early showed its high opinion of its own importance. In the thirties, when only a small band of extremists had been gathered from the dissatisfied ones of other sects to Nauvoo, Ill., Joseph Smith, the so-called prophet, was set up by his people as a candidate for the presidency of the United States on a

platform of 'free trade and sailors' rights.' This candidacy was the climax of a series of political movements among the Latter-day Saints that had gained them the enmity of both parties in the State. The church leaders claimed and exercised the right to dictate the politics of their followers and used their power to secure concessions on all sides, until at last, becoming angry at double-dealing, the people of Illinois cast out the curious sect.

"When the new home was sought in Missouri nothing had been learned in political matters through the experience in Illinois. The 'prophet' continued to direct even the most minute temporal affairs of the people, and State matters once more became his plaything. The citizens of Missouri might have tolerated polygamy, because at that time their moral force had not become so highly potent as it probably would be to-day; but they would not accord to the Mormons the right to play fast and loose in politics. Partisan feeling ran high in the forties, and Missouri was a battle-ground between the two great national factions. When Joseph Smith united church and state matters, there he came to grief. His people were driven to the West, and to use a Mormon phrase, 'he was martyred.'

"The same forces have been at work in Utah ever since. Gold-seekers, who were making their way to California in the fifties, found in the valleys of the Great Basin a veritable Mormon kingdom, ruled absolutely by the head of the church and levying tribute on all who needed supplies. Adventurous men who settled in the midst of the strange religious people found themselves limited by Mormon ambitions on every hand. Search for the rich mineral deposits of 'Deseret,' as the Mormon state was called, was forbidden by the church leaders, who thought that by concealing the precious metals they might keep out the Gentiles and be unmolested in their ambition to rule. Any one who would not bow to the hierarchy was given to understand that there would be no opportunity in business or politics, for him until finally those who opposed the temporal practices, and not the religious teachings of the Mormon Church, awakened the forces which made such a long and bitter fight against polygamy.

"They found at hand a most suitable weapon. Some of them were not in a position to criticise the moral phases of Mormonism, and a large percentage were men who denied the existence of God and scoffed at his commandments. But they realized the force of the great religious sentiment of the country, and awakened it to make war against polygamy. In the bitter years that followed not the least influential of the elements which opposed the dominant church was striking at its political power. Hack politicians from the East, gamblers, saloon men and atheistic miners vied with the devoted missionaries in the general fight. Their idea was to free the police, municipal governments, legislature, and courts from the

overshadowing influence of the priesthood, so they might have a voice in the government and business of the Territory. They sought to divide the Mormon people in politics, in order that there might be some opportunity for the minority, at least, to make its ideas known.

"The feeling that polygamy was not the chief evil of Mormonism was shown curiously after its abandonment by the manifesto of Wilford Woodruff, in 1890. Even after it was conceded that the Mormons had accepted the new 'revelation,' the old Gentile party in Utah continued its organization and campaign, declaring it would not disband until sufficient assurance was given that the priesthood should not control politics. Several promises and statements that the church leaders should never again endeavor to control the action of their people had to be made before real division on national political lines was brought about.

148

"Statehood was bestowed upon Utah because it was believed that the members of the dominant church had become honestly divided. What has been the result? Briefly, the priesthood has been gradually regaining all the power it abandoned in order to lull the suspicions of the religious people of this country. Mormon ambition is entrenched behind absolute authority, and is able to bid defiance to the religious sentiment of the country, and to trade for political power. In fact, the Mormon kingdom, of which Joseph Smith and Brigham Young dreamed, seems likely to become a reality.

"The hold of the church upon the State is becoming stronger with every year. The governorship was put in the hands of Heber M. Wells, a young man who had been the hands of Heber M. Wells, a young man who had been closely identified with church business matters, in the first election under statehood. The Supreme Court and some of the district courts, by inadvertence, were given to the Gentiles. A United States senatorship was seized for the son of George Q. Cannon, the real head of the church. The second election resulted in the defeat of the most determined Mormon opponent of the union of church and state, Moses Thatcher, whose ambition to be United States senator was balked by the leaders. Salt Lake City was wrested last year from the control of the Gentiles, and a faithful Mormon was made mayor. School boards were next attacked, and churchmen whose loyalty to their 'file leaders' was unquestioned, were placed in power. There are still several promising fields in which the church leaders may operate; and it can hardly be doubted that they will not rest until they have secured as complete control of Utah as Tammany has of New York.

"One of the outgrowths of the increased power of the priesthood is seen in the new policy in educational matters. Before Utah became a State the schools of Salt Lake City and other important places, and the University and Agricultural college were the pride of all the people. Good salaries were paid to teachers, and it was the aim of those in control to secure the best possible talent. Teachers were drawn even from New York and Massachusetts on the east and California on the west. The broadest and most modern educational ideas were put in force. This is being changed now. With the control by the priesthood of the educational officials, the idea of employing only young men and women of Utah, and eventually, of course, only young Mormons as teachers, is becoming dominant. In this is seen one of the striking examples of the use of Mormon political power, and the principle applied will fit in almost any department of the State.

"If the church and state matters were to be confined to Utah, however, perhaps the subject would be unworthy of more than passing notice. The 70,000 or more Gentiles could be left to work out their own fortunes or leave the State. But there is a broader meaning to Mormon ambition than is found in the mere contemplation of the little western State, which is of vital interest to the whole country.

"Utah has two United States senators. The church has demonstrated its ability to choose these officials, for both Senators Cannon and Rawlins owe their seats to the exercise of the priesthood's power. Wyoming has two more. The Mormons are very strong in the western counties. Idaho has two more. Senators Shoup and Heitfeldt owe their election to the Mormon vote in the

legislature, in which the church has held the balance of power for four years. Here, then, are six senatorial votes and nine electoral votes over which the Mormon leaders will have at least partial control.

"Moreover, as Apostle Lyman said in an address before the Mormon conference in Brooklyn, 'Zion is spreading out. Zion wants more room to grow.' The old aggressive missionary work of the church has been started again since the Federal Government generously gave the priesthood freedom and restored to it the property that had been confiscated. Converts are again being sent out to the West. Mormon settlements in Colorado and Nevada are very considerable, and politicians in each have learned to make concessions to secure the Mormon vote. Politicians in Arizona, which must some day become a State, now acknowledge that the balance of power in its affairs is held in Salt Lake City. New Mexico also has a growing Mormon population that is bound to become potent. It will thus be seen that the church vote, properly handled, might become a most powerful factor in the politics of the intermountain States.

"Will it be so handled? The only answer one can give is that Mormon ambition in the past has never hesitated to secure power; Mormon leaders are among the most astute politicians in this country; and the Mormon people have ever been plastic when the priesthood has told them the good of 'God's people' would come from obedience to their leaders."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 10 , p. 161.

THE country has before it two object lessons warning against a union of church and state. One is Spain,—once the foremost nation in Europe, now bringing up the rear; vanquished by each of her American colonies; bankrupt in purse and prestige, and without any creditable history since the discovery of America,—Spain, the ever-faithful adherent of the Roman Catholic Church. The other object lesson—and one which the country is obliged to notice—is Utah: now endowed with the powers of a sovereign State, and rapidly furnishing evidence of being under the control of the Mormon Church. The American people revolted at the idea of the perpetuation of polygamy; but it has been demonstrated that the union of religion with the state is a greater evil than polygamy; that is, and not polygamy, is the root evil of Mormonism. Will the people of the United States now proceed to establish a religious state, for which millions of religious people here are now working? Will they establish on a national scale what

Utah has furnished on the scale of a single State? If they do, with these object lessons before them, they will certainly be without excuse.

March 17, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 11 , p. 161.

"JUDGE not, and ye shall not be judged." "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned."

EVERY Christian is called of God to be a reformer, but not one is called to reform any nation, community, or individual, by the power of legislatures or of courts.

THE church might lobby till doomsday to secure legislation in behalf of religious institutions, without ever convincing the world that there is such a thing as the power of godliness.

AMS regards religion, the majority in this world have always been on the wrong side. Hence the vote of the majority in a religious question is practically certain to be on the side of error.

MEN are not made good or bad by the government; but the government is made good or bad by the men who conduct it. Reform the men, and there will be no occasion for a reform in the government.

THE only government that is suited to a corrupt people is a despotism. When the American people become corrupt, a despotism must and will be set up over them. Despotism is the inevitable sequence of national corruption.

WHEN the "peace of God" rules in the heart, there is quiet in the soul; and that quietness is a hundred fold more essential to proper Sabbath observance than all the quiet that can be secured by Sunday laws. Without it, indeed, no real Sabbath observance is possible.

A SUNDAY law is a tax, demanding one seventh of all an individual's time. And this time is money to the individual, but cannot possibly be such to the government which demands it. It is of all taxes the most absurd, useless, unwarranted, and unjust. God alone has the right to require one seventh of a person's time, and he alone has a wise purpose in requiring it.

IT is very strange that a prayer-meeting or other religious service can be held in the church on any "week-day" evening without being at all disturbed by work and traffic, but cannot be held on Sunday

without "great disturbance," if there happens to be any work or traffic in the vicinity. One would think it was not possible to be religious except in the midst of absolute quiet.

"A Word More on the Flag Salute" *American Sentinel* 13, 11 , pp. 161, 162.

IN reply to a correspondent from Iowa, who writes us that many people object to the SENTINEL'S opposition to the flag salute on the ground that it would stifle patriotism, we take occasion to say a word more on the salute in its relation to patriotism.

The only salute we have specifically noticed is that used at Boulder, Col., which required the pupil to make a profession of allegiance to God. It was on this ground mainly that the SENTINEL opposed it.

The flag salute is used in many other States; and so far as we know, in no other does it contain any reference to God. Without this it is of course much less objectionable. But there are some principles which apply to these salutes in general, by which we think their character for good or evil must be determined. It is our aim to touch upon these in this article.

162

In the first place, we think there is ample evidence that, in most cases, the flag salute is designed rather to foster militarism than patriotism. That the spirit of militarism is creeping into the public schools, cannot be denied. The "Boys' Brigades" which are now so much "in evidence," marching through the streets equipped with all the accouterments of war, demonstrate this. The spirit that glorifies war is the spirit of militarism.

But militarism is not patriotism. Militarism means despotism, patriotism—in this country at least—stands for the opposite of despotism. Militarism is the curse of Europe. And if it is ever set up here, it will be the curse of America. We do not want it, and no true patriot will encourage it.

And in the second place, there is no evidence that the flag salute is an incentive to patriotism. The salute is but a form, and you cannot get the spirit out of the form. A person can go to church, and sing, and pray, and talk; but this will not give him piety. These forms are but the means by which his religious fervor finds expression. In themselves they are useless. And just so as regards patriotism. If the individual has patriotism, saluting the flag may be a suitable means of

expressing it. But unless he already has it, the salute is meaningless, like any other mere form. Patriotism is a spirit, and not a form.

We do not believe any person can be truly patriotic without being upright, honest, courageous,—in short, endowed with the virtues of *manliness*. Any person endowed with these virtues will be patriotic naturally. And we do not believe the country wants any "patriots" of a different stamp.

The burden of proof is upon those who have introduced the flag salute, to show that it is an agency of good and properly belongs where they have put it.

The SENTINEL does not stand along in opposition to this innovation. Whether it has the approval of the press generally or not, we do not know. But we do know that in at least one instance the secular press has condemned it. On this point we quote the words of the *New York Journal*, of January 24, with reference to the salute proposed for the schools of this State, which is as unobjectionable as any that we have seen. After stating the salute in detail, the *Journal* says:—

"This seems to be another example—they are already innumerable—of the unfortunate tendency of well meaning persons to mistake flag idolatry for patriotism. It were better to teach frankly to the boy that the flag is now what his fathers made it, and will be what he and his fellows make it; that it waved over slavery until his fathers purged it of that stain; that it waves now over political corruption, judicial injustice, and industrial distress, and will continue to spread its folds over these evils unless he and his fellows with stout hearts, pure minds, and honest purpose toil in their youth and in their age to sweep away the abominations which have grown up under our flag as under others.

"There is a wide difference between flag patriotism and true patriotism. The latter includes reverence for the flag; the former is apt to include nothing else."

**"Another Raid on the National Treasury" *American Sentinel* 13, 11 ,
pp. 162, 163.**

THE old readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL will well remember the campaign we made in 1890 and onward on the looting of the national treasury by the churches under cover of Indian schools. We gave from the public records the history of that raid from its inception.

Those records show that the scheme was invented by the Catholics, who by easy persuasion and open invitation were joined by about fourteen professed Protestant denominations. These professed Protestant denominations soon found that they were being used by the Catholic organizations as cats-paws—that by means of them the Catholic organization was getting money from the public treasury, which without them she never could have got at all. They found too that the Catholic Church, which first got nearly as much as all of them put together, soon was getting twice as much as all of them together, and soon again was getting a greater proportion than that. Then the "Protestant" churches began to turn Protestant; quit receiving public money, and protested vigorously against that "raid on the public treasury" which they with Rome had been engaged in for years.

This protest, however late, accomplished much. Though it took years to accomplish it, that "raid on the treasury was finally stopped: after millions of dollars had been taken from the national treasury by these churches and devoted to their own church work in their own church schools. It was a direct support of churches by the national government. By taking the money of all the people and appropriating it to these churches, the United States Government was but compelling people to make contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which they do not believe, which our fathers declared to be "sinful and tyrannical."

In view of the foregoing sketch of some recent history the following from the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, of February 23, 1898, is intensely suggestive and well worthy the most thoughtful consideration:—

"Some Methodist Episcopal names which are precious in all branches of Methodism are on record as favoring the pending congressional claim of the Southern Methodist Church for damages. A prominent and eminent minister of the southern church, in a dinner-table speech to the Cincinnati Methodist Social union, which latter recently gave a reception to the Book Committee, said that he returned thanks for several things, among others 'for the fact, he would call it a civil fact, that the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church had generously given their approval to the claim of the Southern Methodist Church, without which my church probably would not have received a much-needed appropriation' from Congress. We quote these words as substantially *verbatim*, for they express just that which the speaker said. That speech made our episcopal indorsement a public fact,

and we therefore ask no pardon for alluding to it, nor do we water time to say that our allusion is entirely respectful.

"We regret that our bishops have indorsed the claim, for the reason that it is excessive at a time when there is

163

no just ground for any claim whatever, and because we are securely intrenched by facts that show that no Protestant church in this republic—*the Southern Methodist Church not excepted*—can afford to have that claim passed by the Senate, signed by the President and paid.

"We have it from authorities that command national respect and confidence that hundreds of other claimants are behind this Southern Methodist bill for indemnity and damages. Millions of dollars' worth of greedy clamor awaits this successful award. Among them are Roman Catholic claims that will open the eyes of this nation, but when it will be too late. Some Roman claims already have been granted, and some of our own churchmen declare that 'it is right, *therefore*, that some of the public money should go to Protestants.' Four of our eminent ministers recently have said just that to this writer.

"The Methodist claim, as we firmly believe and have sound reason to hold, has been advanced and put through the House by the combined, massed, concentrated, and therefore irresistible influence of the friends of other claims already formulated and awaiting the 'breaking of the jam,' as pine-log herders say of their river work in the spring. We therefore do not marvel at the wonder and surprised gratitude of that same Cincinnati banquet speaker who emphasized his astonishment that a claim that had never been able to pass a Democratic Congress is now in such a gratifying position in a Republican Congress. We are inclined to congratulate the Democrats upon their worldly wisdom and traditional astuteness!

"Any man can stake his reputation upon the prophecy that this claim, if matured and paid, will presently be followed by insistent other claims for large sums which will get through because the Nashville demand has manifested so much importunity for a third of a century. If it were possible for our own Methodist Episcopal Church to make some large claim, American and all other Jesuits and American politicians would support it; and for two reasons: 1. Because they would reap enduring gratitude from the largest church in the United States; and 2. Because the question of the precedent of a successful claim paid to the largest church in the republic would open the floodgates to the Roman greed which already has made New York City and other cities a very bonanza gold mine and replete and accessible treasury for the benefit of an unfillable maw. This historic Roman greed and its appetite for all

that our national treasury can feed to it, is the correct, reasonable, and sufficient explanation to our Cincinnati banquet speaker why Republicans have done that which Democrats dared not.

. . . "Harpies, greedy seekers after federal gold and designing politicians are making cats' paws of our Southern brethren. These latter condemn us for resisting their claim, alleging that we are 'reactionist,' are 'unfraternal,' and so on. For purposes in hand only, we must be entirely indifferent to that estimate, and we now return answer that we really honor them when we declare our belief that, if they properly weighed the facts sketched in this article, and shadowed in the entire series of this, our most recent opposition to their claim, they would *refuse to accept* its proceeds and would *indignantly decline* to be made a precedent whereby our national treasury will be looted to an extent that will make Methodism a reproach for two generations. Not for one moment have we resisted the claim for motives like those attributed to us. Our grounds for opposition are far better than that. It is the old Roman Catholic Indian school question over again. Protestants have decided to accept no more government Indian school money, because it is a block, inside the treasury, to hold open the door while greed fills its lustful hands.

"This danger is real. The immense claims are formulated and await the golden hour in which mints will scarcely be able to coin money fast enough to pay constructive, excessive and outrageous damages to people whom the government has fostered and not harmed."

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 11 , p. 177.

GOD calls every person to be a Christian, and every Christian to be a missionary and reformer,—to "go about doing good," to minister to those suffering from any need; to reform all that which has become marred and broken down by sin. For all this there is a world-wide opportunity to-day. Have you heard this call?

WHILE science and civilization have done much to ameliorate the condition of the race, it is evident from the situation to-day that they have not kept pace with the power of human greed and selfishness to plunge the race into misery and woe. Selfishness finds some way to "get around" science and civilization every time. Never was there such need of the spirit of brotherly love.

March 24, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 12 , p. 177.

IT is just as impossible to legislate good deeds out of bad men, as to legislate good fruit out of a bad tree.

THE measure of strength and prosperity in any government can be accurately judged by the degree of civil and religious freedom enjoyed by those living under it.

CIVIL government can accomplish its ends only as it has and employs force to compel obedience; Christianity can accomplish her ends only as she refrains from the use of force.

A SUNDAY law, or any form of religious legislation, is a blow which falls much more severely upon free government than upon the individuals who are its intended victims.

THERE is a pope within you, unless the kingdom of God is within you. It is the popery in people by nature that makes possible and calls for a pope outside of them.

OUGHT the citizen of Spain, in case of war over the "Maine" disaster, to be patriotic and support his country, and do all the damage possible to this country? If not, why not?

THE man who wants to keep Sunday can keep it without any Sunday law; and the man who doesn't want to keep Sunday can get neither rest nor religion out of such a law if he has one.

"COME up and see my zeal for the Lord," said Jehu, the king of Israel, as he was on his way to execute vengeance upon the stronghold of idolatry; but Jehu did not accomplish much as a reformer. And the reason was that his reform work was by force of arms and not by the power of the Spirit.

IT is said there must be no union of church and state, because that would discriminate against some of the churches. But how can there be a union of the state with religion without discriminating against some religion? And if it be right for the civil power to discriminate against one religion in favor of another, why is not such discrimination just as regards the churches?

"The Question of Disturbance" *American Sentinel* 13, 12 , pp. 177, 178.

IT is provided in nearly every Sunday law upon the statute books of the States, that any work that is to be permitted on Sunday must

not be to the "disturbance" of other people. This provision is a hollow sham.

It is not lawful to disturb people—in any proper sense of the word—on any day of the week. It is no more lawful to disturb people on Monday than it is on Sunday.

Unless a different and extraordinary kind of disturbance is meant by this provision of the Sunday laws, therefore, there is no possible reason for making it. But why should some extraordinary meaning be put upon the word "disturbance" for Sunday only?

Whatever disturbs the mid-week prayer-meeting, or the devotions of any person on ordinary days of the week is a disturbance in the proper sense, and is prohibited by law, irrespective of Sunday statutes. And whatever does not disturb people on such occasions, cannot properly be considered a disturbance on the first day of the week.

But some people are very much "disturbed" by the mere knowledge that other persons are at work on their day of rest, thus indicating that they dissent from their views as regards the sanctity of the day. They want

178

their feelings protected from disturbance no less than their devotions. But truth—and religious truth especially—has always had to make its way in this world by disturbing somebody's feelings. And no person's feelings have been more disturbed than those of the people who were in error.

All such "disturbance" is for the good of mankind. It is especially for the good of those resting in error, if they will but have the meekness to profit by it.

Let ideas jostle one against another without restraint in the wide arena of religious controversy. Truth must always be the gainer by it, and error the loser.

People who claim the right to work on the first day of the week do not claim any right to disturb people and have no wish to disturb them. Religious assemblies are amply protected by law upon all days of the week, and there is no occasion for giving them or any individuals special "protection" on Sunday.

"Christian Citizenship" in Practice *American Sentinel* 13, 12 , pp. 178, 179.

WE have presented several Bible studies with the *Christian Citizen* on the separation of church and state, which can mean nothing else than the separation from the state those who belong to the church. As certainly as those who are united with the church are united with the state, there is in the very nature of things the union of church and state.

It may perhaps now be well to take a glance at the *history* of church and state; as we desire to do everything possible to help those *Christian Citizen* people.

One of the clearest and most profound productions on the history of church and state is the "Ecclesiastical Researches" of Robert Robinson. A close acquaintance with the Scriptures is all that is needed to see that this is so. He declares plainly of the early church, that "Christians of all classes had always thought religion independent of secular government;" and that "this is clear to a demonstration by their conduct."

"Paganism was the religion of the state, and pontiff was a title annexed to that of emperor. But Christians all disowned by their practice the office of high-priest, while they allowed and obeyed that of imperator.

"These Christians ought to be divided into two general classes. They had all set out with order: but some had degenerated into government; which was a very distinct discipline, and is the true and real seed of every kind of hierarchy. Originally placed by Jesus in a position of perfect equality, they felt their freedom when they met, and so formed a mutual confederacy against sin: having separately no authority at all, and collectively only that of declaring on due investigation that an individual had committed a known crime, which by violating the contract discharged them from their obligations to continue in society with him.

"If any of the number were chosen to officiate for the rest, the offices did not lift them out of the state of brethren into that of rulers. . . . The whole assembly judged whether their officers conducted their affairs properly: and there was perfect order and liberty but no government.

"Into some of these congregations came that wrong-headed sort of men, who were half-Jews and who thought that Christianity would be mightily improved by inserting the Jewish ritual into Christian practice. Of this sort were all the 'saints,' and Jerome expressly says that what

Moses and Aaron and the Levites were among the Jews, *that* teachers and officers ought to be in the Christian church."

"By slow degrees this Jewish theology depraved the church, and subverted the primitive order by losing the old idea of confederacy against vice, and by elevating the servants of the church into inspectors and watchmen, and guides, and masters, and monarchs, who, as they rose, sunk the people in due proportion—first into carelessness, sunk the people in due proportion—first into carelessness through confidence, next into inability through ignorance, and lastly into the most abject slavery, when tyranny was played off for virtue; and to stamp the people into dust and ashes was the only method of acquiring distinction and wealth, honor, ease, and everlasting reputation. On these piteous ruins rose the saintship of Augustine, and Cyprion, and Becket, and the theology converted these dregs of the world into oracles of God.

This lust of power and government in the church led directly and inevitably to the lust of power and government in the state. "Bishops became a legislative power, and each bishop of a city church exercised this authority in three distinct characters: At home in his own cathedral, assisted by a session of clergy, whom he created and supported, he gave law to his church. In a provincial synod, assisted by other bishops, living within a district of secular division, he gave laws to all the province. In general councils he was one of a body that made laws for the whole empire. Over all in this period was the emperor, who presided as high priest, or as the Emperor Constantine used to call himself, bishop or superintendent of the external affairs of the church.

"In virtue of this office, old in name and new in practice, the emperor defended the church, not the state; suppressed enemies of the church, not those of the empire; called councils, enforced the canons, placed and displaced priests, and became the executive power, not for the benefit of a free commonwealth, but for the support of a dangerous monopoly. Thousands of volumes, ancient and modern, have been written to assort and conciliate this kind of government, but it never can be exonerated.

"Before this time emperors were not under any obligation to think of religion as they were ordered. Their reason and conscience were free, and an emperor might choose his god and his ritual; but now it was understood that he was to obey the church in all matters of religion. This was extremely difficult for the church was divided into two great factions, Arian and Trinitarian [or those who were in

power and those who were not], that persecuted each other with a mortal hatred. And it was curi-

180

ous enough to require the emperor to believe a point under examination, which neither side had skill to determine.

"On the other hand, the church was to obey the emperor in secular things; but this was a very difficult undertaking, for cathedrals, and honors, and privileges, and endowments, and a thousand other secular things were so closely connected with this kind of church, and so essential to its very existence, that one absolute emperor might ruin in an instant what another had cherished for half a century.

"There is not an evil that can blast society which is not contained in this fatal coalition. Out of these two absolute powers in one kingdom rise new crimes, new claims, new disputes, a new order of men to investigate them, new canons of law, new officers, new courts, new taxes, new punishments, a new world all in arms, animated with a fury that never sleeps and never cools until one party subdues the other into silence. There was no peace in any kingdom where this system was adopted till either the prince disarmed the priest or the priest dethroned the prince."—*pp.* 133-139.

This sketch, though brief, is a complete history of the false Christian citizenship idea, the union of church and state, from its beginning in the Christian era until now; and it is a perfect forecast of the only thing that can possibly come in the United States, and that will certainly come, as surely as the present "Christian citizenship" movement shall succeed in its designs upon the government. A. T. J.

"The True Reformer" *American Sentinel* 13, 12 , p. 179.

"AND Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the inhabitants of Gilead, said unto Ahab, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word."

In these words the Scriptures introduce to us one who stands almost preîminent among the world's reformers. It will be instructive to glance at some features of the situation in which he is set before us.

Ahab was the king of Israel. Against the king and the kingdom Elijah stood alone. No human arm was raised for his assistance. No votes were cast, no legislation was enacted, in his favor. All the power of the government,—of law, of the courts, of the army,—was at the

command of the king. Against all these Elijah dared to proclaim boldly, to the king's face, and with perfect assurance, the message of a radical reform throughout the kingdom.

Who was this Elijah? The Scriptures answers: "Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are; and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit." James 5:17, 18.

What then was the difference between Elijah and ourselves? By nature there was no difference. He was a man of like passions with us; but in comparing his work with that of the "reformer" of this day, a vast difference is apparent. The secret is revealed in his words to Ahab: "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand." Elijah lived and acted in the presence of the infinite God. He was a man of faith.

But do not we also stand in the presence of God? Yes; what was true of him is no less true of us. It is true enough, but it is *faith* that enables us to realize its truth; it is faith that brings it to our minds as a *reality*. There is a God, the infinite One, Lord of heaven and earth, "before whom I stand." This is no figure of speech, but a literal fact.

Elijah's faith grasped the reality of this great truth, and he acted accordingly. Our faith—if we have faith—will grasp it likewise. And if that be so, we shall act as though that Presence were sensible to the natural eye. Faith deals only with facts; faith convinces us of the *reality* of things not seen.

Who, in the presence of God, and loyal to him, would fear all the power of man? Who in that presence, commissioned by Him to proclaim the truth, would feel weak without the aid of man? Who would seek for help from the legislature? The very fact that such things are done by men claiming to speak for God, is conclusive evidence that they have not faith. Faith hears the "still small voice," and knows it to be more powerful than earthquake, fire, and storm. Faith knows the "sword of the Spirit" to be more powerful than all the swords of steel.

"The Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand." That is the language of faith, the language of true reform. The Christian sees in God the true majority; in his law the all-sufficient legislation; in his word the "voice of a multitude," that is greater than the voice of the ballot. He trusts in the presence of Him who has "all power" "in heaven and in earth."

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." Mal. 4:1. The spirit of true reform in the last days is the spirit of Elijah,—the spirit of faith.

Have you faith?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 12 , p. 193.

"AND ye shall be my witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth" were Jesus' last words to his apostles before his ascension, and were meant for his followers for all time; but judging from the press reports of pulpit utterances, from all over the country, one would think that to-day the order of things was changed, that the duty of the "ambassador for Christ" instead of beseeching men to be reconciled to God, was to incite them to war, and send them forth, not to save men's lives, but to destroy them.

THE fiat has gone forth, and from human lips, that "Christ is to be this world's king," and also the manner by which this is to be accomplished, namely, "through the gateway of politics." This of course cannot be accomplished in all the earth at one time, so the initiative has been taken here in America, and it has been purposed to "enthroned Christ on Capitol Hill" as this nation's king. And this being made an accomplished fact, the movement will reach out till, "through the gateway of politics," all the earth shall be brought into subjection to Him. Yes; Christ is to be given the kingdoms of this world (Rev. 11:15), and he is to reign forever; but is it to be accomplished in the manner described above? Is Christ to become king through the ballot? On the contrary we are taught in the Word that instead of becoming king through the puny efforts of men, God himself will give him the kingdom (Ps. 2:8; Eze. 21:27), and he shall reign forever. O that men would forsake the ways and means that are not of God, that they would realize their high and holy calling, that instead of seeking through the primary and the polls to set up the kingdom of Christ, they would seek to draw men away from the things of this present evil world, and prepare them to stand in that day when the kingdoms of this world, being given to Christ, he shall dash them in pieces like a potters vessel (Ps. 2:9), and set up his kingdom which, occupying the whole earth, shall stand forever. Dan. 2:35, 44.

THERE is plenty of talking to-day concerning "Christian citizenship," and the duties of the "Christian citizen." This country is beyond question the grandest country in the world, but the Christian

is a citizen of a better country than this. The citizen of this country may have privileges above that of citizens of all other countries, but the "Christian citizen" has privileges above even this, and the duties that pertain to the Christian citizen are far above and beyond, in every particular, the duties of him who boasts of his citizenship here. The Christian's citizenship is in heaven (Phil. 3:2, R. V.) and it is his privilege to have the "angels of God" (Heb. 2:6) do service for him. Heb. 2:14 (R. V.) Not only that, but he has been called to fill the position of fellow-worker with God (1 Cor. 3:9) and raised to the position of joint-heir with Jesus Christ as a child of God (Rom. 8:17) and been given the position of ambassador from the court of heaven (2 Cor. 2:20), his duty as such, grand and noble above all this earth can give, is to present the claims of God upon man to his fellow-beings, and call them from the kingdoms of this world unto the kingdom of God's dear Son. Col. 1:13.

April 7, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 14 , p. 209.

ENFORCED idleness is not rest. It is unrest.

THE pedigree of the "civil Sabbath" is wholly religious.

LAW furnishes nobody with the power to obey its requirements.

"RELIGION is the best armor in the world, but the worst cloak."

"MEN will wrangle for religion, write for it, fight for it, die for it,— anything but live for it."

A FORCED uniformity never does anything to promote unity. The one is directly contrary in spirit to the other.

UNION of the state with religion, means a state conscience in religion, by which the individual conscience is to be superseded.

"TO render good for evil, is God-like; to render good for good, is man-like; to render evil for evil, is beast-like; to render evil for good, is devil-like."

RELIGION cannot be made a department of civil government without losing all its goodness; and politics cannot be made a department of religion without destroying civil government.

EXPERIENCE with a strict Sunday law in the large cities proves conclusively that in such places at least the measure does not lessen crime or promote the safety of life or property.

THE man who believes he ought not to keep Sunday, and has the courage of his convictions in the face of all opposition, is of more value to his community and to the state than the one who believes likewise, but has not the courage to do what he thinks is right.

"Civil Government and the Gospel" *American Sentinel* 13, 14 , pp. 209, 210.

"THE powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13:1. "The powers that be" represent civil government. In a fallen world, civil government—a government of force—is a necessity.

But civil government is not the only or the most important thing ordained of God for this world. Before civil government arose, it was ordained that fallen man should be restored to his lost estate by a plan of redemption—the gospel.

This was because "God is love," and the salvation of man—the object of that love—was in the sight of God the thing of primary importance.

There are then, in the world, two governments, both ordained of God; namely, civil government—a government of force—and a government of love, which is operative upon the earth through the gospel.

The government of love is God's government; for "God is love." This was ordained of God from the beginning, and must always continue, so long as the character of God remains what it is. Civil government, being not of love but of force, was not thus ordained, but became a necessity on account of sin.

These two governments being in the world, both or-
210
dained of God, it is evident that in the purpose of God they are to operate in harmony with each other.

The gospel—the government of love—demands that pardon be accorded the penitent transgressor. The government of force demands that the transgressor be punished, whether penitent or not. It is evident therefore that if these two governments are made to cover common ground, they will come into immediate conflict with each other.

This is why it is that civil government and religion must be kept separate. When civil government is carried into the sphere of religion, it begins at once to antagonize the work of the gospel.

God wants every person on the earth to form an upright character. And as character stands for free personal choice, it is necessary that man should not be coerced into the path of uprightness, but should be left free to choose between right principles and those of a contrary nature.

It is not the business of civil government, therefore, to coerce men into doing right; to force them into the paths of morality. In so doing it would only antagonize the gospel. Its sphere is limited to that of natural rights. To protect these is the only prerogative of force.

"Christians and War" *American Sentinel* 13, 14 , pp. 210, 211.

TWO bishops of the M. E. Church have given assurances that if war should come the Methodists will be "ready to answer the call as in days gone by."

How anybody can profess to be a Christian and profess to know the Scriptures, and yet talk war, is a mystery exceedingly difficult to explain.

The direct command of God, which all Christians who know the Bible profess profoundly to respect, is "Thou shalt not kill." Now how can any man sincerely respect that command and at the same time go to war. War means the killing of people. In war it is intended to kill people. In war every possible effort is made to kill people. Then, of all people, how much does a professed Christian who goes to war really believe in the command "Thou shalt not kill"?

Again: When John the Baptist came as the forerunner of Christ, preaching to people that they should believe on Christ when he should come, he was asked by those who were already soldiers, "What shall we do?" And the answer came direct, among other things, "Do violence to no man." Now how can any man go to war, and yet do violence to no man? War in itself is violence and only violence. War seeks only to do violence to men. Christians profess to be loyal to the principles of Christianity. One of these fundamental principles is "Do violence to no man." How then can by profess Christian be loyal to his profession and yet go to war, which does violence and only violence to man.

Again: When the perfection of Christianity was ushered into the world by the birth of Jesus, the word which accompanied it was "Peace on earth, good will to men." War is not good will to men. It does not intend good will to men. When these promised Methodists

go to war, they do not go to preach peace on earth, nor good will to men. These bishops in promising Methodists for war are not preaching unalloyed peace: true they use the word "peace," yet it is always peace with a "*but*." And peace with a "but," is about the same as war with a "but."

Again: One of the Lord's disciples in a perfect crisis, drew a sword to make war. Jesus said to him, "Put up

211

thy sword." How then can any man really respect the word of Christ and yet take the sword and go to war? How can any man really respect this word of Christ, and yet promise that his brethren shall take the sword and make war?

Again: When two of the disciples of Jesus thought that some people ought to be wiped off the earth, he said to them, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them." War means the destruction of men's lives. War cannot be made without destroying men's lives. War is intended to destroy men's lives. But this is not Christianity. Christianity is not to destroy men's lives; but to save them. How then can any man have respect to Christianity or loyalty to its principles, and yet make war?

We are not here discussing any question as to whether there ought to be war between the United States and Spain. That is a question to be decided altogether by those who bear the sword and in whose province all such things lie. We are simply calling attention to the words of Christ and the principles of Christianity, and the contrast between these and the words and actions of professed Christians who talk war and promise to engage in it.

Christianity is one thing; war is another and far different thing. Christians are one sort of people: warriors are another and far different sort of people.

A. T. J.

April 14, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 15 , p. 225.

JESUS CHRIST never declared war on anything but sin.

THE Christian can always maintain "peace with honor."

IT is the age of gold; but we seem as far as ever from the golden age.

IT is more dangerous to adhere to an evil principle than to a wicked person.

IF the world could be reformed by law, God would have reformed it long ago.

A NATION of slaves—slaves to that which debases manhood—cannot hope to maintain its independence.

HE who cannot enter into the true spirit of Sabbath-keeping can find no rest nor benefit in it. The letter, without the spirit, is useless.

WHAT the church most needs to show to the world is not that she can wield the arm of civil power, but that she can move the arm of God.

WHY should any of the States of the American Union be afraid or ashamed to incorporate in its constitution the provisions against religious legislation which are contained in the Constitution of the nation?

IF Sunday laws were really designed for the physical benefit of those to whom they apply, they would not seek to prohibit Sunday games and recreation, which offer a diversion from the week of labor healthful both to body and mind

THE Sunday law takes away the *privilege* which every man has to make Sunday—or any day of the week—his weekly rest day, and puts in its place a stern necessity, backed by the terrors of civil pains and penalties. It really takes from the workingman the right it pretends to give him.

"National Service to the Church" *American Sentinel* 13, 15 , pp. 225, 226.

IT is the theory of the National Reform movement that the Government ought to serve the church. For years the leaders of this movement have been working to put the Government in a position where it would be subservient to the church,—that is, to the church as they represent it. And they claim to find Scriptural support for this theory. A recent issue of the *Christian Statesman* makes this statement:—

"We regard it as our imperative duty to warn this nation of the approaching judgments of the reigning Messiah, which history and revelation assure us follow quickly upon those nations which interfere with his messengers in the proclamation of his terms of peace. 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (the church) shall perish: yea, those nations shall be broken in pieces.'"

If disaster to the country should follow upon an outbreak of war with Spain, the *Statesman* would point to it as evidence of the wrath of God against the nation for its "secularism," by which term is meant its refusal to "serve" the church.

It is true that the Scriptures do say of the church what is here quoted by the *Statesman*. The words are found in the 60th of Isaiah (v. 12). But it is equally true that no service to the church can possibly come

226

through an alliance with the powers of the earth. It would be well if every religious body now seeking such an alliance would study and pay heed to the language of the chapter in which these words are found.

The chapter sets forth a condition of exceeding glory and power, as being that to which in the will of God it is the privilege of the church to attain. All that the church desires or is seeking to-day in the way of success,—all that she can ask or even dream of—is here set before her as that which she may certainly have. There can be no doubt about it, for it is the promise of the Omnipotent. Here is power; here is glory; here is exaltation; here is influence; here is the "wealth of the Gentiles," and the service of kings and of the nations. Does the church really want all this? Do those for which the *Statesman* speaks really want it? If they do, then let them by all means seek it in the appointed way.

That way is plainly set forth,—no less plainly than the glorious results which it brings. God says, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." V. 1-3.

The SENTINEL is set to warn the people of the nation against the fast-forming alliance of church and state. But upon the authority of the plain word of the Lord, it can say to the church, Your privilege—and your duty—is to arise and shine with a glory that will be seen with wonder throughout the earth. "The glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!" But not so if you are seeking glory from an earthly source—through politics, or through legislation. The glory of the Lord upon you is that which marks you as separate from all that is of the earth.

It was the glory of God that shone above the camp of the ancient Israel when they were separate from all the nations—the "church in the wilderness." It was the glory of God that appeared upon the top of Sinai when the mountain was set off from all the surrounding land and guarded from every earthly tread, save that of Moses and the chosen elders. It was the glory of God that filled the Most Holy Place of the sanctuary, into which the high priest alone might enter, and that but once a year. And when the glory of the Lord is seen upon you, that will mark you as separate from the world—as set apart unto the service of God. And it will be seen upon you if you are thus separated, and only upon this condition.

Then "the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." You are not to go to the kings, but kings are to come to you, and that because of the glory of the Lord which they see upon you. You are not to be upon the level of the world or to travel with the world. It is in the order of God that his church should be above the world and ahead of the world—so far above and so far ahead of the world in all that is desirable that she will be the wonder of the world. But the church has never occupied her appointed and privileged place, save for a few brief intervals of time. Yet in those few brief intervals, the glory and success of the church was such as to be the marvel of succeeding ages.

Does the church, then, want the service of kings and of nations? It is for this that she is seeking. And she can have it, if she will so fully separate from the world that the glory of the Lord will be reflected upon her, in such measure as will astonish and draw the Gentiles and kings of the earth. She can have it by pursuing a course the farthest possible removed from that of seeking a union with earthly powers. She can have it—and only thus can it be had—by pursuing exactly the opposite course to that which is followed in the movement for National Reform.

Then "the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish," as it is written: not because it refused to do your bidding, but because it set itself against God, and must meet the fate of all that fight against him.

If the church will turn her feet into the pathway of total separation from the world, the SENTINEL will be foremost to bid her "God speed."

"A 'Christian Flag'" *American Sentinel* 13, 15 , p. 226.

THE fad of a so-called "Christian flag" is running like wildfire over the land. Doubtless the next thing will be that whosoever does not salute this so-called flag will be held as no Christian at all; and whosoever does not show respect to it will be denounced as an enemy of the church and a traitor to Christianity.

In behalf of this fad, it is claimed by its originator that "as every other nation on earth has its flag, so the kingdom of Christ should have one too:" which is but to say that the kingdom of Christ is earthly just as is "every other nation on earth." This earthly, sensual, conception of heavenly and spiritual things coincides very aptly with the false "Christian citizenship" notion that is now so largely prevalent.

A "hymn" has been written and "dedicated" in honor of this so called flag. It is said that excursion steamers have ordered these things for their use when carrying Sunday-school excursionists. It would indeed be exceedingly appropriate on Sunday excursion steamers. No Sunday excursion steamer or train could justly be accused of disloyalty to the "Christian Sabbath" while flying the "Christian flag."

We wonder what freak will appear next in behalf of a worldly, sensual "kingdom of Christ."

Nevertheless, the word of Christ stands forever sure, "My kingdom is not of this world."

A. T. J.

April 21, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 16 , p. 241.

ONLY the power of God can enforce the law of God.

THE law of man lays hold on the sinner; but the gospel lays hold on the sin.

THERE is no consistency in taking your religion from one source, and your politics from another.

AN effort to force the world to conform to the church always results in conforming the church to the world.

WHAT the church needs to-day is not Sunday laws, but something to separate her more clearly from the world.

THE effectiveness of human law depends altogether upon public sentiment. The effectiveness of the divine law is altogether independent of public sentiment.

IT is better for the worldly man to be engaged in honest work on the Sabbath, or in innocent recreation, than to be going through the forms of Sabbath-keeping.

IF the apostles had turned from the preaching of reform through faith in Christ, to the preaching of political or legislative reforms, the world would have been sunk in evil long ago.

THE mightiest power in the universe is the power of God; and the mightiest manifestation of God's power is in the gospel. The gospel is the power of God against sin; and that power alone can overcome the evil that is in the world.

IT is better to lean upon God than upon a Sunday law. He who leans upon God does not need any other support; and he who does not lean upon God will fall in spite of all the support that religious legislation can furnish.

IT is entirely useless for Christians to try to compel the world, by the force of law, to act in an unworldly manner. The unregenerate person must act out the nature that he has, until by the grace of God he is given another and better one.

"A Groundless Apprehension" *American Sentinel* 13, 16 , pp. 241, 242.

A NEW ORLEANS paper makes note of an effort made during the Louisiana Constitutional Convention just closed, to eliminate from the Constitution the recognition of Sunday as a sacred day, and calls it "an outrageous proposition." It would be a terrible thing, in its view, if the restraints of the Sunday laws were removed, and people permitted to engage in worldly occupations on that day as on any other.

It is quite natural for religious people in states which have long maintained a Sunday law to hold this view, even though, as in New Orleans, the law has long been practically a dead letter. It seems to them that the removal of such a law would be the opening of the flood-gates of secularism, which would result in sweeping away the Sabbath altogether. But really, there is no foundation at all for this apprehension.

It may be that the removal of Sunday laws would result in an increase of Sunday business and of Sunday amusements. Very well, we say; suppose that it does. If people want to be worldly on the Sabbath (which however is not Sunday), if that is their nature and desire, let them be so. Let the world conduct itself after the man-

242

ner of the world. How else could it be expected to act? It is only people who want to be worldly—people who could not keep the Sabbath anyway without a change of heart—who will not want to rest on the Sabbath.

All this will not affect the church: at least, there is no reason why it should. The church is in the world, surrounded by worldliness in every form; yet she is not to be of the world. The world is the proper place for the church, under the present constitution of things, just as the water is the proper place for a ship; but the world need not get into the church, any more than the water need get into a ship: indeed, the world can always be kept out of the church if the church so wills it. Sometimes water gets into a ship by unavoidable accident; but the church must first voluntarily open its doors to the world before the world can get into it.

Let the people of the world, then, go about their worldly pursuits on the Sabbath, as on any day, and let the church spend the day in rest and the worship of God. *This very thing would do much to mark a distinction between the church and the world.* The great trouble with the church to-day is that this distinction is not plainly marked. The friends of the world know it is not, and the enemies of religion know it is not; and this is why the church to day has so little influence over them. And the reason it is not plainly marked is that hardly any distinction exists. In endeavoring to conform the world to the church by non-scriptural methods, the church has become very largely conformed to the world. And a Sunday law is one method—and not by any means the least—by which this conformity has been accomplished.

A Sunday law tends always to conform the church to the world.

The government—the state—is of the world. And it must always be of the world, for it is that into which every worldly element enters. The government cannot rise to the level of Christianity; but the Christian church can descend to the level of the world (of course losing her Christianity in the process). And when the government enacts a Sunday law, and compels the world to conform to it, the only effect is

to obliterate, in part at least, the distinction between the church and the world. But that distinction ought not to be obliterated; it ought to be much sharper than it is.

When the church joins with the government in this (as she has done in every case, being always the foremost advocate of such laws), she simply joins with the world, and trails the banner of godliness in the dust.

There is a class of people in the country who do not observe the popular rest day, but keep the seventh day instead; and of all classes of religious people, none are more marked as being separate and distinct from the world. And nothing more plainly marks them in this way than their observance of the seventh day as a day of rest and worship, while all the world around them is engaged in its accustomed secular pursuits.

No one tries to force the world into conformity with this people. No law exists or ever existed—of an earthly sort—to curtail worldly business or amusements in any degree upon their day of rest. Yet their Sabbath is not overwhelmed and lost by all this secularism. The flood is beneath it, and can no more overwhelm it than the flood of water could overwhelm the ark.

Let Sunday laws be removed from the statute books everywhere, and the result will be for the good of the church and of all men. Let the church address her petitions to God and not to the state, and the fading line of demarkation [*sic.*] between the church and the world will become much more clear and distinct.

FOR some reason this "Christian nation" shows no disposition to "turn the other cheek" to Spain; but is getting ready to do something quite different.

"Sunday Laws and Sabbath Keeping" *American Sentinel* 13, 16 , pp. 242, 243.

IN behalf of Sunday laws it is said that "Sabbath-keeping develops and strengthens the religious nature, and fosters reverence for God and his revealed truth, which is the basis of all well-being and prosperity."

This is true, if it be God's Sabbath that is kept, and it be kept in God's appointed way. But how is it as regards the sabbath-keeping which is secured by Sunday laws?

Does a Sunday law develop and strengthen the religious nature? How is that nature strengthened? Is it not by faith in God? All must admit that it is; but what has a Sunday law to do with faith? What has the aid of the civil power to do with faith? Is not the act of seeking for and depending upon such aid the very opposite of faith in God?

"Thus saith the Lord: Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited." Jer. 17:5, 6. Thus has God answered those who would put their dependence upon an earthly power.

On the other hand, how is it with those who do the opposite? We read further in this chapter: "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green, and shall not be careful in the year of drouth, neither shall cease from yielding fruit."

This is the kind of experience that "develops and strengthens the religious nature"; and it comes altogether from faith in God. Faith in God is trust in God; and trust in the arm of flesh is the opposite of trust in God. It is the opposite of faith.

Can it be said, either, that Sunday laws "foster reverence for God and his revealed truth"? Do they call

243

attention to God at all? The law calls attention to the legislative body which enacts it. A human Sabbath law, therefore, calls the attention of the people away from God to a human power as the source of authority in Sabbath observance; and this does not foster reverence for God, but the very opposite. God is the only authority for Sabbath observance, and he alone can rightfully be recognized in such a matter. Any other "authority" is self constituted, and a daring usurper of the prerogative of Heaven.

And what have Sunday laws to do with fostering regard for God's "revealed truth"? What Sunday law ever called attention to God's truth? It is the very absence of such truth from the foundation of that institution which prompts its adherents to seek a declaration from an earthly power. It is the absence of any divine law in support of the day that calls for support from the laws of men.

For the very reason, therefore, that "Sabbath-keeping develops and strengthens the religious nature and fosters reverence for God and his revealed truth," no human law ought ever to intrude itself into the matter of Sabbath observance. A human law in the domain of religion can only act as a barrier between man and his God.

"Natural Rights and the 'Common Good'" *American Sentinel* 13, 16 , pp. 243, 244.

THERE is no more fallacious theory extant than that which is embodied in the common idea that natural rights must be limited by law in order to promote the "common good."

Natural rights are the rights given to man by the Creator. They are neither more nor less than what the Creator made them. To say that they need to be clipped and pruned down to meet the requirements of a successful life, is to reflect upon the wisdom of the Creator.

Rights were given to the individual for his good. Among man's "inalienable rights" the Declaration of Independence enumerates "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The more of these things an individual has, the better off he is, and the more of prosperity does he enjoy. And the more individuals there are of this kind in the community, the more prosperity and happiness is there in the community.

What, on the other hand, is the "common good"? It is a very indefinite term. Each person defines it to suit himself. Government define it to suit themselves. Over in Russia it is declared to be for the "common good" that the little children of heretical parents should be taken from their homes and sent away to be brought up in the orthodox "faith." In Peru, until recently, it was considered to be for the common good that no Protestant marriage ceremonies should be recognized as valid by the state. In Spain it was for the common good that Protestants should not be allowed to worship in church buildings. The list of instances in which personal rights have been invaded under the plea of the "common good," might be extended indefinitely.

How are these things decided to be for the common good? Oh, it is by the decision of the majority, at least of those in power. And this is the way the question is always decided; this is the way it is proposed to decide the question to day, and the only way in which civil government can consider it, in this country at least. A natural right, therefore, as limited by the "common good," is simply such a

privilege as the majority may see fit to grant. And this would take the matter out of the hands of the Creator entirely. It would leave no force to the term "natural" right at all. For what a person is allowed to have by the majority, cannot be his by nature—by birth.

And for what purpose is this limitation sought to be put upon natural rights? A quotation from the recent hearing on the Sunday bills before the Massachusetts legislature will explain. A speaker in behalf of the bills said:—

"When we speak of natural rights it must be with limitations. Natural rights of the individual in the community are subordinate to the common good. Sabbath laws have been proved to be for the common good."

Natural rights are sought to be curtailed in the interests of Sunday laws. Sunday laws are a denial of natural rights, and this is instinctively recognized by the

244

advocates of such laws in the pleas made for their enactment. It is in behalf of religious legislation that natural rights are most commonly curtailed, in all countries. The two are antagonistic; and when one prevails, the other must give way.

This is not saying that the common good does not require that limitations should be set to individual freedom of action. It is not saying that an individual has liberty to do as he pleases. But we are not speaking of what an individual may please to do, but of what he has a natural right to do. He has no natural right to do anything that would conflict with the rights of his neighbor. Rights do not conflict. Any individual in the world may freely exercise the natural rights with which the Creator has endowed him, without interfering with the like exercise on the part of any other person.

Natural rights lie at the foundation of all proper legislation and government. Neither individuals nor governments may rightfully invade them. They no more justify wrong doing under the plea of "conscience," than under the plea that might makes right. Test all governmental measures by the touchstone of natural rights, and let it be remembered that natural rights are always individual rights. In this way secure the good of all individuals, and the common good will take care of itself.

April 28, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , p. 257.

ONLY in the Christian warfare does victory always mark the side of right.

CHRISTIANITY is science; but "Christian science" is the opposite of Christianity.

DEPENDENCE on self alone is often mistaken for independence; but the two are vastly different.

CONSIDERING that "war is hell," it is strange that a Christian should ever feel bound to go to war.

THE Christian maintains peace by fighting self; the non- Christian seeks to get it by fighting some one else.

THE "deceitfulness of sin" often makes people believe they have defeated the devil, when the devil has in fact defeated them.

THE fact that the world is growing worse, does not constitute any reason at all why *you* should not be growing better.

THE marching order of the Commander of Christians are, "Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

IT is religion alone that gives Sunday a different character from that of Monday or Tuesday; Sunday is different in character from those days only by being a religious day. And were it not for this fact, there would never have been a Sunday law enacted.

INTERVENTION—that is what Jesus Christ undertook in the terrible difficulty that arose between God and man. And it was not "armed intervention," but it was effectual.

THE more of the war spirit there is in the world, the more necessity is there that Christians should maintain peace.

THE question of whether the souls of men are to be saved or lost, is always the greatest question that can come up for settlement in this world; and when ministers of the gospel give precedence in their discourses to some other question, it only shows that they have themselves lost sight of the great truth which they are set to point out to others.

"Does Christianity Justify It?" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , pp. 257, 258.

IT has been decided by the United States Government that present circumstances relating to the condition of Cuba justifies war with Spain; and in this decision it has the support of the professedly

Christian churches. Does Christianity justify this conclusion to which the churches have come?

Turning to the Text-book of Christianity, we find that, from the Christian standpoint, war was not justifiable when its object was to save the life of Jesus Christ. Is it then justifiable from the Christian standpoint now?

Jesus, in the Garden of Gethsemane on that memorable night, was surrounded by a mob who were bent on taking his life. They were determined to crucify the Son of God. Peter, realizing their purpose, drew a sword to defend the Saviour, and "smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear." Immediately Jesus

258

said to Peter, "Put up again thy sword into his sheath;" and touching the wound made by Peter's sword, he healed it.

The Author of Christianity therefore plainly declared that such circumstances as had come upon Him and his disciples did not justify a resort to the sword. But if those circumstances did not justify it, what circumstances do?

It may be said that it was necessary that Jesus Christ should die for the salvation of the world. This is true; but God did not ordain that he should be betrayed and crucified. This was the work of wicked men—men whom the Christian church regards as the most guilty of their race. But to prevent this terrible deed,—the crucifixion of One who not only was the most innocent of all persons on the earth, but was Son of the infinite God—a resort to arms was not justifiable.

A few hours later, standing before Pilate, Jesus said to him: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." He did not say, If circumstances were different, then would my servants fight. If some greater crime than my death were perpetrated, then would my servants fight. He did not say this. The reason his servants would not fight was because his kingdom was not of this world. Because that was so, fighting by his servants was not justifiable; and until his kingdom is of this world, the same reason must hold good. But Christ's kingdom is no more of this world to-day than it was then.

Peter, drawing the sword as a servant of Jesus Christ, is a figure worthy of note. Peter was an ardent disciple of Christ, a prominent member of the littler band of Christians, but—*he was not converted*. Jesus told him, that same evening, that he was not converted: and the cock-crowing hour of the same night, brought ample confirmation of his words.

After his conversion, Peter never resorted to the sword. But standing there, sword in hand, bent upon its forcible use in the interests of Christianity, he well prefigured that class who, while professedly ardent servants of the Son of God, are nevertheless not sufficiently converted to have comprehended the truth that his kingdom is not of this world.

"Important–If True" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , p. 258.

THE Rev. Dr. Charles Bridgman, of this city, has given us the assurance, that as regards the Cuban crisis, "It is God and not the devil who now calls the hosts to battle." Just how he has learned this we are not informed; but, being the word of a clergyman, it is supposed to be accepted as a fact without any great amount of accompanying proof.

Dr. Bridgman is chaplain of the eighth New York regiment, and his sermon last Sunday, the 17th, was preached to the regiment especially, that being the occasion of their annual church service. The opening hymn was–

"The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar;
Who follows in his train?"

And the discourse which followed was calculated to impress the soldiers with the idea that they were following "in his train" by going forth to engage in carnal warfare with the Spaniards. This mixing of the spiritual with the carnal, earthly, and sensual is the fatal defect in the conceptions of Christianity which prevail to-day. The Son of God never went forth to carnal warfare, and none who do so to-day can be following in his train.

Notwithstanding the Rev. Mr. Bridgman's assurance, we are not satisfied that the business of making war has in this instance passed out of the hands of the devil into those of the Lord. Christianity opposes evil with good—not with evil.

"His Holiness" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , pp. 258, 259.

IT seems that the title "His Holiness" is not exclusively the property of the pope, but is held by several leaders of religious sects in India, the title being recognized by their followers as that of the pope is by

Roman Catholics. Of course, the title means just as much in their cases as in that of the pope. No person can become

259

or remain holy by virtue of the position which he occupies. No person can be invested with holiness by vote.

Why non-Catholics should recognize this title as one properly designating the pope, is a question that is not clear. It is an assumed title, a title which no person or persons on earth have authority to confer on anybody, and which no mortal can take to himself without being guilty of blasphemy. Surely the Protestant world at least ought to be cognizant of these facts.

"Does Archbishop Ireland Rule the United States?" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , p. 259.

IN the United States Senate the other day Senator Turner of Washington, standing in his place, "charged that the delay [in sending the President's Message] last week was not due to the request of General Lee; but to the fact that Archbishop Ireland had cabled to the Vatican in the hope that the holy father might be able to bring about a peaceful solution of the difficulty. The President was waiting upon the pope to secure that which American diplomacy had failed to obtain."

That a United States senator, speaking upon a question so grave as to be known by all to involve war between nations, would say such a thing as this at random is not to be believed.

The truth of the charge is favored by the fact that though the message was withheld professedly because the publication of it that day "would endanger the lives of American citizens in Cuba," yet when it was made public, *unaltered*, a week later, there was not in it a single sentence that could by any conceivable construction stir up any spirit that would in any way endanger the life of any American citizen. The *World* has asked the President or anybody to point out in that message any single sentence that would have endangered the lives of Americans in Cuba had it been published the day it was promised, and Congress and the country sat in suspense waiting for it.

Another pointer in favor of Senator Turner's charge is the statement of the Washington correspondent of the Chicago *Times-Herald*, April 14, that "Archbishop Ireland was again active to-day in the cause of peace, rushing from one embassy to another and from legation to legation, spending much time at the French minister's

house, and an hour with the envoy of Austria-Hungary, in one last effort to preserve peace."

It is well known that no effort has been made by either the pope or Archbishop Ireland to secure peace between Spain and the Cubans; and also that there would be no such effort now were it not for the strong prospect of Cuba being lost to Spain. Under Spanish rule the church of Rome has governmental support and a practical monopoly in Cuba. The moment Cuba is lost to Spain, and is free,—that moment Rome finds her governmental power there vanished.

This is not peace for the sake of peace, but peace for the sake of power and revenue, that Archbishop Ireland and the pope are so busily working for just now as Cuba is about to be free. And that through the President, Archbishop Ireland and the pope should in such a cause, or any other, be able to play pitch and toss, and peek-a-boo with the Congress and people of the United States, is sufficiently suggestive to cause the American people seriously to think.

It can be remembered also in this connection that Archbishop Ireland dictated to the St. Louis Convention.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 17 , p. 273.

THE only thing that Jesus Christ ever did in the way of using force among men was to take a "whip of small cords" and cleanse the temple of God. He used force—or its equivalent—to drive worldly men out of the temple of God; but to-day his professed representatives want to use force to drive worldly men into that temple.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL does not assume the position of an adviser of this or any other civil government. We say this in reply to the assertion some have made that the SENTINEL was trying to run the Government, while telling Christians that they could not properly take part in political affairs. If this were true, the SENTINEL'S position would of course be very inconsistent; but it is not true. The SENTINEL says that civil government should not do certain things which constitute an interference with natural rights. This is not saying how the government should be run, but only how, as regards these rights, it should not be run. And it says this from the standpoint of Christianity; not as taking part in civil government, but as stating to men the divine truth which was summed up by Jesus Christ in the

words, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And it says these things to men in order that they may escape the condemnation and disaster which a different course from that set forth in these words of Christ must bring upon them.

May 5, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , p. 273.

THE "force" which represents Christianity is the Holy Spirit.

THE blood that counts in the Christian warfare is the blood of Christ.

THE best protective armor that was ever devised is the "shield of faith."

NO law of man ever contributed to the stability of the government of heaven.

THE best declaration of independence is an acknowledgment of dependence on God.

THERE is tremendous power in a thirteen-inch shell, fired from a modern navy cannon; but there is infinitely great power in one word of God.

THE church is about the only body of intelligent people in civilized lands who cannot see that the future of the world is dark with the clouds of war.

IF God cannot preserve the Sabbath in the earth without the aid of civil governments, it is because he cannot preserve Christians; for Christians always observe the Sabbath.

YOU cannot appreciate the Sabbath unless you appreciate God; and you cannot appreciate God so long as you think you must the help of an earthly power to enable you to do right.

THE giant of war has at last been roused from his slumbers, and he does not mean to go to sleep again until he has imposed a heavy task upon civilization.

"THE Sabbath was made for man," and when God had finished making it for man he gave it to man—to every man. And what is needed now is not more of the gift, but more people to accept the gift and appreciate it.

"'Peaceful' War" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , pp. 273, 274.

WAR is a terrible thing; and it was never more terrible than it is and must be to-day, by reason of the deadly elements with which modern science has supplied it. Appreciating this fact, but convinced that hostilities are a necessity of the situation, the Government is conducting a "peaceful" blockade of Cuban ports, the commanders of the naval forces having been instructed not to fire into the cities nor against the forts of the enemy. A blockade of course means the cutting off of supplies, with the object of forcing the enemy to choose between starvation and surrender.

But wherein is it worse to kill people by a bombardment than to kill them by starvation? Starvation is a lingering form of death, and attacks every individual in the beleaguered place, while a bombardment would at the worst be short and would leave many of the inhabitants uninjured. There can be no question but that a bombardment is more merciful to a city than a "peace" blockade, when the blockade is, as it is meant to be, effective.

No, Mr. President; you cannot conduct war in a peaceful manner. War—if it is war in fact—is the opposite of peace, everywhere and always. There is no use trying to make real war by Christian and humane meth-

274

ods. Such methods do not apply to real war at all, and the attempt to unite things so incongruous can only make it worse in the end. "You can no more conduct a war on benevolent principles than you can let a gun go off easy."

"A Christian Duty" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , p. 274.

FOR two years or more the Cuban "reconcentrados" have been dying of starvation in the cities whither they were sent by the decree of the Spanish general Weyler. They are still dying from the same cause, and we are told that the American people have a Christian duty to perform in the matter.

Now is it s Christian duty to relieve distress, certainly. It is a Christian's duty to deal his bread to the hungry; there can be no doubt about that. And it is his duty to do this under all circumstances. If he has bread to give, he is to give it to those who are perishing for the lack of it, knowing that such is the will of God, and trusting in God to enable him to perform that will, and to take care of the results.

But what did the people of this country do in performance of this plain Christian duty toward their fellow-beings in Cuba during the two

years following General Weyler's decree? That a little was done, we do not doubt; but it was only a little. It was not enough to prevent the death of hundreds of thousands of the women and children who were the victims of Weyler's cruelty. Plainly, they left their Christian duty in this matter unperformed.

It may be said that they could not do this; the Spanish forces would not permit it. But who knows that they would not? Perhaps they wouldn't, when supplies of food were to be sent in ships of war. Spain did object to that, and quite naturally. But would Spain do not have permitted the Christian people of this country to feed the starving Cubans in a peaceable manner? There is no proof that she would not. Miss Clara Barton, we are told, testifies that the work of the Red Cross Society in Cuba was not hindered by the Spanish forces, and that the food brought and stored by the society for the Cubans was not disturbed by the Spanish troops.

The Christian people of this country might have fed the suffering people of Cuba in a Christian way, and thus have discharged a plain Christian duty and have received a blessing from the God of mercy. Of this we do not believe there can be a particle of doubt.

But is it not a marvelous thing that these Christian people, having failed for two years to discern this Christian duty, now discover that it is their Christian duty to relieve the suffering in Cuba by fighting the Spanish! And what seems chiefly to have impressed this duty upon them was the blowing up of the battleship "Maine."

The carnal mind can quite readily discover "Christian duty," when it is something to be performed in a carnal way.

"The War, and the Result" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , pp. 274, 275.

WHAT events will follow as a result of the outbreak of war between this Government and Spain, are as yet matters of conjecture; but there is one result which it requires no supernatural vision to foresee. It is one which the nations have already foreseen, and which is giving them no small concern. It is the development of militarism in the United States.

Whether this country wins or loses in the contest will not be a matter of so much consequence to this country and to the world as will the development of the military power in this country which the war must inevitably bring.

For be it remembered that the situation to day is governed by vastly different circumstances from those which prevailed at the time of the contest between North and South. At the end of that war the great armies which had been called into the field melted quickly and easily away into the general body of civilians engaged in the peaceful pursuits of life, and so far as the military power was concerned, there was soon little evidence remaining that the nation had fought one of the greatest wars in modern history. But the ascendancy of the military power to day would not be followed by a like result.

The world is dominated to-day by the war spirit to an extent that was not dreamed of thirty years ago. For years Europe has been a great armed camp, and the peace of the world has been in unstable equilibrium. The nations, in reaching out under the impulse given by advancing science, exploration, and the desire for colonial extension, have come into closer contact with each other; so that a move on the part of any one of them is liable to cause a serious disturbance. There has come to be a "balance of power"; that is, the military power of Europe is balanced, and as every person knows, it requires no great thing to upset things when they are evenly balanced. Let something be added to one scale, or taken from it, and the balance is upset at once.

And this "balance of power" really extends over the whole civilized world. For in these days of swift travel and intercommunication, even the broad expanse of ocean does not isolate the affairs of one nation from those of others. The interests of the nations of the Old World are in intimate contact with those of the American republic; they touch the shores of every nation of the Western hemisphere. And a disturbance on this side of the Atlantic may easily be of such proportions as to

275

throw the balance of power out of its present equilibrium and necessitate a readjustment which could only come after a fearful expenditure of life and treasure.

It is stated—and there is every reason to credit it—that the real reason why the threatened "concert of Europe" against the United States was not put into effect, was that the Powers of Europe feared that such a step would so arouse the military spirit in this country that Americans would not be satisfied until they had built a navy which would be one of the most formidable in the world. The Powers fear that they will have to reckon with this nation, not only in maintaining their possessions in American waters, but in pursuing their policy of

dividing up the rest of the world between themselves; and there is certainly ground for their apprehensions. Hence they are most unwilling to see the United States become a power which could back up any of its demands by a tremendous armament on the seas.

Already it is beginning to be talked that as an outgrowth of the present state of things, the near future will see an alliance between England, the United States, and Japan, which will entirely upset the present balance of power throughout the world. An alliance between nations of a common origin, language and religion is only naturally to be expected in the face of hostility from other powers; while force of circumstances has put Japan where she may be looked upon as a probable third party in such a compact.

But most significant of all is the fact that the United States itself is beginning to favor a departure from the traditional policy of keeping aloof from the affairs of other nations. That was the policy urged upon the Government by Washington, when the nation started out upon its career as an independent power. That policy, it is now said, was good while the nation was in its infancy and needed to give its attention to the development of its own territory; but—and this is said by men in positions of influence—it was not meant to be the policy of the nation for all time; and the time has now come when the United States should assert its position among the nations, and take a part in the dividing up of the territory of the earth.

This policy is being advocated to-day; this sentiment is growing, and it is growing rapidly. And these things being so, it is evident that whatever may be the events of the war, the outcome will be one which will vitally affect the interests of the nation, and of the world. For, at the least, the war will greatly stimulate the military sentiment which is already too prevalent in the land, as witness the "Boys' Brigades" which are a common feature of the public—and even of the church—schools. It must greatly stimulate the growth of the navy, and the tendency to an alliance with some one or more of the Powers of Europe. In short, its direct tendency must be to join this nation with the military powers of the Old World in a general melee of war and strife for which the nations have long been in arms, and which is set down in prophecy as the final catastrophe of the world.

"Archbishop Ireland Is Going to Explain" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , pp. 275, 276.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND has publicly announced that he is going to "make a public reply to the attacks made upon him." By "the attacks made upon" him, he means what has been said upon his and the pope's meddling with the affairs of the United States, and their manipulating the President, and making a Punch-and-Judy show of Congress. He says that when he does come out, "The publication of his letter will be timely."

Yet, with this preliminary announcement of what he is going to do, he takes occasion to explain at considerable length why he did what he has already done, and to tell a good deal of what he expects to do. And in this there are some points worth considering.

He says that when the pope wanted to use his "good offices for the preservation of peace, it became necessary that some one in Washington should be in a position to send him hourly bulletins, if necessary, of the attitude of the Administration [*sic.*]."

Of course for anybody to do that, he would have to be in the very inner circles of the councils of the Administration. He says that the papal delegate "Martinelli was first selected for this place," but that "he decline to act, upon the ground that he could not possibly have any standing at the White House, being merely an ecclesiastical representative of the Vatican." And lo! when one who was "merely an ecclesiastical representative of the Vatican," could not act, *because he was that*, then one who was an ecclesiastical representative of the Vatican was chosen to act *because he was that—and more*.

Martinelli could not act because, being "merely an ecclesiastical representative of the Vatican," he could not possibly have any standing at the White House. Then the thing is shifted and an ecclesiastical representative of the Vatican is chosen who can have such standing at the White House, as to be able to send hourly bulletins of the Administration. In other words, in order to get in his work, the pope must have an agent, a representative, in the inner circle of the Administration; Martinelli did not have the qualifications; and Archbishop Ireland did have the qualifications; therefore Archbishop Ireland was chosen.

But what were these qualifications that adapted Archbishop Ireland for a position that the apostolic delegate could not fill. The archbishop tells us. And here they are: "It was then determined that the close and cordial friendship which existed between Archbishop Ireland and President McKinley and his whole cabinet, joined to the fact that he is

an eminent American citizen, made him a fit instrument through which negotiations could be conducted."

Now ecclesiastically President McKinley is a Methodist. How is it that there exists such a "close and cordial friendship" between a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic and him, as to gain for that ecclesiastic a position and knowledge that would enable him to send "hourly bulletins of the attitude of the Administration"? How is this, when

276

it is perfectly certain that there is not a Methodist bishop in all the United States between whom and President McKinley there is such a "close and cordial friendship" as to gain for said Methodist bishop a position or knowledge that would enable him to send "hourly bulletins," or perhaps any bulletins at all, of the attitude of the Administration? How is it that ecclesiastically or otherwise there is a more "close and cordial friendship" between a Methodist and a Roman Catholic archbishop, than there is between that same Methodist and any Methodist bishop.

Of course everybody knows that this "close and cordial friendship" of the archbishop's, is altogether political and solely because of political advantage. Everybody knows that it is the archbishop's political power which was exerted at the St. Louis Convention and through the campaign of 1896, that makes "the close and cordial friendship" between him and "President McKinley *and his whole cabinet*" and which made him "a fit instrument through which negotiations could be conducted" that could not be conducted at all by Martinelli. Martinelli is an Italian and has no standing in American politics yet. All of which demonstrates that the greatest Roman Catholic official in the United States *out of politics*, has not the power and therefore is not so dangerous to the United States, as was, and is, a subordinate Roman Catholic official who is *in politics*. And this is equally true of every other ecclesiastical connection in the United States. No ecclesiastic or religionist of any kind can do the mischief out of politics that any one can do in politics. Therefore the eternal principle is, and this papal trick lately played is a forcible illustration of it, that ecclesiastics and religionists of every sort should forever keep out of politics.

And when it had been "determined that the close and cordial friendship which existed," etc., "made him a fit instrument," etc., the result was that "In view of this he received a formal letter from Cardinal Rampolla, papal secretary of state, authorizing him to

represent the pope. This was presented to Judge Day, and semi-official relations began."

It is then *a fact* that the Secretary of State of the United States has formally received "a formal letter" from the "papal *secretary of state*," appointing a representative of the pope "through which negotiations could be conducted" with the Government of the United States in an affair with another nation. Accordingly the archbishop's statement proceeds: "*Since that time* Archbishop Ireland has been in communication with Europe. *Through him* the *official texts* of the concessions *which Spain* was willing to make for the sake of peace, have been laid *before this Government*, and before the European ambassadors. The composite news of the situation has been *cabled to him*, and by him disseminated."

The pope and his representative to the United States Government did not succeed in securing a peace to perpetuate the papal power and revenue in Spanish enslaved Cuba. But they *did* succeed in getting what the papacy for years has been working for—the formal receiving of a representative of the pope to this Government, upon a formal letter from the papal secretary of state; and thus established the precedent of formal official relations between the papacy and this Government.

This much has been gained already. And must more *is planned*; of which we shall have occasion to speak. Just now, however, the report says that when the archbishop shall have made "public his reply to the attacks upon him," in which he "will go into details," "he will proceed to Rome."

Of course he must hurry off now to Rome and the pope to report in full the progress made, and laugh together with him while they map out their program for further official recognition when the time comes to settle the terms of peace between Spain and the United States.

We hope he will go into details and give the whole story exactly as it is. And then we wish he would go to Rome at once, and, for the good of the United State, stay there forever. And then let all other ecclesiastics and religionists in the United States keep out of politics here forever.

"The Sabbath Needs No 'Fence'" *American Sentinel* 13, 18 , pp. 276, 277.

MRS. J. C. BATEHAM, who has been prominent in connection with the "Sabbath reform" work of the W.C.T.U., makes the statement, in a contribution to a "Sabbath reform" journal, that—

"A Christian Sabbath cannot long be maintained if the protecting fence of civil laws be thrown down."

If this is true, then of course "civil Sabbath" laws are necessary, and we should have them by all means. But is it a fact that the Almighty is so dependent on human legislation for the perpetuity of one of his institutions? If we believed he was thus dependent, we would at once lose confidence in him as a God.

The very essence of Christianity, as we understand it, is the all-sufficiency of the power of God to uphold that which is his, in the face, if need be, of all the power of man and Satan combined. The church never lost anything by the attack of the world upon her. Christianity never lost anything because earthly governments failed to support her. Christianity and the church have always gained in such conflicts. The church loses only when those within her fold voluntarily relinquish their hold upon spiritual things. But whether Christians loosen, maintain, or regain their hold upon spiritual institutions are matters that human laws cannot affect.

So long as an individual really has hold upon the Lord, there is no danger that he will lose the Sabbath, even though all the laws of earth were against his keeping it instead of giving it their pretended support. When he relinquishes his hold upon God, it is always done voluntarily; other wise he would not be responsible before God for his lapse from righteousness. And when he has lost his hold upon God, he is in a position to be fright-

277

ened by the opposition of men, or even by their failure to give him their "support."

At the very beginning of the world, God set apart the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath—his Sabbath, made for man—and from that day to this the seventh-day Sabbath has continued in the earth, and has a respectable number of adherents to-day, although no human law was ever enacted in its support, and many have been enacted against it.

The God to whom the Sabbath belongs is one in whom we can safely trust, without any anxiety as to the attitude of worldly governments. The Lord let Satan remove all the fence there was around Job, but he preserved Job just the same. There is no need

that his Sabbath should be fenced about with the straw of human statutes.

May 12, 1898

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 13, 19 , p. 289.

THERE can be no true patriotism apart from loyalty to the right.

THE Christian is the one man in the world who can have perfect confidence in the future.

TRUTH is intolerant of error; and good, of evil. This is the "intolerance" of true Protestantism.

A PATRIOT is not always known by the multitude of his words; but a fool, according to Solomon, most always is.

EVERY person whom God trains in this world has an experience of standing with the minority against the majority.

NOT the doctrine of evolution, but the doctrine of unchangeableness, is the hope of the world to-day,—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

BOAST not thyself of loyalty to this Government if you are not loyal to the principles upon which it is based. Many who boast of their loyalty, it is certain, have not even a clear conception of what these principles are.

AS well might this country be conquered by a foreign foe as that the people now here should change the institutions and principles of its government to correspond with those of a foreign land. Bad people do not need to be watched so carefully as bad principles.

PRESERVING a religious institution by legislation is like preserving a thing by pickling. At best only its form is retained. Its flavor, freshness, and power of growth are lost. It is a curiosity, not a thing of use. God's word alone can preserve a religious institution in the condition necessary to supply continuously the spiritual wants of the people.

THE Government is making good progress in blowing up, sinking, and keeping away from our shores the Spanish war ships; not let us have something done to get rid of the Spanish ideas which have already invaded the country and apparently with success. The worst thing about Spain is its principles of government; and it is these, and not the Spanish ships, which constitute the chief source of danger to

this country. We refer chiefly to Spain's union of religion with the state.

"Archbishop Ireland's Scheme" *American Sentinel* 13, 19 , pp. 289, 290.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND has not yet published his promised "reply to the attacks upon him" in which he is to "go into details" about his manipulating the Government of the United States. However in his explanation to the effect that he is going to explain, there are statements sufficiently suggestive to cause serious thinking and careful watching on the part of all who care for true American liberty and independence.

Having failed to preserve peace in the interests of papal power and revenue, his plan is next to make the war turn to the credit of the papacy—and especially to the power of the papacy over the United States. The scheme announced in behalf of the archbishop and endorsed by "one high diplomat," before the war was actually begun, is as follows:—

"He [Archbishop Ireland] expects to bring about a

290

congress of nations. If this is considered impracticable, such a concert will be arranged that the possible elements and factors in the situation may be eliminated by friendly pressure upon Spain and upon the United States.

"It is possible and probable that a congress of nations will be called immediately after a positive declaration of hostilities.

"The whole matter will then be taken up and adjusted. Spain will receive some adequate compensation for the loss of the Island of Cuba, if the experiment now on trial fails through war, and at the same time Cuba will be put under stable rule and government, probably under the protectorate of the United States.

"In doing this the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine will be acknowledged, but the incidental responsibility of the United States thereunder will be defined and demonstrated. This will work greatly for the preservation of the peace of the world. As matters stand now, there is constant danger that some puny nation may through braggadocio or truculence, involve some great powers."

Thus the papacy is determined to make herself felt, and will force herself into recognition, in the affairs of the United States. Having failed to hold her power and revenue in Cuba by holding that suffering people under Spanish despotism, she now proposes to accomplish that purpose and a good deal more by engineering a settlement in

which she will have to be recognized as a chief party to be reckoned with.

And notice how coolly her arrogant position is assumed. See with what an air of superiority it is that she announces that "friendship pressure" will be put "upon the United States" as "upon Spain"—as though the United States were her subject as Spain has always been.

Notice, also, and inwardly digest the deep and sinister meaning of it, how self-confidently it is declared that by this "congress" or "concert" of *her* calling, "the whole matter will be taken up and *adjusted*." See the assumption of supremacy displayed in telling just how the parties interested will be dealt with—"Spain *will receive* some adequate compensation": "Cuba *will be put* under stable rule and government" and "probably" this will be "under the protectorate of the United States." Cuba declared, and made, "free and independent" by the United States; and the United States, professedly at least, free and independent in her own right, are to be taken charge of by the papacy and her "concert" and to be dealt with as she decides, as though they were her absolute subjects to be placed and moved like "men" on a chess-board! And then to cap it all "the incidental responsibility of the United States" under the Monroe Doctrine, "*will be defined and demonstrated*" for the United States.

There cannot be the least doubt that the papacy will do every possible thing to carry out this program announced from Archbishop Ireland.

And who is prepared to say that she will not succeed in having this program carried out according to her own ideas and wishes—if not in every detail, largely in very substance? Especially who is prepared to say that she will not succeed in it, when at her very first move she has been successful in gaining official recognition from the Government of the United States? when at her very first step she succeeded in having an official communication from her "secretary of state" officially received by the Secretary of State of the United States, and her "representative" recommended in this official communication, also officially received, through whom afterward "the *official texts* of the concessions which *Spain* was willing to make for the sake of peace" were "laid before this *Government*." When she can do all that at the very beginning of difficulties, what will she not do before the difficulties are ended?

Another thing that just now makes all this worthy of only the more careful consideration is the movement to have the United States

enter the lists as one of "the Powers," and alliances and carry on intrigues with the "Powers" in the affairs of the whole world.

Just now is a time for deep study and careful thinking. A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 19 , p. 304.

IF the church had never gone into politics, religious persecution would never have been a political proceeding.

HUMAN nature moves a person to nothing more readily than to a usurpation of prerogatives which belong to no human power.

JESUS CHRIST, as he is to-day, is the divine standard of manhood. In the school of Christ, and that only, can that standard be attained.

"I DETERMINED," said the Apostle Paul to certain of his converts, "to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Not much politics or war would be preached by ministers to-day if they were like Paul.

WHEN the church leads the state, there is a fulfillment of the proverb of the blind leading the blind into the ditch. In such a case the church is blind to her true calling or she would never want to lead the state; and the state is blind to its proper mission on earth or it would not allow the church to be its leader.

MEN do not pay very much attention these days to the word of the Lord, except to pass criticisms upon it; but there is a time coming when their most earnest attention will be given it unasked. That time will be the day which will unmask its power over physical things. A great nation, with its power expressed in the ponderous guns of its battleships, is the most conspicuous thing before men's eyes to-day; but the day cometh—and cometh soon—when "the Lord also shall roar out of Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people." Joel 3:16. God's Word is the most powerful thing in the earth to-day, and as such should receive the most earnest attention of mankind, for whose salvation it is now employed.

ROMAN CATHOLIC writers are in the habit of designating Protestantism as a mere negation; and some even of those who call themselves Protestants are inclined to consider Protestantism as being faulty in this respect. But such have only the most superficial view of what Protestantism is; so superficial, in fact, as to be altogether erroneous. Protestantism is truth, and truth is always first;

error comes afterward and denies the truth, and then the truth also denies the error; but error is the negation, in the truest sense. Protestantism denies papal doctrines just as all truth denies error; but it is no less positive than as though there were no error for it to contravene.

LET your Christianity recommend your creed.

May 19, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 20 , pp. 305, 306.

IT is better to know how to live, than how to die.

INTOLERANCE is always glad to shake hands with error.

IF you do not have religious liberty to grant to others, you do not have it at all.

TO submerge individualism in nationalism, would be like trying to have dollars without cents.

NOT "Remember the Maine," but "The faith of Jesus," is the watchword of Christian warfare.

A SINGLE dollar saved for eternity is better than a million dollars saved for a few years of time.

A CHRISTIAN loves peace; a "Christian power" loves piece, and is always willing to fight to keep it.

THE choice is laid before every person in the world, of denying self or denying God. He must do one or the other.

IF this nation should acquire the "big head" by victory over Spain, it might be worse in the end than if it were now to suffer defeat.

IF the papacy can harmonize with Spanish government in Spain and Cuba, she can, and would, harmonize with Spanish government in the United States.

GOD could destroy the whole world in a moment of time, but his *wisdom* is made known in the gospel by which he would save the world. True wisdom seeks to save life, not to destroy it.

THE barbarians conquered Rome, but the principles of Rome conquered the barbarians. Shall those principles now conquer the Anglo Saxons? If, so then the overthrowing of Spanish armadas will have been a useless task.

"THE powers that be are ordained of God." So saith the Scripture; and strangely enough, this text is used to justify obedience to the "powers that be" in opposition to the commands of God.

Can the thing ordained be superior to Him who or-ordained [*sic.*] it? If not, as is self-evident, then cannot the command of men be superior to the precept of Jehovah. "His kingdom ruleth over all."

IT is declared by both Catholics and Protestants in this country that "this is a Christian nation."

NOW it is a fact that Catholics do not admit that Protestantism is Christianity. Even the stoutest defender of Catholic "liberality" must admit this.

When Catholics, therefore, say that "this is a Christian nation," they mean that it is a Catholic Christian nation. Whatever Protestants may mean by the expression, it is certain that this is the meaning, and the only meaning, it has for Catholics.

Roman Catholics and Protestants, therefore, are arrayed against each other in this claim for national recognition,—each one claiming to be the party which makes the nation Christian, and the Catholics at least, denying the position of the Protestants.

The Supreme Court decision raised this controversy,

306

and now it "will not down." It is here and must be settled. That it is not very prominent as yet does not lessen the significance of the fact. It will grow more and more prominent as time goes on.

And what a bitter controversy must ensue before it is settled! More than this: what a change its settlement must effect in the principles of this Government! for it can be settled only in accordance with papal claims. The principle of both claims is papal.

HE who engages in war, must obey absolutely the commands of his military superiors. This is the first principle of military discipline.

NOW there is a command of God which says, "Thou shalt not kill:" and another which says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." In time of war the soldier must disregard both these precepts at the order of his commander. He must kill men of the opposing force, and must do this, if so ordered, on the Sabbath day.

Is it not plainly evident, therefore, that the soldier must have another god than the Author of the Ten Commandments? Is it not evidence that the Government stands to him in the place of God?

But what man can afford to make this exchange? God has not authorized it, and the eternal interests of every man forbid it; for what James Russell Lowell wrote of war is the truth,—

"If you take a sword and dror it,
And go stick a feller throu',
Guv'ment aint to answer for it;

God'll send the bill to you."

Alas for him who expects government to answer for his misdeeds at the bar of God.

THE salvation of God is brought to the world in Christianity. That which is Christian will be saved from the final dissolution which is to come upon earthly things. All believers in Christianity agree to this.

It is said by leading representatives of the state and of the church in this country, that "this is a Christian nation." This nation, therefore, will be saved in the kingdom of God.

Every citizen of the United States is a part of this nation. The salvation of the nation must of course include the salvation of its parts.

To secure salvation, therefore, an individual needs only to become a part of this nation. If already such, he needs only to remain in it; and if not, he can become such by taking out papers of naturalization.

He may believe in Christianity, or he may not; he may be a Jew, or an agnostic, or an atheist; it matters not. His salvation is certain, yea, unavoidable, if he remains a United States citizen. And all this by virtue of Christianity!

Such is the logic of the National Reform doctrine that "this is a Christian nation." It simply makes the gospel of God of no use to the individual, as such.

And this being so, that doctrine is as clearly anti-Christian as anything that ever emanated from the "father of lies."

WHEN we point to the atrocities perpetrated upon Christians in times past in various lands, and call it religious persecution, some are ready to exclaim, "Oh, no; it was the civil power that inflicted penalties upon them. They suffered for political reasons, and for that the church is not responsible."

Yes; very likely they did suffer for political reasons. But how came such reasons to be political? How came matters of religious belief to be mixed up with politics, so that political measures had to be instituted against people on account of Christianity?

Oh, it was because the church went into politics. It was because religion and the state became united. And then religion found its way into the laws of the land, and people who opposed that religion were persecuted and put to death by the civil power, for disobedience to the civil law. And that was only a political proceeding, of course!

If the church had kept out of politics, Christians would never have been persecuted for political reasons. And when the church goes into politics, persecution for political reasons is sure to follow.

Let the church keep out of politics. That is the plain lesson taught by the history of every land where Christians have been put to death by the civil power.

"The Papacy and the Monroe Doctrine" *American Sentinel* 13, 20 , pp. 306, 307.

A PART of the scheme of Archbishop Ireland and the pope, as announced, is that "The wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine will be acknowledged; but the incidental responsibility of the United States thereunder will be defined and demonstrated."

This statement is worth some examination. It was in direct antagonism to a scheme in the interests of the papacy, and at least of which the papacy was a willing party, that the Monroe Doctrine was announced. And now it is announced on the part of the papacy, and as a part of a scheme guided by the papacy, that "the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine will be acknowledged." Does the papacy really intend now to acknowledge the wisdom of that act which defeated a cherished plan to which she was a party? In other words: Does the papacy intend really to confess to the whole world that she was wrong—even once?

About 1820, a certain "Holy Alliance" was formed by the "powers" in Europe, to maintain and propagate the absolute monarchical government in Europe. And what *holy* alliance of European powers ever was, or ever could be, formed without the co^operation and benediction

307

of the papacy to give to it the character of "holiness"? as for instance, the "Holy Roman Empire."

In 1823, this "Holy Alliance" was about to exert its power to bring all the South American colonies back in full subjection to Spain, and so to confirm and enlarge the dominion of Spain on this continent. And this of course would open the way for the planting or extension of the power of the other parties to the "Holy Alliance" on this continent also: also extending here their absolute monarchical governments: and with it all would be the extension of the power of the papacy which alone could give to the alliance the character of "holy."

Information of this scheme was conveyed by England, which was not one of the allied powers, to the United States Government. Whereupon President Monroe, in his annual message of the year 1823, published the following sentences:—

"We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between United States and the allied powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered, and shall not interfere; but with the governments which have declared the independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and just principles, acknowledged, we could not view an interposition for oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

He also declared in another place in the same message that "*The American continent should no longer be subjects for any new European colonial settlement.*" And it is said on authority that "These words of President Monroe were addressed especially to Spain and Portugal."

That is the Monroe Doctrine, and such was the occasion that called it forth. And that Monroe Doctrine is the thing, the "wisdom" of which the papacy now says "will be acknowledged."

Yet this is to be done with a "but." It is not to be a plain, open, and free acknowledgement. It is to be an acknowledgement with a string to it: "The wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine will be acknowledged; BUT the incidental responsibility of the United States thereunder will be defined and demonstrated."

That is to say that the papacy will acknowledge the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine, "but" she will *interpret* the doctrine of the United States. She and her proposed "congress of nations" will acknowledge the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine, "but" she and her "congress of nations" will *define* it, and also will "define and *demonstrate* the incidental responsibility of the United States under it" as thus defined and interpreted by herself and her "congress of nations."

And thus it is that the papacy assumes and publicly announces the prerogative of supremacy over the United States, to interpret the most cherished doctrine, and to decide the most important affairs of this Government.

Again, we say, When the papacy takes this bold stand at the very beginning of complications between the United States and a European power, what will she not do when complications have deepened, when other European interests have become involved, and when in it all settlements must be made?

In this affair between the United States and Spain, there are more points of interest and solemn importance than the movements of the army and navies.

A. T. J.

"The Last War Scene" *American Sentinel* 13, 20 , pp. 307, 308.

PUBLIC interest centers just now upon the news from the seat of war. People would like to know in advance what is going to happen during the continuance of the conflict; but this not being possible, they scan the "extras" and the bulletin boards to get the news of an event as soon after it has happened as the facilities of modern science can set it before them.

What events may transpire before the present war is concluded, no one can foretell. What other conflicts between the nations may be inaugurated, and what results may attend them, are matters hidden behind the veil which no human hand can draw aside. It might not be of any benefit to us if we could know them. But there is one thing we can know, and it is the thing we would naturally want to know most, and which it would be most to our benefit to know; that is, what is to be the final outcome. How does it all end,—all the war fervor and all the vast preparations made by all the powers for an expected conflict? We may know the answer to this question because the Word of God has set it plainly before us.

Turn to the 19th chapter of Revelation. There is given a description (v. 11 and onward) of One who comes forth from heaven upon a white horse, followed by the armies of heaven, down to the earth. The description leaves no room for doubt that the One who thus rides at the head of the armies of heaven is the Son of God. He goes forth to war, and "out of his mouth," says the Scripture, "goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations"; and all the fowls of the air are called to come and eat "the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great." And what of the nations at that time? What will be their attitude? The chapter says (v. 19):—

"And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and

their armies, gathered together to make war against Him that sat on the horse, and against His army."

The prophet saw the "kings of the earth and their armies," gathered in battle array against the Son of God and his army. Whatever power we may believe to be represented by the "beast," there can be no uncertainty as regards "the kings of the earth and their armies." This is a plain reference to the powers of earth,—the great powers—the nations of Europe, and of America as well. These are found, with their armies, arrayed against the forces of heaven. It is a "holy war," but the holiness is not on the side of the power of earth.

Of course there can be but one result. The prophet describes it:—

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

This is the last war scene in earthly history; this is how it all ends. And there is no discount on this "news." No sensational rumor or "fake" of "yellow journalism" is this, but a strictly "official" announcement from headquarters. It is absolutely reliable. Now, we see all the world arming for war. We see the war spirit overtopping every other sentiment. We see everywhere the "kings of the earth" getting their armies in readiness to take the field. Nothing like it was ever witnessed in the earth before. Never such a general preparation, such a general sound of war, was known before in human history. It is the beginning of the end, and the prophetic description tells us what the end will be. The final gathering together of armies and navies will be to make war against the forces of heaven, in the great day against the forces of heaven, in the great day of the second advent of the Son of God to the earth, in power and glory.

It is certain that no Christian will be found in the armies of the kings of the earth at that day. No Christian will be found fighting against God. Every Christian must, before that day comes, draw out from the military forces; he must renounce the spirit of war and fighting, notwithstanding what may be said by ministers of the gospel in its favor. And since he who is a Christian, or would be one, must do this sooner or later, or be found ere long on the side of opposition to

the Commander of heaven, is it not obvious that the best time to take the step is just now? Since the Christian must separate himself from all this, as being contrary to God, the separation cannot be made too soon.

The Word of God throws more and surer light on this subject than can be derived from any other source of information.

May 26, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 21 , pp. 321, 322.

THE cross of Christ is sent to all countries, but against none.

HE who is at peace with God will naturally be at peace with his fellowmen.

THE battle ground of Christian warfare is not Cuba or the Philippines, but the human heart.

THE greatness of a nation depends upon the number of its men who are great as individuals.

BIGOTRY defines the unpardonable sin as being the expression of dissent from its opinions.

POLITICS comes as near to being Christianity as federation comes to being the "unity of the Spirit."

ALL history shows that it is better that the state should dominate religion, than that religion should dominate the state.

IN the Christian warfare every soldier is sure to get killed; for he cannot be of any use as a soldier of Christ until he has been crucified with him.

THE greatest victory that was ever gained since time began was announced in these words: "I have overcome the world." And this victory is for every Christian.

THE only thing for which God gives an individual superhuman power, is to resist temptation.

CHRISTIANITY says that Spaniards and Americans should stop fighting, and be brethren. "Patriotism" says that they should fight to the bitter end, because such is the call of country.

MANY people scoff at the idea of creating money by governmental fiat, who seem to think it quite proper that there should be laws to make people good. But it is just as easy to create money by law, as to create character.

TAKE four individuals—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln; only these four—out of American history, and the reputation of this nation would suffer an incalculable loss. Any one familiar with United States history must admit this.

These four individuals were great men. But the nation did not make them great; they, on the contrary, added much to the greatness of the nation.

They became great as individuals, and it was only the recognition of this greatness which gave them national reputation. They were not great because they were put at the head of the nation; they were put at the head of the nation because they were great.

Having the same opportunities and advantages which hundreds or thousands of others about them had they rose to positions of pre-eminence by virtue of the inherent power that was in them,—the power of character. And by the same power they acquitted themselves well at the head of public affairs.

A small man—small as an individual—would look a good deal smaller at the head of a nation than he looks as a private character.

These are truths, and plain truths; yet in spite of them the notion is getting to be prevalent that individualism is a dead issue, and a doctrine of no value to

322

mankind to-day. The talk is all about "nationalism"—as if there was something in nationalism that could elevate or save mankind.

The nation cannot help the individual. Give him all the wealth of the nation, or give him all the power, and what would he do without a strong, upright character? He would do a great deal worse with them than he would without them.

Without individualism, there can be no nationalism that amounts to anything. And if the day of individualism be passed, then the day of national greatness is passed with it.

THE fourth commandment, it is claimed, does not specify that the rest day is the seventh day of the week. But this claim will not bear investigation. For the Creator, when he rested on the seventh day, completed and marked off the first *week* of time; and the day on which he rested, and which he blessed and sanctified, was necessarily the seventh day of the week. The week has continued unchanged from that time to this.

ONE of the greatest kings of antiquity, was Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. He was one of the few monarchs that have sat upon the throne of universal earthly dominion.

This Nebuchadnezzar at a certain time in his reign made a great image of gold, which he "set up in the plains of Dura," and commanded all the "people, nations and languages" of the province of Babylon to worship it.

There were three officials of the government—Hebrews—who refused to obey the king's command, and declared that they would worship the God of heaven and none other. They flatly refused to obey the law of the land.

The government said that they should do a certain thing, and they absolutely refused to do it. That was plain disloyalty to the government.

Was it? So Nebuchadnezzar thought, and he commanded them to be cast into the "burning, fiery furnace." And they were bound and cast in; but lo! another power greater than the power of Babylon interposed by a wonderful miracle vindicated them in their refusal to do that which had been commanded.

When Nebuchadnezzar, who was looking on, saw that, he changed his mind: not as regards their opposition to the law of the land, for he said that they had "changed the king's word"; but as regards their loyalty. And the indisputable proof that he changed his mind on this point is the fact that he then *promoted* these three individuals—"Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego"—in the province of Babylon. Dan. 3:30. And every Christian will admit that in this the king did what was proper and wise.

These three men, by their firm adherence to the right in opposition even to the law of the land, gave better proof of their loyalty to the government than was given by the men who obeyed it simply because it was the law. Nebuchadnezzar recognized this fact.

That was loyalty to the government then; and what true loyalty was then, it is to-day.

"An Anglo-American Alliance" *American Sentinel* 13, 21 , pp. 322, 323.

FRIDAY, May 13, Right Honorable Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies of the British Empire, in a public speech at Birmingham, Eng., used the following words:—

"The time has arrived when Great Britain may be confronted by a combination of powers, and our first duty, therefore, is to draw all

parts of the empire into close unity, and our next to maintain the bonds of permanent unity with our kinsmen across the Atlantic." [Loud cheers.]

"There is a powerful and generous nation," said Mr. Chamberlain, "speaking our language, bred of our race, and having interests identical with ours. I would go so far as to say that, terrible as war may be, even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack should wave together over an Anglo-Saxon alliance." [Prolonged cheers.]

"It is one of the most satisfactory results of Lord Salisbury's policy, that at the present time these two great nations understand each other better than they ever have done since, over a century ago, they were separated by the blunder of a British government."

Of course this remarkable statement has attracted attention, as undoubtedly it was intended to do, in all the nations. As might be expected, Spain was the first to remark especially upon it. Senor Gullon, of the Spanish government, said that the speech has "real importance, not only for Spain, but for the future of Europe."

Everyone may say that this speech has importance not only for Spain, and not only for Europe, but for the whole world. For if such an alliance shall be formed, which indeed we do not doubt will be, it will assuredly mean much for the whole world.

At present, however, we do not purpose discussing the meaning and effect of such an alliance when it might be formed; but rather the prospect that there is of its being accomplished.

Strictly, Mr. Chamberlain's words can hardly be reckoned to be more than an open reply, in the hearing of all the world, to suggestions to the same effect from the American side. In an interview, published in the *New York Herald*, April 17, Hon. E. J. Phelps, who was formerly U. S. Minister to Great Britain, said:—

"The Chinese question has assumed an importance that under all the circumstances makes it necessary for us to look seriously upon the suggestion of an alliance with England. I am not prepared to say that we should or should not form an alliance so far as individual questions are concerned. The only point of view from which we can now consider the matter is on the basis of the

323

broad principle itself—on the broad ground of general advisability."

Among the reasons given by Mr. Phelps in favor of an alliance are the following:—

"It seems to me there are several reasons, the first and most important being one which I fancy may not meet altogether with the

approval of the masses—the benefit England would be to us under such circumstances. She is a far older nation, and therefore more experienced, possessing the calm wisdom that comes with age and the power to judge dispassionately. We should be to her like the young partner to the old one, and as in the case of such a partnership the younger always gains through the ripe knowledge of his elder. The calm, firm, wise policy of England results in the settlement of difficulty, where often the ephemeral passages of our diplomacy accomplish little or nothing.

"Another reason which might weigh in favor of an alliance is the presence of our great neighbor to the north, that stretches from sea to sea—Canada. But for the presence of Canada nothing would confront us at home which would make it possible that we might have serious difficulty with England, but no man can foresee what will happen. There are difficulties between nations under such circumstances just as there are between landowners or in business life. Therefore I say that just so long as Canada exists, so long is there a possibility of difficulty which an alliance would be very apt to remove.

"Again, there is the moral strength that we should enjoy through an alliance with England. I means the moral strength resulting from the effect of such an alliance upon other nations. It is not to be supposed for a moment that any power would attack the United States and England if those two nations presented a solid front. For that reason an alliance might be advantageous.

"Still another fact we must consider when surveying the field or reason opened by the question of an Anglo-American alliance is the effect upon commerce. We are not a nation of seamen: England is. Our marine is not developed; hers has gained with every year. It is as a sea power that she holds her high position. Were it otherwise she would never be able to maintain her dignity and power in all parts of the world. On the sea an alliance would be of unquestioned advantage to us."

Three days later, April 20, Hon. John Hay, present United States ambassador to Great Britain, in a speech at the Easter Banquet at the Mansion House, London, said:—

"The good understand between us is based on something deeper than mere expediency. All who think cannot be see there is a sanction like that of religion which binds us in partnership in the *serious work of the world*.

"Whether we will or not, we are associated in that work by the very nature of things, and no man and no group of men can prevent it. We are bound by ties we did not forge and that we cannot break. We are *joint ministers* in the same *sacred mission of freedom and*

progress, charged with duties we cannot evade by the imposition of irresistible hands."

About the same time Lord Charles Beresford, Vice-Admiral, and Member of the British Parliament, said:—

"Such an alliance is natural, and I believe the mere fact of its conclusion would deter others from attacking any adequately defended interests of either country. Now is the time to accomplish it, when advantages are apparent to both countries. . . . And Anglo-American alliance would be the most powerful factor in the world for peace and the development of commerce."

This suggestion by such representative men has been widely discussed in the press, both secular and religious, of both countries, and even in the pulpit in the United States, with the vast majority of voices in its favor. For instance, at the conference of Methodist bishops lately held at Albion College, said:—

"The time will come—and may it come—when the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack will fly from the same staff and American and Englishmen will fight shoulder to shoulder for liberty and against the cause of oppression and barbarism. England is our natural ally, and the time is past when America can live its own life in and of itself. We are competent to take a part in the affairs of the great world of nations, and we are proving our right to such a course."

And now that such a high representative of Great Britain, as is Mr. Chamberlain, has so plainly announced to all the world that such an alliance would be "cheaply purchased" even by war, it may be counted as a foregone conclusion that such an alliance will be accomplished.

This is an exceedingly important matter, and we shall have more to say upon it.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 21 , p. 336.

THE difference between God's character and man's is indicated by these words of the 25th Psalm: "For thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great." The slightest of the trespass, not the greatness of it, would be the ground on which pardon would be asked of man.

IT needs not faith, but only intelligent observation, to see that now—

"We are living, we are dwelling,
In a grand and awful time."

The times call for some decisive action on the part of everybody. The person who sets out to be merely a looker-on in the great earth-drama, will be overtaken by a grievous surprise.

THE Roman Catholic Church and the Spanish government are united. This is a plain, undeniable fact. In belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, therefore, a person is bound to be at least friendly to Spain. His church, while the union lasts, goes with that government, and he must likewise go with it or withdraw from his church. This is what is demanded by logic and consistency.

And it is the same as regards the person who is a Protestant. If he is a part of the state he must go with the state; and if he is a part of the church he must also go with the church. Then when the church and the state go different ways—as in the case of Spain and the Catholic Church in America—he must withdraw from one or the other. No person can ride two horses at once, going in different directions. Of course, he may still profess allegiance to both; but logically—and actually—he must repudiate one or the other.

And it is a fact that the Christian church and the state—any state on the earth—are not going in the same direction. The Christian church is going to heaven; but the state is not going there; no state is going there. Individuals from every country on earth are going there; but no state will go there. Every state is moving toward extinction; for no state has immortality now any more than Babylon, Greece, or Rome had it. The end of the world will be the end of every state and government in the world. And, therefore, the Christian church cannot be joined with any state, and no individual can be at one and the same time, joined with the state and with the Christian church.

June 2, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 22 , pp. 337, 338.

MIGHT does not make right, but right makes might.

TO have faith means to stand alone against a multitude.

MIGHT does not make right, but right makes might.

TO have faith means to stand alone against a multitude.

IN Christian warfare the soldiers daily rations are drawn from the Word of God.

NOT legislation, but faith, is the lever which lifts fallen men to the plane of righteousness.

THE true Protestant is not he who opposes Roman Catholics, but he who opposes Romish principles.

THE real battles of the world are not fought with armies and navies, but with principles of good and of evil.

THE Christian religion looks so high for its sustaining and energizing power that it does not behold the state at all.

AN alliance with one another may suffice for the nations; but nothing will answer for the interests of the individual but an alliance with the Lord of hosts.

THE first things human that were established on earth were the individual, and individual rights. These are, therefore, the most venerable of all things human.

TO deny the rights of the non-believer in Christianity—as for instance by a law forbidding him to work or seek amusement on Sunday—is to put a barrier across the way of his possible conversion.

THE question whether war is a proper means of accomplishing Christian work, is but the question whether carnal weapons are more effective than spiritual weapons. Christians believe the latter are more effective, always.

THE only army that Christ ever commissioned is that to which he said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" and "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

IT is not always safe in this world to be on the side of the majority.

It was not safe in Noah's time, or in Abraham's time, or in Elijah's time. There is no evidence that it was safe in anybody's time. The Word of God expressly cautions the Christian that he shall "not follow a multitude to do evil."

The history of the cause of truth and righteousness is but a history of the minority who have stood for God against the spirit and will of the majority. It presents many a picture in which an individual stands alone against a multitude.

Christianity does not rest upon the decisions of majorities. It cannot recognize their authority in religious things.

The last view, prophetically given, of the majority, in the history of human events, is an interesting one. It is given in the 20th chapter of Revelation. The prophetic description is:—

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison; and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarter of the

earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.

"And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

In the beginning the majority were destroyed by a flood of water; and in the end they are found overwhelmed in a flood of fire.

There should be in this sufficient warning to Christians against building their hopes upon what may be done in this world by the majority.

RELIGION—the Christian religion—is a law. It is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." So the Apostle Paul speaks of it; and he says that by its power he was made "free from the law of sin and death." Rom. 8:2.

Being a law itself, it must be obvious that Christianity does not need a law to give it support. One law is not made to support another. A law that could not support itself would be useless altogether.

Any law that is passed for the support of Christianity, therefore, is but a declaration that Christianity is, in itself, a powerless and useless thing. It is a reflection upon God himself.

But this "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" has power to deliver men from the "law of sin and death." This is power vastly superior to any that ever was or can be exercised by any legislature or government on the earth.

To be certain of this, it is only necessary that the individual should experience the deliverance of which the apostle writes. Try it, if you have not already, and be convinced.

IT may be truthfully said of the present that it is an age of federations and fortifications.

There is federation everywhere among men and among the nations; and there are vast armies and navies created by the nations in the hope of securing a defense behind which they will be impregnable against attack.

These represent the greatest power of which the world knows. In them the world is obliged to put its trust. But will they be sufficient for the test of the day that is coming?

The world hopes that they will, but it feels no assurance. Its statesmen look to the future with forebodings. What is there that will

really prove a safe defense when the forces of destruction that have so long been gathering are unloosed?

He will be safe in that day who is behind the Lord of hosts. The winds of the final commotion are held by the angels in the "four corners of the earth" until the final choice of the people in the earth is made. Rev. 7:1-3.

There is a choice for every person to make in this matter. There is a choice to be made by you. Will you choose the means of safety that are being provided by the world? Will you be secure behind the defense of an international alliance, with the resources at its command? Will you be secure behind anything less than the shield of Omnipotence? And can you afford to place yourself behind any other defense than this to-day?

"Washington's Advice" *American Sentinel* 13, 22 , pp. 338, 339.

IN view of the favor with which the suggestion of an alliance between England and the United States has been received, and the readiness with which it is advocated in influential circles in the United States, it is of real interest to every American to know just what Washington said on that subject. We therefore present in full that part of Washington's famous and solemn address to his countrymen:—

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil, and even second, the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our

concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance, when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected—when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation—when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alli-

339

ances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are not at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold that the maxim is no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise, to extend them.

"Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

"Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying, by gentle means, the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing, with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinions will permit, but temporary, and liable to be, from time to time, abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay, with a proportion of its independence, for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having

given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon, real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

"In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations; but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigues, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated."

A. T. J.

June 9, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 23 , p. 353.

IN the Decalogue, God addresses individuals only.

THE law is all right as a fence, but it is of no use as a walking-stick.

WHEN a nation tries to make itself Christian, it always makes itself anti-Christian.

NOT the Spaniards in Cuba, but the saloons in America, are the real curse of the Western hemisphere.

THERE is no person so dextrous that he can wield both the sword of steel and the "sword of the Spirit" at the same time.

IF professors of Christianity had never gone into politics, the professedly Christian Church would never have been responsible for religious persecution.

"REVERENCE for law" does not go to the foundation of good government. Without reverence for right, there would be few laws in the land that were worthy of reverence.

TO say that the government is superior to the individuals who have formed it, is to say that the creator is inferior to the thing which he creates. But even God cannot create a thing superior to himself.

PUBLIC sentiment should not be confounded with Christian sentiment. Public sentiment may be manufactured by various

expedients known to politicians and others; but Christian sentiment comes altogether from the Word of God.

THE question of how much rest a person needs, and when it should be taken, is one to be settled by the physicians and not by the preachers, if it is to be settled outside of individual preferences.

"CIVIC righteousness," as defined by its advocates, is something altogether inferior to the righteousness which will count with God. It is, in fact, a counterfeit, and goes hand in hand with the counterfeit sabbath.

"EXCEPT your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," said Jesus Christ, "ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

What was the matter with the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees? Oh, it was all on the outside. It was all a matter of forms and ceremonies and respectable appearance. It was not a matter of the heart.

And this must be the case with all righteousness—so called—which is the product of civil law. The law cannot change the heart; it can affect only the outward deportment.

Reform by law can go no deeper than the outward deportment. But—to paraphrase the Saviour's words—Except your righteousness shall exceed that of a pious and respectable outward deportment, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Or, in other words, Except your righteousness shall be greater than "civic righteousness" ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.

Civic righteousness—the righteousness of outward forms, of scrupulous regard for the letter of the law, and of pious look and demeanor—did not stand very high in the estimation of Jesus of Nazareth. And it does not stand any higher in his sight now than it did when he rebuked the Pharisees and Scribes. The only righteousness we want is that which bears the genuine stamp.

"Reverence for Law" *American Sentinel* 13, 23 , p. 354.

"REVERENCE for law" is a very essential thing in good government, but it is not the foundation stone.

REVERENCE for law is not in itself an energizing, purifying force in government. Its value in government is not intrinsic, but is conferred by something else.

REVERENCE for law never shook the throne of a despot, or broke the shackles from a slave.

REVERENCE for law did not inspire the writing of the Declaration of Independence.

If our forefathers had always adhered to the doctrine of reverence for law, the world would never have heard of that Declaration, nor of Magna Charta.

The pathway from despotism to liberty in government has been along the line of revolution, and often squarely across that of reverence for law.

Law, in itself, is not entitled to reverence. If it were, then the worst law ever enacted would be entitled to it equally with the best, and the "three worthies" in Babylon of old did wrong in not worshiping the golden image.

In the Declaration of Independence, our forefathers took a step from the standpoint of reverence for law, to that of reverence for right. And it was a very long step; it meant revolution.

The law of Great Britain said one thing; but right, as they asserted it, said another thing. Right said that human governments were instituted to preserve the unalienable rights with which all men are endowed by the Creator. From the standpoint of reverence for law this was treason; but in the conflict, right prevailed.

Reverence for right is the pole star of good government. It cannot be lost sight of without a resulting deviation from the course which leads to national prosperity.

A person who has no reverence for right, can have no true reverence for anything.

All Christian institutions are founded in right, and hence are entitled to reverence, irrespective of any law in their behalf; nor can any such law contribute at all to the reverence felt for them by human beings.

But there are religious institutions which have no foundation in right; and it is now sought to secure reverence for these from the people by pointing to them as being part of the law of the land. Prominent among these is the institution of Sunday rest.

In behalf of this institution very much is said about the necessity of reverence for law; but nothing at all about the necessity of reverence for right. All the right in the case has to be assumed; it does not rest upon evidence.

Reverence for right is reverence for the higher law of God,—that law which says nothing about the first day as a day of rest, but commands the observance of the seventh day. As against that law, and against the requisites of good government, the doctrine of reverence for human law can be of no force at all.

"Which Is the Safest Course?" *American Sentinel* 13, 23 , pp. 354, 355.

HAVING had Washington's advice against the United States ever forming any entangling alliance with European or any other foreign power, it will not be amiss to set down, for comparison, the arguments now offered in favor of such alliance and indeed directly against Washington's advice. Then the reader can estimate the relative weight of argument, and wisdom, of the two courses advised.

Hon. Richard Olney, who was attorney general and secretary of state in President Cleveland's cabinet, writes in the *Atlantic Monthly*, thus:—

"The rule of international isolation for America was formulated by Washington, was embalmed in the earnest and solemn periods of the Farewell Address, and has come down to succeeding generations with all the immense prestige attaching to the injunctions of the Father of his country and of the statesmen and soldiers who, having first aided him to free the people of thirteen independent communities, then joined him in the even greater task of welding the incoherent mass into one united nation. The Washington rule, in the sense in which it has been commonly understood and actually applied, could hardly have been adhered to more faithfully if it had formed part of the text of the Constitution. . . .

"What is it that these utterances enjoin us not to do? What rule of abstinence do they lay down for this country? The rule is stated with entire explicitness. It is that this country shall not participate in the ordinary vicissitudes of European politics, and shall not make a permanent alliance with any foreign power. It is coupled with the express declaration that extraordinary emergencies may arise to which the rule does not apply, and that when they do arise temporary alliances with foreign powers may be properly resorted to. Further, not only are proper exceptions to the rule explicitly recognized, but its author, with characteristic caution and wisdom, carefully limits the field which it covers by bounds which in practice are either accidentally or intentionally disregarded.

"If the Government can do its duty with an ally, where it must fail without, and even if it can more securely and efficiently do that duty

with an ally than it can without, it would be not mere folly, but recreancy as well, not to make the alliance.

"If we shall sooner or later—and we certainly shall—shake off the spell of the Washington legend and cease to act the rôle of a sort of international recluse, it will not follow that former alliances with other nations for permanent or even temporary purposes will soon or often be found expedient. On the other hand, with which of them we shall as a rule practically co-operate cannot be doubtful. From the point of view of our material interests alone, our best friend as well as most formidable foe is that world-wide empire whose navies rule the seas and which on our northern frontier controls a dominion itself imperial in extent and capabilities. There is the same result if we consider the present crying need of our commercial interests. . . .

"But our material interests only point in the same direction as considerations of a higher and less selfish

355

character. There is a patriotism of race as well as of country, and the Anglo-American is as little likely to be indifferent to the one as to the other. Family quarrels there have been heretofore and doubtless will be again; and the two peoples, at the safe distance which the broad Atlantic interposes, take with each other liberties of speech which only the fondest and dearest relatives indulge in. Nevertheless, that they would be found standing together against any alien foe by whom either was menaced with destruction or irreparable calamity, it is not permissible to doubt. Nothing less could be expected of the close community between them in origin, speech, thought, literature, institutions, ideals."

Lyman Abbott, editor of *The Outlook*, published in the *North American Review*, an article on "The Basis of an Anglo American Alliance," in which he says:—

"The time has therefore passed when the United States can say, 'We are sufficient unto ourselves, we will go our way; the rest of the world may go its way.' The question is not, 'Shall we avoid entangling alliances?' We are entangled with all the nations of the globe: by commerce, by manufactures, by race and religious affiliations, by popular and political sympathies. The question for us to determine is not whether we shall live and work in fellowship with European nations, but whether we shall choose our fellowship with wise judgment and definite purpose or whether we shall allow ourselves to drift into such fellowships as political accident or the changing incidents of human history may direct. . . .

"It is for this reason I urge the establishment of a good understanding between the United States and England, in the hope that in time it will grow to a more formal alliance—civic, commercial, and industrial, rather than naval and military—and yet an alliance

that will make us, for the purposes of our international life, one people, though not politically one nation. . . .

"It is true that in a sense the United States is neither a Christian nor an Anglo-Saxon nation. It is not officially Christian, if thereby is meant a nation which gives political or financial advantage to one religion over another. It is not Anglo-Saxon, if thereby is meant a nation which sets itself to confer political power upon one race over another. But though it is officially neither Christian nor Anglo-Saxon, it is practically both. Its ethical standards are not those of Mohammedanism or Confucianism, but those of Christianity. Its ruling force in the country, educational, political, and on the whole commercial, is not Celtic, nor Slavic, nor Semitic, nor African, nor Mongolian, but Anglo-Saxon. Thus in its religious spirit, though not altogether in its religious institutions, in its practical leadership, though not in the constituent elements of its population, and in its national history and the genesis of its political institutions, the United States is of kin to Great Britain. The two represent the same essential political ideals—they are both democratic; they both represent the same ethical ideals—they are Christian; and they both represent the same race leadership—they are Anglo-Saxon. . . .

"It [an Anglo-American Alliance] would create a new confederation based on principles and ideas, not on tradition, and bounded by the possibilities of human development, not by geographical lines. It would give a new significance to the motto *E Pluribus Unum*, and would create a new United States of the World, of which the United States of America would be a component part. Who can measure the advantage to liberty, to democracy, to popular rights and popular intelligence, to human progress, to a free and practical Christianity, which such an alliance would bring with it? Invincible against enemies, illimitable in influence, at once inspiring and restraining each other, these two nations, embodying the energy, the enterprise, and the conscience of the Anglo-Saxon race, would by the mere fact of their co-operation produce a result in human history which would surpass all that present imagination can conceive or present hope anticipate."

In an interview a member of President McKinley's cabinet is reported as follows:—

"Under a broad and liberal territorial government established by the United States the people of the Philippine Islands will eventually be raised up to a condition of enlightenment and civilization that will make them able to establish a firm government.

"It is time that the people of this American Republic began to realize the greatness of their mission among the nations of the world. They must broaden their horizon, enlarge their views. Some people in their shortsightedness say that we cannot hold the Philippines without interfering with our established Monroe doctrine.

So much the worse for the Monroe doctrine. Others say that we cannot hold outlying territory under the Constitution. We amended the Constitution at the close of the last war this country was engaged in. Why cannot we amend it again?

"An amendment to the effect that the United States may extend a protectorate over the islands of the sea (without assuring them a state government) for the purpose of affording the inhabitants thereof a good government, security to life and property, freedom of religion, etc., till they are able to set up a stable government of their own, would be agreed to by the people of this country if it were ever submitted to them.

"At the close of this war with Spain the United States will hold a very different position among the nations from that which it occupied previously. Our destiny is to extend the sphere of Republican government. Our Government will have an opportunity to show whether or not it appreciates the importance of that mission.

"These great questions have been brought to the front very suddenly. But I have no doubt that the American people will use their opportunity wisely and well."

In individual life when a person *has* great influence, he always lessens it by *trying* to exert it. It is admirable to have great influence for right principles. But it is possible for a person to become proud of his influence and be ambitious to make it felt. Such pride and ambition, however, is just as subtle and dangerous as is any other sort. And all this is true of nations, which are but collections of individuals.

Right influence is most powerfully exerted, whether by individuals or nations, always in quietness and humility.

"Cromwell, I charge thee, Put away ambition.

By that sin fell the angels."

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 23 , p. 368.

"THE kingdom of God is within you," said Jesus Christ. Is it so? Is the kingdom of God within *you*? If it is, then you are not affected by the commotion and strife that are in the world. Commotion and strife are filling the world, and if the world is in you, its commotion and strife are there with it. But the kingdom of God is pervaded by peace and love. No matter how bad things get in this world, it is your privilege to live in the enjoyment of peace. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."

June 16, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 24 , p. 369.

A CIVIL government cannot practice the principles of self-denial.

THE outlook is just as bright for the Christian to-day as it ever was.

THE gospel is the best remedy for the ills of humanity; war, the worst.

SUNDAY laws stand condemned by the premium they are obliged to put upon idleness.

NO character is ever strengthened by leaning upon public sentiment or popular custom.

SIN entered the world through the individual, and through the individual it must be cast out.

THE power which is most to stir the world is not that of armies and navies, but "power from on high."

UNDER existing conditions the peace lover can well count himself, as Abraham did, a stranger and pilgrim in the earth.

A RELIGIOUS state cannot be an effective remedy for evil until it is possible for one person to be righteous for another.

THE devil never worries over any movement for moral reform which invokes the power of the state instead of the power that comes through faith.

THE duties an individual owes to God, and the manner of discharging them, are matters which stand unaffected by the fact that there are a great number of individuals in the world.

ANY religious action by the state means the interposing of man between God and man,—the substitution of a sinful, fallible mortal for the "one Mediator between God and man," Jesus Christ, and of human wisdom, authority and power for that which is divine.

LIEUTENANT HOBSON and his crew who took the "Merrimac" into Santiago harbor are not braver than the one who storms and takes the citadel of self, in the face of the fire from the forces of evil within it, and of the world without.

FOR religiously-inclined people, Sabbath laws are superfluous, since such people observe the Sabbath by their own preference.

For other people, Sabbath laws can do nothing but put them in a condition of enforced idleness. But such a condition is unnatural. Nature abhors it as she does a vacuum.

The only periods of absolute idleness for which nature provides are the hours of sleep.

As a worldly-minded man cannot be active except in a worldly way, and Sabbath laws are directed against the manifestation of worldly activity, they can, at most, only reduce such a person to a condition of idleness which is contrary to the laws of nature.

And as the laws of nature are the laws of God, it is plainly true that Sabbath laws, to be enforced by civil authority, have no place in the economy of God.

June 23, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 25 , pp. 385, 386.

"BLESSED are the peacemakers."

"IN the direction of peace," is upward.

THE natural offspring of tradition is error.

WAR and sin will go out of the world together.

THE carnal nature is always "spoiling for a fight."

TO know God, is the only sure way to "know thyself."

EXPANSION is not always an indication of healthy growth.

ANY day in the year is a good day to declare your independence of the powers of evil.

IT is better to be a "pessimist" with your eyes open, than an optimist with your eyes shut.

THE world has yet to invent a protective armor that is equal to the shield of Providence.

NATIONS, like individuals, perish far more frequently from internal disorders than from causes that operate from without.

WHEN the majority cease to feel any regard for the interests of the minority, the state has become unfit for self government.

THE person who believes that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," shows thereby that he is not familiar with the voice of God.

IT is beyond the power of legislation to broaden the "narrow way" of righteousness so as to accommodate the multitudes who are under the sway of civil authority.

AN erroneous but all too common idea of patriotism makes it a pedestal for the exaltation of self. The true patriot is willing to serve others without the hope of acquiring wealth or fame.

IT is affirmed in the Book of divine truth that there is "one God" and "one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

All men may come to God through Jesus Christ; and only through him can they come to God; for "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

But Jesus Christ is "the *man* Christ Jesus." And being a man, he is become the representative of the human race.

Thus in the government of God, which covers all our relation to him, we have a representative, "the man Christ Jesus." He stands before the Father's throne as the representative of all on earth who have accepted him as their Saviour. And God views all such as complete in him.

There is, however, a doctrine in the land which proclaims that man may represent his fellowman in religion; that religious acts may and ought to be done by the Government, in which each official is the representative of the people. It is the very common doctrine that "this

386

is a Christian nation." The declaration means that the officials of the Government ought to act for the people in religion.

Manifestly, this idea is wholly contrary to Christianity. One person cannot have faith for another; nor can one be righteous for another. If the people are sinful they must suffer for their sins, and no righteousness on the part of any official, from the President down, could save them. Speaking of a sinful land, the Lord by the prophet Ezekiel says (Eze. 14:13, 14): "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness."

The only righteousness which can save the sinner is the righteousness of Christ, which every person may receive by the exercise of faith. No government can give righteousness to anybody. There is no righteousness in the universe but God's righteousness, for he alone is righteous of himself; and his righteousness is the righteousness of Christ. And having God's righteousness Christ is perfectly fitted to be man's representative in religion; and he alone, of all beings in heaven or earth, is so fitted.

The "Christian race" must be run—the Christian life lived—looking not to the state, but "unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." Heb. 12:1, 2. To look to the state in any matter of religious faith or practice is to look away from Jesus and to depart from the foundation principle of Christianity.

THE state is the embodiment of power. By power it lives and moves and has its being. Take away the power and there is nothing left of the state.

States are, by their very nature, independent powers. When the state yields to another power, its own identity is lost, and it remains but a part of the conquering power so long as the authority of the latter is exercised over it.

But the state cannot be Christian without yielding to another power and thus surrendering its independence. For the first step in Christianity is submission to the will of God. The state therefore would simply lose itself in the government of God. In that government there are no states.

And it is a truth which all Christians know, that no person can become Christian without first passing through death. The Apostle Paul says that he was "alive" before being converted to Christianity, but that "when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Rom. 7:9. And his experience is that of all Christians. Man, *as he was before conversion* must die, before he can become Christian.

Christianity means a new creation. All that is of earth, must have a new creation before the stamp of Christianity can appear upon it.

And this utterly debars the state. For as nothing can become Christian without first passing through death, the state would simply pass out of existence in the endeavor to acquire the stamp of Christianity.

There is no "new birth" for a state.

"The New World-Power" *American Sentinel* 13, 25 , pp. 386, 387.

BETWEEN Spain and the United States there exists, and there has existed for some time, a state of war. As for the actual element of war, there has been so far very little. Yet from the little that there has been, there have already sprung prospects of possibilities that are of most profound interest to every soul in the United States, whatever his view or his attitude concerning it.

As a matter of fact, the incidents of this controversy are of far more importance to the country than all the actualities put together, so far. It is these things that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is watching and studying with most absorbing interest. We are not, in these things, criticising; we are simply calling attention to important developments.

One of these, which we have pointed out, is the distinct advance made, and point gained, by the papacy in her designs with regard to the United States. More will be heard from that before the controversy shall be ended.

Another is the proposal and prospect of an alliance between Britain and the United States.

And now a third is the proposal and serious prospect of a world career to be seized and followed by the United States all on her own part. This prospect has already become so tangible as to excite the serious attention of leading and thinking men both for it and against it. The most calm and considerate view of the situation as it is, that has yet appeared, is set forth by Col. T. W. Higginson in *Harper's Bazar* of June 11, under the title "A New World-Power," the substance of which is as follows:—

"IT startles one a little to turn back to Bacon's Essays and read there the quiet remark, made three hundred years ago (in the essay on the 'Greatness of Kingdoms'), that the only two nations of Europe which excelled in arms were the Spaniards and Turks; though he admits 'great declination' as to the latter race. He little dreamed that a few hours in the bay of Manila were to reveal the existence of a wholly new power, which in his day had not even been born on the planet, and before which the Spanish race should apparently be destined to yield. It has been given to few men and to few events to construct so much of human history as was accomplished in those few hours by Admiral Dewey. Not only did it seal the downfall of one great world-power, but the arrival of another; and it will cost all the power of resistance on the part of moderate men to keep this country from following the steps of England into an imperial position on the globe. It is a curious fact that the Monroe doctrine—"let the Western Hemisphere alone and we will let the Eastern Hemisphere alone"—was the attitude held to be radical only so long ago as the days of Cleveland and Olney. Yet those who now hold that same Monroe doctrine, and propose to abide by it, are taunted as conservatives. There have been in political history few greater and more sudden transformations of public opinion.

387

"When the Athenian general Themistocles was asked to touch a lute at a feast, he said that he could not play on that instrument, yet he could make a small town into a great city. No matter how large the country, the temptation to make it larger is just as strong. Rome means to us the Roman Empire, and England the British Empire. There are none now living who can personally recall the excitement provoked when Jefferson bought the vast Louisiana territory in

1803; but although it was a direct violation of all his political theories, and perhaps actually unconstitutional, it evidently swept the nation and practically annihilated the opposing party. There are many living who uttered the threat, 'Texas and disunion;' yet who would now be willing to forego the national possession of Texas? It would certainly be the same with the much distrusted Alaska. It is inevitable that those who have seen, again and again, these successive steps in enlargement of our territory should be tempted to raise the cry of 'manifest destiny.' It is inevitable as the temptation, when a man has already enlarged his farm by buying an adjoining lot on the northeast, that he should look with increased favor on the offer of another adjoining strip on the southwest, and so on indefinitely.

"Yet the farmer who yields much to such temptations is pretty sure to come to grief sooner or later, and it is the severest test of the judgment and self-control of a nation when it knows how to stop. Practically, this nation holds Alaska by the grace of England, just as England holds Canada by the grace of this country; and perhaps this recognized interchange of hostages is a sufficient guarantee. The case is very different when we plan to go far from home and to become occupants of islands which may involve us with all the leading powers of the world. All the entanglements of the older nations become partly ours when we once set foot on their very ground. What is worse, all the safeguard of the Monroe doctrine vanishes, for there is no reason why those nations should not proceed to parcel out South America as they have Africa, the moment we depart from the traditions of Monroe. All this is to bequeath to our children a wholly different world of policy from that which they have dwelt in—a formidable result to follow from a few hours of target-practice at Manila.

There will be involved also the enormous expense and labor of keeping up an army and navy on the scale of European nations. And this, with our vast scale in the payment of pensions—an expense far exceeding that of European nations—will affect all taxation, and consequently our whole habits of living. Nothing that we can do in any foreign waters will be worth half so much to the world as to perpetuate a successful republic on this continent; and to endanger that is to forfeit our chief mission on this planet.

The only *republic* that ever went over this ground before was the republic of Rome. And when Rome once became imperial in *territory*, it was but a little while before she became both imperial and *imperious* in *spirit*, and then it was but a little while before she became imperial in *government*.

Anybody who is really acquainted with the course of Rome, can readily appreciate the wisdom of the following words of *Harper's Weekly* of June 11, 1898:—

"The sound American believes in the genius of the republic and in virtue of its institutions. His government was founded for the benefit of the individual citizen. Its task is the most beneficent of all the tasks performed by government the world over. Its burdens rest so lightly upon its citizens that they hardly realize its existence. It makes mistakes; it is sometimes ignorant; it is often awkward; it exasperates us; it is frequently insufficient as it is: it would be *always inefficient* if the burdens of large military establishments and of colonial government were imposed upon its executive power. Its virtues lie very largely in this executive weakness. But awkward and mistaken, inefficient and exasperating as it often is, it has worked more lasting good in the world than all the other governments combined. It does not govern colonies. It governs no man against his will, or without his consent expressed as to the smallest detail. Its accomplishments for the human race and its virtues are the consequences of its differences from other governments. Other governments can manage colonies because they possess the machinery for ruling men against their wills, for levying taxes without the consent of those who pay them. In the elements and features of our Government, which differ from those of Europe, lie its Americanism, and those who wish to maintain the government as it was framed and as it has existed until now are the true Americans, while those who want to go abroad in distant oceans for new territory thus express their distrust in our institutions, and their longing for a return to the flesh-pots of Egypt."

A. T. J.

June 30, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 26 , pp. 401, 402.

THE truest patriotism is not the noisiest.

A MAN'S time is an important part of his wealth.

IT is the business of the church to invite, not to command.

THE gospel of force is the devil's counterfeit of the gospel of love.

NEITHER the church nor the state is the custodian of an individual's rights.

IN gospel work, coercion is not a remedy for failure in the line of persuasion.

THE church is effectual for righteousness only as she is energized with power from on high.

GOD worked upon the first day of the week and he will not punish any one for doing what he has done himself.

THE important question is, not what the country did for you a century ago, but what you are doing for the country to-day.

"HIGHER criticism" will have to get a good deal higher than it is before it reaches the level of that Word which it professes to dissect.

POLITICAL methods find no place in Christianity.

THE approval of conscience is worth more than the applause of the multitude.

"CHRISTIAN politics" combines the worst form of religion, with the worst form of politics. It is not Christian in any sense.

THE *Christian Statesman*, in an argument made to demonstrate the awful recklessness of deeds which constitute a desecration of Sunday, says that "Every battle begun on the Sabbath as a historical fact resulted disastrously to the aggressor."

This was printed by the *Statesman* just about the time that news came of Dewey's great victory in Manila harbor, on Sunday. As a matter of fact, it is not historically true that battles fought "on the Sabbath" have always resulted disastrously to the aggressor; but the engagement in Manila harbor, fresh in the minds of all Americans, should constitute a

402

complete answer to the current sophistry that the Government ought, as a measure of safety, to avoid the desecration of the first day of the week.

THAT which is of most value to any person, is character.

And that which, above all other things, is effectual for the development of a strong, sound character, is faith.

But faith does not call the individual's attention to the multitude of other people around him. It does not call attention to public sentiment nor to popular customs and maxims. By faith, the individual sees none of these.

By faith, the individual beholds Jesus Christ, the author of salvation to all who believe on him. The life of the Christian is lived by "looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of faith." Heb. 12:2.

By faith the individual sees "no man, save Jesus only." If he is looking at some other man or set of men, or if he is looking at human customs, opinions, and laws, contemplating the question of how much help he may derive from them in right doing, he is not

beholding Jesus at all. He is not walking by faith; he is not forming a character which will be worthy of perpetuation beyond this life.

And when laws are passed to prescribe moral duties to the individual, or those things necessary to the formation of right character, their only effect must be to point him away from Jesus Christ to the multitudes of the world, and to the sentiment of the multitudes, which the law embodies. Such laws can tend only to weaken character, not to strengthen it.

Jesus Christ is the standard of righteousness. He is the divine standard; and any standard set up by human law, whether by people in the church or out of it, can be only a human standard, and altogether below the required excellence.

Laws which are passed with the intent of doing more than to protect the rights of the individual, are worse than useless.

BE true to yourself by being true of God.

"Imperial America" *American Sentinel* 13, 26 , pp. 402, 403.

"IMPERIAL AMERICA" is a term now seriously proposed and actually used to suggest the "manifest destiny" of the United States in the "enlarged sphere" opened to her by the guns directed by Dewey on the morning of May day at Manila. This sentiment is fast growing. In a speech at a dinner tendered to him a few days ago at San Francisco, Major-General Merritt, the proposed military governor of the Philippines, said:—

"I believe in the new national policy of the United States, which looks to the acquisition of additional territory represented in outlying islands that are requisite for the development of national strength and growth. The war was begun for the enforcement of the idea of human liberty, and with no thought of national aggrandizement; but the logic of events has brought about an unexpected result and the Government has taken the Philippines by right of conquest. What the navy has won the army will hold. The strong hand of the Government on those islands ought never to be loosened. This great people is in need of room in which to spread. The people feel this, and the Government will never be able to let go of the islands that have been won by American prowess."

The Chicago *Times-Herald* is almost strictly an administration paper. With General Merritt's words—"What the navy has won the army will hold"—for a text, the Washington correspondent of the *Times-Herald* tells what he finds at the National Capital as follows:—

"What the navy conquers the army must hold."

"So said Major-General Wesley Merritt, prospective military governor of the first colony of the United States, and his sentiment has awakened a responsive echo from the nation.

"Admiral Deweys' victory at Manila has filled the American blood with the fever of conquest. Conservatives may preach on the 'policy of the fathers,' but they cannot hold the ears of the masses while the fever is on. The cooler judgment of the second sober thought may quiet the public pulse, but there is abundant evidence that for the time being the sentiment of the nation is against the surrender of any territory wrenched from the grasp of Spain, with the exception of Cuba.

"FLOOD OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT"

"Hawaii will be annexed as one of the first results, and, once launched on a policy of colonial expansion, who can say where it will end? Speaker Reed and the sugar trust and other powerful interests were opposed to Hawaii, but they have been engulfed in the flood of public sentiment. The House of Representatives will vote for annexation Wednesday afternoon. The opposition in the Senate may filibuster indefinitely, but the wearers of the toga might better accept their fate gracefully, for the handwriting is on the wall.

"But it is the jewels of Alfonso's crown at which the newborn lust of conquest aims. It is the Spanish isles of the Orient and Occident that have challenged the American prowess. It is the idea of empire that has filled the American soul with world-wide ambitions. These aspirations are a new force in American life, and sooner or later the guiding statesmen must face that force. Washington is the nerve center of the country, and the new sentiment is

403

surging to this center with such intensity as to command earnest attention.

"SPAIN'S ISLAND POSSESSIONS"

"Already the cry is that Spain must be stripped of all her island POSSESSIONS IN AMERICAN AND Asiatic seas. Let the figures tell the price of that stubborn quality termed 'Spanish honor.' This is the list of the principal islands, with their area and population, according to the latest statistics:—

AMERICAN

Square Miles. Population.

Cuba	41,655	1,631,687
----------------	--------	-----------

Porto Rico.	3,670	806,708
---------------------	-------	---------

AMSIATIC

Philippines.	114,326	7,000,000
Sulus.	950	75,000
Carolines and Pelews.	560	36,000
Ladrones, or Marianos	420	10,172
Total, . . .	161,581	9,559,567

"President McKinley has no colonial policy. He is not counting any chickens before they are hatched. He will not cross the bridge until he comes to it. It is his purpose to bring the war to a successful end before formulating any policy for the disposition of the pearls of the sea garnered by American valor, but there is a tide of public opinion already set in for colonial expansion that may sweep all opposition before it. This statement must not be taken as an implication that the President will oppose such a policy, for he has stated distinctly to close friends that he will not be diverted by such problems from the main purpose of crowning American arms with complete and lasting victory.

"MERRITT HITS POPULAR CHORD

"Unused to the possession of insular colonies, taught by a hundred years of precept and example to avoid it, the first thought of Americans on learning of the triumph of Admiral Dewey was that Spain should not be punished by the loss of the Philippines. American sentiment has changed. It has become familiar with the thought of 'colonial empire,' and there is something in the sonorous term that appeals to the imagination. Advocates of colonial expansion have sprung up on every hand. The disease is contagious, and the masses have caught the fever.

"General Merritt not only touched a popular chord, or at least awoke a dormant chord to responsive rhythm, but his phrase has furnished the country with a telling shibboleth. Statesmen may make the laws, but greater than they is he who turns the sentiment or passion of a nation into a pat epigram. General Merrit [*sic.*] has made the epigram, and if he were a younger man it might make him President of the United States and its dependencies.

"NEW NATIONAL DESTINY

"By one of the accidents with which all history is strewn the American people have a new destiny opened before them. One need not be for or against a policy of colonial expansion to

recognize the fact that the nation is at the parting of the ways, nor should one be blind to the wonderful possibilities and the grave responsibilities presented to the United States for its choosing, but a calm survey of the field from Washington is calculated to convince one that there has been a remarkable transformation in the American habit of thought. It has been revolutionized, apparently, within a few weeks. The change is reflected in Congress, for the representatives of the people are quick to catch the public pulse.

"The American Government entered on this war to free Cuba and hand it over to the Cubans, but the American people may change their mind. Influences are at work that may ultimately force the retention of the pearl of the Antilles, though this Government would be quick to disavow such a possibility. It is conceded that a protectorate will probably be established over Cuba for a time, until the Cubans shall have organized a competent government of their own, and from a protectorate it may be a short passage to actual possession. There are faint murmurings that betoken the growth of a new sentiment for the retention of Cuba, and the Government may have to face a tidal wave when the war is over and the cost is counted."

In a sermon only a few days ago President Patton, of Princeton, said:—

"History knows not what it is to retreat. Every step we take shuts a door behind us. The boom of Admiral Dewey's cannon across the Pacific made us forget Washington's farewell address and throw the Monroe doctrine for a time into the background. It is impossible, some one says, for a nation to secede from the family of nations, and if it stays in the family it is going to have family complications."

All these things are worthy of thoughtful consideration; for no one knows what "manifest destiny" may produce. And if we mark events as they pass, we shall be able better to understand each new phase that may open to the world. These are times in which the world moves rapidly, and must may occur in a day. "Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments."

A. T. J.

"In Puritan Days" *American Sentinel* 13, 26 , p. 407.

THE wish which some good people in this country have expressed, for a return of Puritanism, is one which, charitably construed, may be attributed chiefly to ignorance. At this distance, under the softening but deceiving touch of time, it is easy to mistake the austerity, intolerance, and rigid formalism of Puritanism for the higher qualities of character imparted by true religion, the need of

which is so strongly felt in all lands; but a closer view of Puritanism will convince any candid observer that were Puritan ways, customs, and ideas of morality to become again prevalent here, may of those who are now foremost in asserting the country's need of Puritanism would be foremost in raising an outcry against it.

It is well known, for example, that Puritanism was very tolerant of indulgence in intoxicating drink. The following "ordination bill," dated at Hartford, Conn., in 1784, is one that has been recently printed as a curiosity:—

?	S.	D.			
"To keeping ministers.	0	2	4		
" 2 mugs tody	0	5	10		
" 5 segars,	0	3	0		
" 1 pint wine	0	0	9		
" 3 lodgings,	0	9	0		
" 3 bitters,	0	0	9		
" 3 breakfasts,	0	3	6		
"15 boles punch,	1	10	0		
"24 dinners,	1	16	0		
"11 bottles of wine,	0	3	0		
" 5 mugs flip	0	5	10		
" 3 boles punch,	0	6	0		
" 3 boles tody,	0	3	6"		

Alice Morse Earle, well known as an authority upon facts of Puritan history, says of this bill, of which she was the modern discoverer: "I sadly fear me, that at that Hartford ordination, our parson ancestors got grievously 'gilded,' to use a choice 'red-lattice' phrase."

The same authority mentions other ordination bills which included among the items of expense barrels of rum and cider and metheglin, bowls of flip and punch, toddy, etc.

Not quite so bad as this, but no more justifiable from a Christian standpoint, was a feast held on the occasion of the ordination of Dr. Cummings as pastor of the Old South Church, of Boston, in 1761, which is thus described:—

"There were six tables that held one with another eighteen persons each, upon each table a good rich plum pudding, a dish of boiled pork and fowls, and a corn'd leg of pork with sauce proper for it, a leg of bacon, a piece of alamode beef, a leg of mutton with caper sauce, a roast line of veal, a roast turkey, a venison paste, besides chess cakes and tarts, cheese and butter. Half a dozen cooks were employed upon this occasion, upwards of twenty

tenders to wait upon the tables; they had the best of old cider, one barrel of Lisbon wine, punch in plenty before and after dinner, made of old Barbados spirit. The cost of this moderate dinner was upwards of fifty pounds lawful money."

The dinner given at the dedication of the Old Tunnel Meeting House, of Lynn, Mass., in 1682, is described as follows:—

"Dainty meats were on ye table in great plenty, bearstake, deer meat, rabbit, and fowle, both wild and from ye barnyard. Luscious puddings we likewise had in abundance, mostly apple and berry, but some of corn meal with small bits of sewet baked therein, also pyes and tarts. We had some pleasant fruits; as apples, nuts, and wild grapes, and to crown all we had plenty of good cider and ye inspiring Barbadoes drink. Mr. Shepard and most of ye ministers were grave and prudent at table, discoursing much upon ye great points of ye dedication sermon and in silence laboring upon ye food before them. But I will not risque to say on which they dwelt with most relish, ye discourse or ye dinner."

The following relates to a different matter, but is no less characteristic of Puritan times. It is a leaf from the diary of Obadiah Turner, dated at Lynn, Mass., two and a half centuries ago. The diary was discovered recently by an antiquarian, and the extract was published in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city:—

"1646. Iune ye 3. Allen Bridges hath bin chose to wake ye sleepers in meeting. And being mch proude of his place, must needs have a fox taile fixed to ye end of a long staff wherewith he may brush ye faces of them yt will have napps in time of discourse; likewise a sharp thorne wherewith he may prick such as be most sounde. On ye laste Lord his day, as hee strutted about ye meeting house, hee did spy Mr. Tomlins sleeping with much comfote, hjs head kept steadie by being in ye corner, and hjs hand grasping ye rail. And so spying, Allen did quicklie thrust his staff behind Dame Ballard and give hjm a grievous prick vppon ye hand. Wherevppon Mr. Tomlins did spring vpp mch above ye floore and with terrible force strike with his hand against ye wall, and also, to ye great wonder of all, prophainlie exclaim, in a loude voice, cuss ye woodchuck; he dreaming, as it seemed, yt a woodchuck had seized and bit his hand. But on coming to know where hee was and ye great scandal hee had committed, he seemed mch abashed, but did not speake. And I think hee will not soone againe go to lseepe in meeting. Ye women may sometimes sleepe and none know it, by reason of their enormous bonnets. Mr. Whiting doth pleasantly say yt from ye pulpit hee doth seem to be preaching to stacks of straw with men sitting here and there among them."

Certainly there can be no good reason for desiring a return to Puritan ways, or as some deluded persons have expressed it, "a rain

of Puritanism." The independence of Puritanism which the country achieved through the efforts of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and their co-laborers, is as worthy of perpetuation as is its independence of Great Britain.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 26 , p. 416.

APPETITE and passion are far worse tyrants than was George III.

PERSONAL independence means more to you than national independence.

ALL human laws are a failure which aim either to make it as easy as possible to do right, or as hard as possible to do wrong.

"OLD Glory" bears neither mark nor sign suggestive of empire or a colonial government. Will the nation adopt a new flag?

A VERY good thing, in its place, becomes a very bad thing, out of its place. The church, out of her proper place, becomes one of the worst institutions in the world.

THE law of the land says that you shall not spend your time in doing that which interferes with the rights of your neighbors. And this is as far as human law has a right to go.

OUR forefathers of Revolutionary days fought against the *principle* of arbitrary government embodied in an act of Parliament imposing a tax on tea. The tax itself was very mild; but the unjust principle was just as big in the mild tax as it would have been in a heavy one. And so of a Sunday law; the unjust principle embodied in the law is in no wise affected by making the requirements of the law mild instead of severe. It is against the principle of such measures that we need to be guarded.

"WHY don't God kill the devil?" some people foolishly ask. The answer is that God believes in religious liberty, and is now giving the human family an opportunity, through the enjoyment of that liberty, to develop character. God purposes to dispose of the devil and sin and all that is evil at one and the same time; for all these things belong together and all tend toward the same end. But if God were to destroy sin now, all sinners would be destroyed with it; but sinners are yet on probation, and have an opportunity to separate from sin, so that the destruction of sin will not involve them with it; and besides, God is able to deliver all persons from the devil, so that so far as that is concerned, the devil doesn't need to be destroyed. If God were to kill

the devil now it would be an acknowledgement that he could not successfully contend with him on even terms.

SOME people find fault with the AMERICAN SENTINEL for speaking so much in a tone of challenge. They think it should have more to say in the line of "All's well," or "Good time coming." We assure our friends that the SENTINEL would be glad to make this report if it could do so upon evidence. It proceeds upon the principle that it is better to know an unpleasant truth, than a pleasant lie. There is a good time coming, but we will not survive to see it unless we know how to meet and escape existing perils.

July 14, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 27 , pp. 417, 418.

THE carnal nature is the architect of hell.

NOT all is Christian that appears angelic.

"THE weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

THE gospel of God cannot be preached by the law of man.

ANY "moral reform" that is not wrought in the heart is a delusion.

CONSCIENCE is one of the things which the Sunday law aims to close up.

"CHARITY" is never found far from her sister graces faith and hope.

IT is useless to invoke the aid of human law in the warfare that is not against flesh and blood, but against "spiritual wickedness in high places."

TRUTH and righteousness cannot fall to the ground while God remains upon his throne. That which embodies truth and righteousness needs no support from the civil arm.

IF law could make men better, there would be no need of the gospel.

NO AMOUNT of legislation can separate conscience from the Sabbath.

THE "snapshot" is a poor way to get a correct photograph of character.

ALL Christian institutions have their support in God; and they need no other.

THE institution of the Sabbath can be neither civil nor uncivil. It is purely religious.

ANY religion might as well go down

418

which cannot be sustained by love to God and to one's fellowmen.

SOME of the most troublesome people in the world are those who have a surplus of conscience—enough for themselves and for all their neighbors.

THE test of Christianity is love; not that which men may call love, but the love of God. Christianity means being like God in our disposition toward others.

But what is the love of God? The Scripture says: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins;" and "God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." John 4:10; Rom. 5:8.

As God loved those who were his enemies, so must Christians love their enemies. They must love all men and count all as their brethren.

But how is love of our enemies to be manifested? The answer is plain. If we are actuated by the spirit of God, our love for all men will be manifested in sacrificing for them even as God did. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on on [*sic.*] him might not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

How then ca the spirit of love—the love of God—be reconciled with the spirit of war? We cannot reconcile it. The spirit of love says that we should lay down our lives for our enemies. The spirit of war says that our enemies should lay down their lives for us.

The Christian warfare does not mean death to our enemies, but death to self. And if Christians are engaged in this warfare, they will not at the same time be engaged in any other.

"A Little Piece of Ancient History Which Is Also Modern" *American Sentinel* 13, 27 , pp. 419, 420.

IN considering the new and "imperial" career that is being opened before the United States, and sanctioned by so many in high positions, we have remarked that there was one republic that had passed over this ground once before in the history of the world. That republic was Rome. It is interesting to read the statements made to-day concerning this "colonial policy" and "colonial career" that is opening up before "imperial America," and compare it with what has

long been written of the course of Rome as she passed over the same ground. It is now claimed on behalf of the new, "Imperial America," that she must accept this great responsibility that has fallen upon her of extending the blessings of liberty to the world. And that she must discharge this sacred office by beginning to deliver from the oppressive rule of Spain, the people of the Phillipines [*sic.*], San Juan, Cuba, perhaps the Carolines and so on to the other oppressed peoples of the world. It is said that America will thus extend the blessing of liberty, just *because* of the blessing of liberty, she will bestow freedom, entirely from love of human freedom as far as possible to all the world.

All this is precisely what Rome proposed to do. Rome claimed that she never wished to make any conquests of any people, nor to control any territory, outside of her own boundaries of Italy. All that she ever did outside of Italy was altogether out of pure benevolence and solely to extend to oppressed peoples the blessings of liberty, of which the Romans were the exemplars before the world, and in behalf of the world, and which they so sincerely loved that they couldn't be content at all so long as any other people were not enjoying this wonderful liberty. Therefore they would man fleets and raise armies, send them over seas at great sacrifice and immense expense to fight battles for strange peoples, only that those peoples might have the blessing of liberty of which Rome was the world's conservator.

One example will illustrate this whole subject. The Romans had sent an army into Macedonia to fight against Philip the Second in behalf of the States of Greece and to save them from being oppressed by Philip. The Roman army was successful, Philip was thoroughly conquered and a treaty of peace was concluded, but "all Greece was in uncertainty" as to what should be their fate, now that the Roman power was predominant in both Greece and Macedonia. It was the time when the Isthmian games were celebrated in which all Greece participated and where vast crowds were assembled to witness the contests, then "the multitude being assembled in the stadium to see the games, a herald came forward and published with a loud voice" the following proclamation:—

"The senate and people of Rome, and Titus Quintius, their general, having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, ease and deliver from all garrisons, taxes and imposts, the Corinthians, the Locrians, the Phocians, the Euboeans, the Phthiot Achaeans, the Magnesians, the Thesslians, and the Perrhoebians; declare them

free, and ordain that they shall be governed by their respective laws and usages."

"At these words, which many heard but imperfectly, because of the noise that interrupted them, all the spectators were filled with excess of joy. They gazed upon and questioned one another with astonishment, and could not believe either their eyes or ears; so like a dream was what they then saw and heard. It was thought necessary for the herald to repeat the proclamation which was now listened to with the most profound silence, so that not a single word of the decree was lost. But now, fully assured of their happiness, they abandoned themselves again to the highest transport of joy and broke into such loud and repeated acclamations that the sea resounded them to a great distance; and some ravens which happened to fly at that instant over the assembly fell down in the stadium; so true it is, that of all the blessings of this life, none are so dear to mankind as liberty! The games and sports were hurried over with neglect and disregard; for so great was the general joy upon this occasion that it extinguished every other thought.

"The games being ended, all the people ran in crowds to the Roman general, and every one being eager to see his deliverer, to salute him, to kiss his hand, and to throw crowns and festoons of flowers over him, he would have run the hazard of being pressed to death by the crowd, had not the vigor of his years, for he was not above thirty-three years old, and the joy which so glorious a day gave him, sustained and enabled him to undergo the fatigue.

"The remembrance of so delightful a day, and of the valuable blessings then bestowed, was continually renewed, and for a long time formed the only subject of conversation at all times and in all places. Every one cried in the highest transports of admiration, and a kind of enthusiasm, that there was a people in the world who, at their own expense and the hazard of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; and that not for their neighbors or people situated on the same continent; but who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universally law, equity, and justice. That by a single word, and the voice of a herald, liberty had been restored to all the cities of Greece and Asia. That a great soul only could have formed such a design; but that to execute it was the effect at once of the highest good fortune and the most consummate virtue.

"They called to mind all the great battles which Greece had fought for the sake of liberty. 'After sustaining so many wars,' said they, 'never was its valor crowned with so blessed a reward as when strangers came and took up arms in its defense. It was then that almost without shedding a drop of blood, or losing scarce one man, it acquired the greatest and noblest of all prizes for which

mankind can contend. Valor and prudence are rare at all times; but of all virtues, justice is most rare. Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades had great abilities for carrying on war, and gaining battles both by sea and land; but then it was *for themselves* and *their* country, not for strangers and foreigners, they fought. That height of glory was reserved for the Romans."

Honest old Rollin's "reflections" upon this, are important to-day, as the United States seems about to start

420

in this same identical path. These reflections run thus:—

"The reader may perceive in the events above related one of the principal characteristics of the Romans which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece and produce an almost general change in the universe: I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent. It reveals itself by degrees; and it is only by insensible progress which at the same time is sufficiently rapid, that we see it carried at last to its greatest height.

"It must be confessed, that this people, on some occasions, show a moderation and disinterestedness, which from a superficial view, seem to exceed everything we meet with in history, and to which it seems inconsistent to refuse praise.

"Was there ever a more glorious day than that in which the Romans, after having carried on a long and dangerous war, after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim claim in a general assembly that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty and desired to reap no other fruit from their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glory sufficed to endear them to the Romans?

"Had this deliverance of the Grecian states proceeded from a principle of generosity, *void of all interested motives*; had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans never belied such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august or more capable of doing honor to a nation. But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive, that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded upon a *profound policy*, wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness which has been so highly extolled on the present occasion. It may be affirmed that the Grecians then abandoned themselves to a stupid joy: fondly imagining that they were really free because the Romans declared them so.

"The Romans declared loudly in favor of those republics [of Greece]; made it their glory to take them under their protection, and *that* with no other design *in outward appearance*, than to defend

them against their oppressors; and further, to attach them by still stronger tie, *they held out to them a specious bait*, as a reward for their fidelity—I mean liberty, of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous, and which the Macedonian monarchs had perpetually disputed with them.

"The bait was artfully prepared, and was eagerly swallowed very greedily by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no further. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them, discovered the danger that lay beneath this charming bait; and accordingly they exhorted the people from time to time in their public assemblies, to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the west; and which, changing on a sudden into a dreadful tempest, would break like thunder over their heads to their utter destruction.

"Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation toward such States and nations as addressed them for protection: they succored

422

them against their enemies; took the utmost pains in terminating their differences and in suppressing all commotions which arose amongst them; and did not demand the least recompense for all these services done for their allies. By this means, their authority gained strength daily and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

"Under the pretense of manifesting their good will, of entering into their interests, and of reconciling them, they rendered themselves as the sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered in some measure as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome, but afterwards they used to summon those who refused to be reconciled; obliged them to plead their cause before the senate, and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators, having become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of *rebellion* to a second resistance. Thus there arose in the Roman senate, a tribunal which judged all nations and kings, and from which there was no appeal.

"We see by the event to what this so-much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans was confined. Enemies to the liberty of all nations, having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchy, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped with insatiable ambition the conquests of the whole world. They seized

indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass."

This extract will be good to keep, and to read along with much spread-eagleism that has been and that will be manifested upon "Imperial America," "our colonial policy," and "our obligations to extend the blessings of liberty to oppressed peoples" and "to all the world."

A. T. J.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 27 , p. 426.

THE Constitution of the United States provides that no slavery nor involuntary servitude, save as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the territory or under the jurisdiction of the United States.

This is in harmony with and demanded by the idea of "government of the people, by the people and for the people." It means that no people shall be governed by the United States without their consent.

But it is now proposed to annex the Hawaiian and Phillipine Islands and to extend over the inhabitants of the same the jurisdiction of the Government, independently of their consent. The case of Hawaii is especially prominent at this time. The question of annexation has long been before the peoples of both countries, and the Hawaiians have never signified that they desired it. Their attitude, on the contrary, has been distinctly against it. By annexation, therefore, they will be brought involuntarily into subjection to the American Government.

But the experiment of involuntary subjection has already been tried by this Government, and the result was such as should never be forgotten by the American people. For many years after the establishment of the Constitution involuntary servitude was maintained in many of the States, and was sanctioned by the Federal authority. And the final result was the terrible civil war.

With that warning lesson before their eyes, the American people may well hesitate to approve that which will again violate the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution, and set up the ensign of liberty and union over a people held in subjugation.

This nation was established to proclaim to the world liberty in government; and when it ceases to do this, by annexing to itself a

conquered territory and people, it becomes useless for the purpose for which it was divinely ordained and may no longer count upon a favoring Providence.

July 21, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 28 , p. 433.

AN ounce of consecration is worth a pound of talent.

RELIGIOUS legislation puts law in the place of conscience.

NO STATE was ever known to be saved by a profession of religion.

HUMAN nature and heathenism have been in partnership since the fall.

NO MAN who appreciates liberty desires to withhold any degree of it from his neighbor.

THE peace which is needed in this world is not the kind that has to be imposed on people by force.

THE Sabbath, as God's memorial, can no more be lost or changed by the acts of men than can the rainbow.

JESUS CHRIST is the true rest-giver; but he commands no person to receive it; he only invites men to come to him.

THE country has plenty of men who are willing to die for it; what it needs is men who are willing to live for it.

THE world's peace is maintained by the rule of earthly powers; with the Christian, peace itself is the ruling power.

A LEGISLATURE can enact a Sabbath law with exactly the same propriety that it could set about the task of manufacturing rest for the people.

THE boy who tries to lift himself by the straps of his boots, is father to the man who thinks people can be made better by religious legislation.

THE Sabbath day is restful only to him who uses it religiously, as the Creator designed. It is God's rest, and therefore the rest cannot be other than religious.

"Defining Sin" *American Sentinel* 13, 28 , pp. 433, 434.

A PRESS item announces that "By invitation of their General Assembly, the United Presbyterians are to vote in their presbyteries on the question whether the use of tobacco is a sin."

But how can the vote of the presbyteries settle the question, any more than a certain Presbyterian vote some years ago settled the question of infant damnation, or than the vote of the papal Ecumenical Council settled it that the pope is infallible? The principle of all such voting is papal and not protestant.

The Apostle Paul tells us that he discovered what was sin by means of the law. "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7.

And the Apostle John says also: "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4.

And that law demands that an individual love the Lord with all his heart, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself. Is this consistent with the love of tobacco?

We think not. The smoking and chewing of tobacco

434

is an utterly useless indulgence, to say nothing of its harmful character, as established by medical testimony and the facts of observation: or of its filthiness, utterly inconsistent with sanctification of the flesh and spirit. And being utterly useless, the love of it, which all users of the weed acquire, is certainly altogether inconsistent with that love to God which demands that we devote all our energies and means to the service of God and our fellowmen. Every useless indulgence proclaims that the individual does not love God supremely, as the law requires.

Just what the law does require, in any case, must be brought to the consciousness of the individual by the Word of God, and the convicting power of the Spirit.

It is useless for any assembly of men to try to define sin. The law of God has settled every such question for all time. The principle of such a proceeding leads directly away from the law, and from its Author.

"Another Piece of Ancient Republican History Which Is Also Modern"
***American Sentinel* 13, 28 , pp. 435, 436.**

THE example of the republic of Rome in becoming imperial in territory, is a point worthy of careful consideration just now in view of the career of imperialism in territory that is just now opening before the republic of the United States. This, because imperialism in territory was the open road through which the republic of Rome walked to every other sort of imperialism.

Foreign territory once acquired, must be governed and the governors must be sent from Rome. The Senate was the governing power of the provinces, and had the appointing of the governors. And the governorship was the goal of wealth. A governor could go out from Rome poor, perhaps a bankrupt, hold his province for one, two, or three years, and return with millions.

"To obtain a province was the first ambition of a Roman noble. The road to it lay through the praetorship and the consulship: these offices, therefore, became the prizes of the State, and being in the gift of the people, they were sought after by means which demoralized alike the givers and the receivers. The elections were managed by clubs and coteries; and, except on occasions of national danger or political excitement, those who spent most freely were most certain of success.

"Under these conditions the chief powers in the commonwealth necessarily centered in the rich. There was no longer an aristocracy of birth, *still less of virtue*. . . . But the door of promotion was open to all who had the golden key. The great commoners bought their way into the magistracies. From the magistracies they passed into the Senate."—Froude. And from the Senate they passed to the governorship of a province.

To obtain the first office in the line of promotion to the governorship, men would exhaust every resource, and plunge into what would otherwise have been hopeless indebtedness: yet having obtained the governorship, when they returned, they were fully able to pay all their debts, and still be millionaires.

The highest offices of State were open in theory to the meanest citizen: they were confined, in fact, to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged for distinctions of wealth. The struggle between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege was over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society."—Froude.

Everybody can see how exactly this sketch of the political character of Rome in her republican days is paralleled already in the political character of the United States. And now this prospective imperialism in territory of the United States opens the door to be a further parallel and a further development of the imperial spirit, through provincial and colonial systems of governments.

436

Of course, republican Rome did not go the full length at a plunge. She began in genuine "republican simplicity." Indeed, "the governor was bound by law to administer his office with republican honesty and

frugality." Accordingly, "Cato, when governor of Sardinia, appeared in the towns subject to him on foot and attended by a single servant who carried his coat and sacrificial ladle; and, when he returned from his Spanish governorship, he sold his war-horse beforehand, because he did not hold himself entitled to charge the State with the expenses of its transport."

But, "The new provincial system necessitated the appointment of governors, whose position was absolutely incompatible, not only with the welfare of the provinces, but with the Roman Constitution. As the Roman community in the provinces took the place of the former rulers of the land, so the governor appeared there in the position of a king." "But it is not practicable for any length of time to be at once republican and king. Playing the part of governors demoralized the Roman ruling class with fearful rapidity. Haughtiness and arrogance toward the provincials were so natural in the circumstances, as scarcely to form matter of reproach against the individual magistrate."—*Mommsen*.

Now read the following analysis by *Harper's Weekly*, of what will be the governing power in the colonial possessions, which by the present war, are being almost forced under the authority or the protectorate of the American republic:—

"There is no doubt as to the power of Congress to acquire territory. The power to declare war and the power to make treaties imply the power to acquire territory. There is no one who questions its existence. It has been declared over and over again by the Supreme Court. Neither is there any doubt as to the power of Congress to govern territory so acquired. This is expressly granted to Congress in the provision of the Constitution which authorizes the legislative branch of the Government to make needful rules and regulations respecting territories. As Justice Bradley said in 'The Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints vs. United States': 'It would be absurd to hold that the United States has power to acquire territory and no power to govern it when acquired.'

"Nothing, then, can prevent the annexation of territory that may be acquired in war with Spain or through a treaty of peace; whether a resolution of annexation would hold is another question, which, however, is not likely to be raised. And territory once acquired, *it will be governed absolutely by Congress*; the President and the regular judiciary having nothing to say in the matter after the organic law establishing the territorial government, if such a law be passed, is once in operation. If, however, Congress assumes full control as a local government, it will be free to do as it will—to pass one law for

one territory and another for another, or to neglect all impartially; while as to the executive and judicial authorities of these territories, they will be such men as the politicians of Congress prefer."

Thus in this "imperial" career that opens before the republic of the United States, and which the multitude are insisting that she shall accept, the Congress of the United States will stand exactly in the attitude in which the Senate of the Roman republic stood. And with politics already in this republic, an exact parallel with that in the Roman republic, who can soberly and honestly doubt that the like results will follow here, that followed there as certainly as this republic allows herself to be drawn into this course of imperialism which now is opened?

A. T. J.

July 28, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 29 , p. 453.

"THE wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God."

HUMAN nature has always believed in a political gospel.

THE devil is the inventor of the much-tried plan of driving people to do right.

HEAVEN is free to all, but you cannot get into the other place without paying for it.

THE "higher" the criticism of God's Word, the lower is the source from which it emanates.

POLICY is the sand upon which stand the houses that will be overthrown by the coming storm.

IF by God's perfect law the world is condemned, how then by man's crude law can it be saved?

WHEN men turn their backs on the Bible, they naturally think that the Bible is behind the times.

IN every transgression of the divine law, we bid an eternal farewell to all that we hold most dear.

THE lightest sin is heavy enough to sink the soul; the smallest is big enough to contain Calvary.

THE devil never pastes his true likeness upon the bill boards or gives his photograph to the public.

THE pathway of righteousness is too narrow and rough to be used by the "political machine." The broad way is the path for it.

THE armory of the Christian supplies no weapons for killing men.

THE power of God unto salvation cannot reach the soul through the channel of human law.

TO DENY self until self is dead is the hardest battle a human being can fight, and the victor attains the loftiest heights of heroism.

[Inset.] The artist has depicted it in the effort of the clergyman to drive people out of the broad path of worldliness and carnality into the narrow way of righteousness, by bringing upon them the penalty of civil law. The attempt only drives them against a perpendicular wall which no human power can enable them to scale. No human power can place an individual in the pathway of obedience to God: all laws enacted for such a purpose are utterly futile. The individual must be lifted up from the broad and downward way into the high, narrow and upward way by the power of *faith*. Civil law is effective only in the field of natural rights.

"God and Religious Freedom" *American Sentinel* 13, 29 , p. 454.

THE leading organ of "free thought" in this section, *The Truth Seeker*, notes with a tone of some surprise the answer in a late SENTINEL to one of its pet conundrums, "Why don't God kill the devil?" It says the question has not been answered, and in proof of this submits several questions, and hints at others equally unanswerable in reserve. We notice those bearing directly on the point at issue:—

"Why could not God kill the devil and save the sinners?"

"If God is able to deliver all persons from the devil, why does he not do it?"

"If there is no need to destroy the devil, then he must be powerless; and if he is powerless, what are the Christians afraid of?"

"If God can successfully contend with the devil, why do the vast majority of the race sin and go to hell—that is, if Christian theology be true?"

These questions can be answered because God believes in religious freedom. If he did not they could not be answered.

God could force all things to come to his terms: but he did not force his creatures in the past, and does not force them now, because he does not believe in a forced service.

God might have forced Lucifer to have remained obedient in his station in heaven. But what would have been the worth of such obedience? and what would Lucifer have been without a character?

Lucifer sinned and became the devil; and he led countless multitudes to rebel with him. But better was it that all this should be, than that God's creatures should have been deprived of their free will, to prevent their sinning. And what a testimony is this to the value of individual freedom in the sight of God!

Because all have this individual freedom, many—even the great majority—*choose* to go contrary to the will of God. They choose not to submit themselves to him. This is the only reason why he cannot save them.

God will—and does—deliver all persons from the devil who choose to be delivered. But it is in the power of every person not to let God deliver them. The Scripture says, "Submit yourselves therefore unto God; resist the devil and he will flee from you."

The devil is powerless with regard to any individual who chooses to let God keep him from the devil. The individual who chooses otherwise finds the devil very powerful indeed. The individual who chooses the devil's pathway instead of the Lord's, cannot reasonably expect that God will preserve him from harm. The individual who sins, chooses sin and its consequences; and God cannot, without being arbitrary, interfere with his choice.

The vast majority of the race sin and doom themselves to destruction because they choose to walk in that way rather than in the way of life. This constitutes no evidence that God cannot successfully contend with the devil. It proves only that God is not arbitrary in his dealings with them.

God allows the devil to live and work with all his power to destroy souls, and at the same time he saves from all the power of the devil and from the power of the world and the power of sin, every individual who comes to him through the avenue of salvation he has opened. And thus he gives to the universe a mightier testimony of his power to save than could be given were he to remove the devil by destroying him. That indeed would be a virtual confession that God could not save people while the devil lived. But that confession would be a stupendous lie.

Seemingly it is the mind of the *Truth Seeker* and of the class for whom it speaks, that God—admitting his existence—should have made man an automaton, having no will of his own, or without power to use it, and hence without character, capable only of acting by the choice of another's mind, and hence without any necessity of possessing any mind of his own. In that way God could have made it impossible

for man to have disobeyed him. Then there would have been no sin, and what a delightful world we would have had, to be sure!

"The Great Need" *American Sentinel* 13, 29 , pp. 454, 455.

THE great need of the cause of God to-day is not money; neither is it talent. The great need is of something the Lord himself cannot furnish, but which men can furnish. It is consecration.

God could rain gold down from heaven, as he once did manna. But that would not help the situation. There is as much gold in the world already as is needed, and any more would only be superfluous.

There is also talent enough; there is any amount of talent going to waste in channels that supply nothing for the real betterment of the race. Why should the Lord increase the supply of this? A wise father does not lavish money upon his son when he is squandering it.

When there is consecration enough, there will be

455

money enough, and there will be talent enough. A call for means is really a call for consecration; and a lack of eloquence and power for the proclamation of the word, or of ability in any line of spiritual work, is also a lack of consecration.

Consecrated talent will grow, always. Growth is a law of heaven; and from the humblest beginning, where the grace of God has free course, there may be evolved the most surprising results. God made the most talented men that have ever lived by starting with nothing; he can then make talented men now out of those that are little more than nothing.

If you would see the cause advanced, "consecrate yourselves this day to the Lord." You furnish the consecration; then God will furnish the rest.

"What Now?" *American Sentinel* 13, 29 , p. 455.

HAWAII has been annexed to the United States, and is now United States territory. Thus a colonial career has been opened in fact, and no doubt will be extended to the Philippines, the Ladrões, Porto Rico, and Cuba. Next a colonial policy will have to be discovered and put into operation. And of what sort shall it be?

We have pointed out how the Roman republic passed over this course, and what resulted. We have seen that Rome started with

precisely the same professions as those with which the United States has now started upon its new career.

And we have seen how, from whatever cause it may have been, the Roman republic with its high pretensions of love of liberty for others became the greatest, the most absolute, and most destructive, despotism that ever was on the earth. What will this second great republic now do, upon precisely the same professions, as she proceeds upon a course like that first great republic? These are live and interesting questions just now.

What will be done with Hawaii? How will she now be governed? What will be the basis of representation?

Will Hawaii be made a State, entitled to two senators upon an equality with the State of New York or Pennsylvania? And if so, will that State government and organization be a continuation of what has been in the so-called republic of Hawaii? For everybody knows that the "republic of Hawaii" never was in any true or proper sense a republic. It never was a government of the people by the people: it was a government of the people by a clique. It is well known that those who seized the kingdom of Hawaii and set themselves up there to rule, never dared to submit to the people of Hawaii the question as to what government they would save. This clique knew that they were so hopelessly in the minority, that to submit any question truly to the people would only overwhelmingly defeat themselves. Therefore they admitted to the franchise, only such as they themselves approved, and, being already in power, confirmed themselves in power by a "popular vote"!

That is the government of Hawaii, as it was when it became United States territory. Will that style of government, that sort of a republic, be perpetuated now that Hawaii is a part of the United States? It *was* contrary to every principle of the Declaration of Independence of the United States. Will it now, *under that Declaration*, be continued as it was? It was a despotism: will it be continued so? If so, then the pose is already set for spreading a like despotism over all the other island possessions. And if so, then a revolution has already been accomplished: and the United States will no longer be for the people; but a government of the people by a self-seeking few of the superior sort *for* this same self-seeking few of the superior sort. And it will be for *these* to decide who are, and who are not, "capable of self-government;" and of course all who are *not*, must be governed by this superior set.

Some words of Abraham Lincoln are worthy to be reprinted in this connection:—

"These arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow— what are these arguments?—They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the argument sin favor of kingcraft were of this class; they also bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden."

Now, I ask in all soberness if all these things, if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and endorsed, if taught to our children, and repeated to them, do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and *to transform* this government into a government of some other form?

Are we on the verge of the time when, are we crossing the line where, government of the people, by the people, for the people shall have perished entirely from the earth?

This is a time for most careful thinking.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 29 , p. 468.

GOD is working to-day not as a showman, doing wonders merely for people to behold, but to exalt his Word. Any "miracle" may be safely discounted which stands disconnected from that Word. His Word is mighty to convict of sin and save the soul, and it is always for this purpose that God manifests his power to-day. That is the work God is doing now. By and by this work will be finished, and then will be seen the manifestation of the power of God in a strange work upon material things. The all-important thing now is to know the power of God working in the heart by faith.

August 4, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 30 , p. 469.

IT is never right to deny rights.

THE human race cannot legislate itself above itself.

TO DENY the rights of one individual, is to deny the rights of all.

THE more fighting there is done in the world, the more of it there seems to remain to be done.

THE worst form of dependence—the farthest from true independence—is to be dependent on sin for your enjoyment.

LET government guard the interests of the individual, and the interests of the masses will take care of themselves.

THE trouble with legislation as a lifting force, is that it has to use the earth as a fulcrum; consequently it can elevate nothing on the earth.

THERE is no more need of human legislation to enforce the law of God than there was for Uzzah of old to put forth his hand to steady the ark of God, for which he was immediately struck dead.

THE amazing unselfishness of God is revealed in the words spoken by him to sinful man—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

IN ancient times men used to worship gold when it was made into molten or a graven image. To-day they have so far degenerated that they worship it in the crude state in which it is taken from the earth.

THE conscience of but a single individual may have all the authority and power of Omnipotence behind it.

"THE state conscience" is one of many names by which despotish [*sic.*] seeks to hide his identity from the public.

NO MAN was ever able to "kill time," but in trying to do so, a good many men have succeeded in killing themselves.

THE person who goes out of the pathway of God's law to gain time, is quite apt to lose eternity as the result.

August 4, 1898

"The Powerful Law" *American Sentinel* 13, 30 , p. 470.

THE law of God is a law not only of prohibitions, but of power. It not only commands, Thou shalt not, but is an expression of the power of God for righteousness, to which power man has access through the gospel.

In this the law of God is as superior to the law of man as heaven is superior to earth.

To the Jews, speaking of the laying down of his life, Jesus said, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of my Father." John 10:18. And all the commandments of God are expressions of his power.

It is a common idea that the commandments of God are the expression or measure of our power toward God—that by exerting our utmost endeavors we will be able to comply with the law, and therefore God requires it of us. But this is as far as possible from the truth. The commandments are the measure of God's power toward us, even in our sins. Hopeless indeed would the sinner's case be but for this.

The deeds of the law are infinitely beyond our human endeavors, but God has destined us for a station infinitely beyond that of fallen, erring humanity. Seen through the gospel, the law speaks to us of a power infinitely beyond our own, to lift us up from the plane of human frailty. "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift!"

And this is why it is that "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul," and is seen in the motions of sun, moon, and stars, as described in the nineteenth Psalm; for in them all is the manifestation of his power.

This is why the believer is "not under the law." Having exercised faith in Jesus Christ, the law of God—the power of God—is within him. He is not under the law, nor is he above it: but it is within him as his life is with him; for it is the life of God that is the power of God. He is not the under the law, but "under grace."

But not so of the law of man. That can only supply man with the knowledge of its requirements; but in the domain of morality, knowledge is not power.

And thus it is only the worst foolishness for the legislatures of earth to think of reŕnacting the law of God, or of attaching penalties to the commands of that law.

No law of man was ever perfect, or ever converted a soul. The law of man is effective only in giving men freedom in the exercise of their natural rights.

"There Are Quiet Revolutions, As Well As Violent Ones" *American Sentinel* 13, 30 , pp. 470, 471.

UNDER the false impression that revolutions can be accomplished only by violence and visible upheaval, the American people are in great danger of passing through a revolution and of finding themselves in the clutches of a new and strange power before they realize that any such thing is going on at all.

It should not be forgotten by any member of the American Republic that the Roman Republic passed through the despotism of two triumvirates, the second far worse than the first, each ending in the despotism of one man: and then passed into the "furious and crushing despotism" of the Roman monarchy; *all* in the *name* of the *Republic*. All this occurred inside of forty years, before the eyes of all the people, while they were pleasing themselves with the fancy and the *name* that they were still a republic.

Even when Augustus had become emperor this fiction was played by him before the eyes of the people; and the people were pleased with it. For, as Gibbon most pointedly remarks, "Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names: nor was he deceived in his expectation that the Senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom." Upon this safe assumption he accordingly deceived "the *people* by an image of civil liberty, and the *armies* by an image of civil government." He was eminently successful, and both people and armies congratulated themselves upon the greatness, and the new and wonderful career, of the Roman Republic

With these facts in mind the following extract from the speech of Ex-Attorney-General Harmon, to the Ohio Bar Association at Put-in-Bay, Ohio, July 12, are intensely suggestive to citizens of the American Republic:—

"Mere expansion is not growth. It is only swelling. We may push across the seas, but we cannot grow there. Elephantiasis is not an unknown form of national malady, and has always proved fatal. There are still chapters of English history to be written.

"We should have to change both the name and the nature of our nation to admit any State out of America, especially if it be populated by alien races. Few, if any, are now bold enough to advocate this. To get dominion over strange peoples for the mere purpose of governing them, not admitting them as equals in a family of States, stretching into permanency for that purpose a power meant to be temporary and occasional only and for that reason left unrestricted, is rightly called an imperial policy. It would belie and discredit the Declaration of Independence, and convict us of hypocrisy. We cannot under

471

our system govern any people without letting them help govern us. The reaction would be swift and sure. We should see what Patrick Henry meant when he said in his famous resolutions of 1765, that such government of the colonies by Great Britain 'has a manifest tendency to destroy British as well as American freedom.'

"An imperial policy will as surely some day lead to an emperor. He may assume some softer name if our sensitiveness survive, as is often the case. But an imperial policy and a republic make a contradiction in terms. The policy must to or the emperor in some new form must come.

"But what are we to do with countries we take? If where our flag is carried in battle it must remain as the emblem of permanent authority, victory will become more perilous than defeat. There is no dishonor in bringing home our victorious banners, as we did from the walls of Mexico. There is dishonor, and danger, too, in pulling down the landmarks of the union. No obligation, legal or moral, prevents our leaving such countries as we find them, or giving their people control of their own affairs if we think best. Desire only, not duty, suggests the assumption of authority over them.

"If we must provide fuel for our ships, we want coal-bins, not provinces nor colonies. We can hold them as property. We need not broaden them into domain. If they must be fortified and guarded so we may fight our way to and from them, let us keep them as England does Gibraltar. She does not have to rule Spain. If we must have purely national property abroad, we can at least keep our politics at home where we can have a close eye on them.

"Congress was authorized merely 'to regulate commerce.' Our ancestors knew commerce can be captured and kept, only by better goods and lower prices. Yet it is more than hinted that it would be a proper exercise of this power to conquer foreign nations in order to make them trade with us. Conquest is even suggested as a means of spreading the gospel. . . .

"But who is authorized to abandon the ocean ramparts with which God has surrounded us, because the inventions of men have made them somewhat less effectual. They will always be our chief defences while the earth revolves. Our country can be no further from danger than its nearest part. Where is the right found to expose our national honor, pride and welfare in dominions beyond the seas, when they may abide in safety forever in the home which the kindness of nature and the wisdom of our fathers have provided for them.

"It is not pleasant to play Cassandra. It is easier to join in the shouting and the dancing of those who seem to think the past is dead and the future assured. But one's duty to his countrymen is to give warning of evil when he believes he detects its approach."

A. T. J.

"A Suggestive Incident" *American Sentinel* 13, 30 , pp. 471, 472.

IN the Boys' High School of Reading, Pa., about June 27, 1898, a lad named Deeter was the valedictorian of the graduating essay in which, says *Harper's Weekly*, he "commented unfavorably on the practice very much in favor now in American schools of attempting to instil [*sic.*] patriotic sentiments into school children by drilling them in singing patriotic songs, and by causing them to repeat, somewhat parrot-like, high sounding sentiments which few of them can be expected to understand."

This, the principal of the school, one "Dr. Shribner," decided to be "unpatriotic:" and for it, he punished the boy by refusing to sign his diploma. However the "Dr." (with the foreign name) would let the boy have his diploma if he would "take it unsigned."

That boy is highly honored by being so "punished" for such an "offense." A diploma without *that* man's name to it would be a far greater honor than with it. We hope the boy eagerly accepted the diploma without that name signed to it.

Harper's truly says, "The expediency of this feature of public school education seems fairly open to discussion: and attempts to choke of reasonable and decorous criticism of its methods are likely to have an effect the opposite of that desired. The sort of patriotism that is so boisterous about 'Old Glory' that it discountenances free speech should try to get its bearings, and make sure it is not off its course."

But the trouble is that these "Dr's." with foreign ideas as well as foreign names, have not yet got their bearings as to either free speech or patriotism. And they think they must enforce in American schools and upon American children, their foreign and despotic ideas and make them count and be accepted for patriotism. Such persons are not fit to be in any American school—except as pupils to be taught American ideas.

The other great trouble in this connection is that there are too many people who profess to be Americans

472

and patriotic and loyal to American ideas, who will not only employ these fellows with foreign ideas and names, but will support them in their un-American and despotic conduct toward American boys who advocate sound American principles.

And thousands of other school teachers, principals, etc., who profess to be Americans and patriotic and loyal to American ideas, to free speech, etc., think themselves exceptionally patriotic in

endorsing the foreign and despotic principles, and in aping the tyrannical conduct of these men of foreign ideas as well as foreign names.

The people of Reading, Pa., should without delay see to it that there is placed at the head of their boys' high school a man who knows the American principles of both patriotism and free speech; and who will not make himself a despot in the interests of "patriotism."

And there are just now many other places in the United States where the people should attend to the same thing.

A. T. J.

August 18, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 32 , p. 501.

CHRISTIAN character is not proved by profession, but by fruits.

THE devil is never so much a devil as when he appears the most unlike one.

IN every instance of religious legislation the devil argues to the world that God is a tyrant.

CARNAL warfare is by nature unchristian. There can be no Christian method of conducting it.

WHEN the eagle can become a dove, then can the United States become a Christian nation.

WHEN the State wraps about itself the mantle of religion, it becomes a wolf in sheep's clothing.

[Inset.] The United States has been at war with Spain, and the American eagle has thoroughly demolished the Spanish flag. And strange as it may seem, this warlike bird claims to be a dove! The symbol of the United States Government claims to be the symbol of Christianity; in other words, the United States claims to be a Christian nation. It has been pronounced to be such by the Supreme Court, and the claim is maintained by statesmen and by the clergy; but can it be true? Manifestly not. The eagle is still an eagle, a warlike bird of prey, however often or loudly he may scream, "I am a dove."

"The United States and the 'Monroe Doctrine'" *American Sentinel* 13, 32 , p. 502.

THE effect which the victorious war with Spain, and the acquirement of colonial territory outside the western hemisphere, will have upon the long-established "Monroe doctrine," is one of the questions which now demands consideration by the people of this country, and of the world. The United States having set foot upon the confines of the Old World, with the intention of staying there, shall the powers of the Old World still be prohibited from setting foot upon the territory of the New? Or has the United States, by the conquest of foreign territory, abandoned the position it has maintained respecting the conquest of American territory by foreign powers?

It is not difficult to understand what view of the question will be taken by the powers of Europe. The United States has been saying to Europe, You keep on your side of the world, and I'll keep on mine. If not explicitly stated, the promise of the United States to refrain from any aggression upon Old World territory is so plainly implied in this doctrine, and so plainly necessary to give it a reasonable meaning, that there can be no question that it is an essential part of the doctrine, in the eyes of European powers at least.

Now, the United States has deliberately stepped over the line which it established by this doctrine, and notice has been served upon the powers of the Old World that the flag of this country is to remain flying where the fortunes of war have placed it. If Europe is given the like privilege of stepping over the line, the powers might be willing to accept the situation as offering a fair field to all parties. But—strange as it may seem—it is proposed here that Europe shall be denied the privilege which this country claims and has now exercised in acquiring foreign territory; it is proposed that the Monroe Doctrine shall be maintained against Europe just as strongly as ever. This is the sentiment of a portion at least—and it is to be feared a large portion—of the American people. It is boldly expressed in one of the most popular dailies of this city, thus:—

"The Monroe Doctrine stands more firmly to day than ever before.

"Why?

"Because we are better able to uphold it than ever before."

To this language, of course, there can be but one meaning, and that is that this nation will do as it pleases simply because it has the power to do so.

By this sentiment the Monroe Doctrine becomes reduced to a mere boast of power. The question of right is eliminated from it, and

the one element of might remains. It becomes another repetition of the old assertion that "might makes right."

That Europe will acquiesce in any such arrangement is, of course, an unthinkable supposition. The powers will not be slow to insist upon their rights; and if this country, in the flush of victory and the dream of empire, shall advance to the bold position outlined in the above quotation, there will be plenty of need ere long for the great army and navy which is being called for as a proper outlay of the national resources. But peace and prosperity for the common people do not wait upon imperial ambition.

IF the legislatures of earth could pronounce against sin with all the force of the thunders of Sinai, it would but drive the people, as those thunders did, further from the Lord.

"An Unobscurable Fact" *American Sentinel* 13, 32 , pp. 502, 503.

IT is a fact which Roman Catholic apologists would gladly have hidden from the light, that the pitiable condition of Spain to-day, as revealed in her impotent struggles to maintain her place in the family of nations, is due more than to anything else to the Roman Catholic religion.

For centuries the government of Spain has been in the closest alliance with the papacy. The papal religion has been the religion of all the Spanish people. No person not a Catholic could secure any office under the government, or hold any position of influence among the people. The State is Catholic, the army and navy are Catholic, the people of all classes are Catholic, and all this has been so for centuries. The papal religion has had a free field; it has been without one rival. These are facts which not even the most ardent Catholic can deny.

What, then, has the papal religion done for Spain? Has it done anything for them? Has it had no effect upon the people and upon the State through all the years of their faithful adherence to it?

If not, what force has it, and of what use has it been to its adherents? But no intelligent person can seriously assert that it has not had an effect, and a most powerful effect, upon the people who have so faithfully practiced

it. In the very nature of things, such an assertion could not be true. It is impossible that a person should make any principles a part of his daily practice and experience, and the basis of his daily thought and

hopes and aspirations, as is done in the practice of religion, without being profoundly affected by them. It cannot be otherwise than that these principles should be absorbed into his very being until they become a part of it, and mold his character into conformity with them. This is a law of nature, as immutable as the law of gravitation.

The Word of God declares, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." This declaration is true if God himself is true: and as certainly as it is true, and as certainly as it must be that the character is molded to the principles embodied in the thoughts and practices of the life, so certainly must it be that the principles of the papal religion, faithfully practiced through centuries by the Spanish people, have affected them, have molded their character, and have more than anything else made the Spanish nation what it is to-day.

This is the plain truth. It is asserted by the laws of nature and by observation; by reason and by revelation. And papal spokesmen cannot deny nor evade it.

And therefore the decadence and fall of Spain constitute incontestable proof of the worse than worthlessness of the papal religion. No papal apologist will ever be able to say, because it cannot be said, why that religion, if it is worth anything, has brought the Spanish nation where it is to-day.

A religion which will not mold the character is worthless, and therefore it must be admitted that the papal religion, if not impotent, does mold the character, and has molded the character of the Spanish people. They have been faithful to that religion, both in the church and the state; and therefore it has done all it can do for them, and what that is may be seen in the utter humiliation of Spain to-day.

The same story is told, only less fully, by the other faithful Catholic nations. Austria is to-day a decaying and crumbling empire; and France—what prosperous nation envies her? Crushed to the ground with paralyzing swiftness in 1870, she has ever since showed signs of weakness rather than of strength. And the republics of Spanish America are emerging into the light of civil and intellectual freedom only as they are shaking off the long nightmare of priestly domination.

Who that is not wilfully blind can fail to recognize these facts? And why will people be blind to truths so palpable, and fail to be admonished by them to be vigilantly on their guard against the encroachments of Rome?

PROPER legislation restrains man only in that which is criminal.

THE best way to honor the flag is to live out the principles for which it stands.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 32 , p. 516.

WHEREVER mercy and justice appear, there is written the name of Gode.

NO HUMAN law was ever enacted to enforce the observance of the true Sabbath.

SIN and slavery came into the universe together, and have gone hand in hand ever since.

"PEACE I leave with you," said Jesus to his disciples; "My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you." John 14:27. And his disciples to-day may be thankful that Jesus does not give peace as the world gives it.

August 25, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 33 , pp. 517, 518.

"SAY ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy."—Isa. 8:12.

CHRISTIAN warfare aims to slay sin, but to save sinners; but carnal warfare aims to kill the sinner in his sin.

ALL men want to get to heaven, but the trouble is with the great majority that they want to get there in their own way.

THE Tower of Babel approached as near to heaven as heathenism approaches the righteousness of God.

THE Tower of Babel came through human pride; the Ladder of Jacob's dream through divine humility.

KEEP your conscience not on a gold basis, but a truth basis.

IF man could ascend to heaven by his own works, he would but convert heaven into an earth by going there.

THE worst fall a man ever gets is from the pinnacle of his pride; and the loftier men carry their tower of babel, the worse will be the ruin in which it will finally involve them.

[Inset.] GOD'S WAY OF REACHING HEAVEN VS. MAN'S WAY. GOD's way is by the Ladder of Jacob's dream; man's way is by the Tower of Babel. The structure reared in the plains of Shinar was symbolical of heathenism in all ages, which seeks to gain heaven by works. Multitudes to-day are striving to mount upwards by a tower of

babel. Some rest upon their respectability, as did the Pharisees. Others think to approach God through penance. Millions are calling for legislation to make righteousness easy and sin hard; and all over the world is sounded the call for federation, to unite the good people of the earth in religious and political leagues, which shall sweep away earth's wrongs and usher in the millennium. But there is only one true way of mounting to the throne of God, and that is by the divine Ladder upon which Jacob saw the angels ascending and descending,—that Ladder which is the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Faith and the Cure of Disease" *American Sentinel* 13, 33 , p. 518.

IN a little village on Long Island, a young girl lies dangerously ill of typhoid fever. When she was prostrated by the disease, her parents, who were firm believers in what is called "faith cure," refused to call a physician, saying that the proper means for the curing of the sick were prayer and the laying on of hands. The child grew steadily worse until finally, by order of the chairman of the village Board of Health, a doctor took the case in his charge and administered remedies which appear to have resulted in staying the further progress of the disease.

The parents submitted to the authority under which the doctor proceeded with the case, but regarded his efforts in combating the disease as being altogether uncalled-for, useless, and contrary to faith in God as the healer of disease.

The case has attracted some notice, and it will no doubt be thought of by many as representing a contest between two methods of healing, which differ from each other on the point of faith in the power of God, and that healing through faith has been shown to be a delusion. As a matter of fact there is nothing of this kind in it.

The trouble is with those inclined to this view, and indeed with people generally, that they are so blind to spiritual truth that they are not able to see God in the many "common" things in which he has revealed himself to them. They think of the power of God as something that must be manifested in some supernatural way, and unless they can see a miracle of some kind they will not think they have seen any manifestation of God at all.

Real faith in God sees vastly more than this. Real faith sees God in the things that he has made. The remedies that are used by the physician to combat disease in the regular practice of his profession

are from the hand of God. The Creator has placed many such things in the earth at the disposal of man, and has given him the ability to discover many ways in which disease can be checked by operations based upon the principles of "natural law," which is the law of God. All this is from the Lord as truly as is the power that heals in a "miraculous" manner, and faith in God views it as such. It sees the miraculous power of God, testifying to God's love for the human family, in the "common" things of every-day experience. It sees God not far off from every one of us, and that "in him we live, and move, and have our being."

Is it to be expected that God will always pass over the common remedies which he has provided against disease, known and used by the ordinary physician, to make use of some extraordinary way of restoring the sick to health? That he sometimes does this there can be no doubt. But having placed many remedies in the hands of man for such emergencies, it is only reasonable that man should use them, and should thus cooperate with God in the work for physical salvation. Cooperation is a principle of prime importance in the economy of God.

And when man does thus use the natural remedies God has provided against disease, let him not fail to recognize the power of God in it the same as if God had seen fit to interpose in his behalf by some miraculous manifestation.

CHRISTIAN enthusiasm cannot be preserved on ice, even in hot weather.

"Unlimited Power" *American Sentinel* 13, 33 , pp. 518, 519.

WE know from the Word of inspiration that power "belongeth unto God;" that indeed, "there is no power but of God." Ps. 62:11; Rom. 13:1.

God upholds all things by "the word of his power." Heb. 1:3. "He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things," and "in him we live, and move, and have our being." Acts 17:25, 28.

Earthly power is the power of God, perverted by sin. The Creator so respects man's free will, that he gives him power to do that which is contrary to the divine will. This power however is limited; but God gives man unlimited power to do that which is according to his will.

The unlimited power of God is manifested through the Holy Spirit. And therefore it is written of the work of God, "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord."

The Holy Spirit is the embodiment of unlimited power, and unlimited power is the natural heritage of beings created in the image of God. But unlimited power can safely be entrusted only to one whose will is in perfect harmony with the will of God. An unsanctified will joined with unlimited power would be a worse combination than is represented by the prince of evil.

But God, having unlimited power himself, does not selfishly withhold that power from all others, or from all save a favored few, but wills that all shall receive this power. Whether it is received or not, is a matter deter-

519

mined wholly by the will of the individual. And therefore there is no reason why the life of every person should not be full of the manifestation of unlimited power, save that the individual wills not to receive it, by willing not to walk in the way of righteousness and life. There is no reason why any individual should not possess unlimited power, by seeking to the right Source for it, upon the right conditions. And especially is there no reason why the church, set in the world expressly to accomplish the purposes of God, should seek to legislatures and political bodies for the power of which it feels in need.

So desirous is God that his creatures of the human family should be endued with this power, that he has poured out his Spirit upon all flesh; for thus was it prophesied of the last days. Joel 2:28, 29; Acts 2:17. It is poured out, and is waiting only to be received by such as will receive it. And only such can receive it in its refreshing fullness as are fully sanctified to the will of God. For to bestow unlimited power upon one not thus sanctified, would be to set the seal of God—his full approval—upon something that is unlike him, and cause him to deny himself. It is because the Holy Spirit is the embodiment of unlimited power that it sets the seal of God upon him who receives it.

God bids his church to be filled with power; not from the legislatures of earth, not from any political source, but "from on high," from his own throne. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "The heavens declare the glory of God," and all the works of God proclaim his power, which is the same power that is "unto salvation" to them that believe, which is unlimited power—the Holy Spirit. All the handiwork of

God joins in the invitation to man, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Without this no man can fight the battle that is not with flesh and blood, but with "spiritual wickedness." And in these "last days," in the climax of the long conflict between good and evil, crises are to be met in which only unlimited power can suffice to guard the soul from destruction.

Then let the church, and every individual for himself, remember now "the promise of the Father," and seek for power from on high. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

"Science' on the Immortality of the Soul" *American Sentinel* 13, 33 , pp. 519, 520.

IT is quite well known that for years certain bodies of scientific men have been investigating the phenomena of modern spiritualism, with the object of subjecting to the test of science the claim made and apparently substantiated by spiritualism, that the dead are conscious and capable of communicating with the living.

The first reports from these scientific commissions were adverse to this claim of consciousness after death, the various phenomena shown in proof of it being ascribed to trickery. It was stated that science afforded no proof in support of the popular belief in the immortality of the soul. But the belief still remained, and spiritualism continued to claim as its due that its phenomena be recognized as of genuine character. And now, this long-sought confirmation from "science" seems about to be gained. While no positive confirmation has yet come from a scientific source, the question is asked, and in a way which implies an affirmative answer, "Has the immortality of the soul received a scientific demonstration?"

In the *Literary Digest*, of August 13, this question forms the basis of a lengthy discussion, in which is quoted the testimony of two men of high scientific attainments, one a professor in Harvard University, and the other a prominent member of the London Society of Psychical Research. Introductory to the statement of their testimony the *Digest* says:—

"The reading public has heard more or less of 'The Strange Case of Mrs. Piper,' a Boston Spiritualistic medium and mind-reader. This woman, under the tests of such able psychologists as Professor James, of Harvard University, and Dr. Hodgson, of the London Society of Psychical Research, has furnished psychic

phenomena which, so far as they are accepted as genuine, tend to demonstrate scientifically the immortality of the soul.

"The Society of Psychic Research was established for the purpose of examining, without bias, the alleged phenomena of Spiritualism. Among the mass of evidence it has collected in its sixteen years of life it has found nothing, up to this latest examination of Mrs. Piper, that was deemed to have established the future existence of the soul, although in the tenth report (1894) of the society the statement is made that 'between deaths and apparitions of the dying persons a connection exists which is not due to chance alone.'"

Of the experiments conducted through the mediumship of this woman, it is not necessary to speak at length. The impressive feature of them was the apparent proof

520

that an unseen intelligence existed who spoke through the medium and revealed facts which could not have been known to the public nor by any possibility have come to the knowledge of the medium through what is known as "mind-reading." The conclusion was, naturally, that an invisible intelligence did exist which was the disembodied soul of the dead person from whom the communication purported to come. The London Society for Psychical Research challenges any one to show that there was in these manifestations any possible room for fraud.

Such statements coming from a source of recognized authority in the scientific world, warrant the conclusion that the time is not far distant when the voice of "science" will speak distinctly in confirmation of the claim that the soul of man is immortal. "Science" will join with theology in proclaiming this dogma as the truth. Then whoever does not accept it as such will be under the ban not only of theology, but of "science" itself. He will be set down as an ignorant and unreasonable person.

The point especially to be noted in all this is that "science" is incapable of correctly solving the problem presented by spiritual manifestations. Such problems do not lie beyond the range of true science, but true science extends far beyond the range of the powers of the human mind. Science, as defined by the human mind, and by that only, confirms the theological dogma of the immortality of the soul; but as defined by the higher Mind it teaches exactly the contrary. When science, as known to man apart from the Word of God, has fully investigated the phenomena which Spiritualism presents, when it has proceeded as far as it can go, it is obliged to

pronounce the claims of Spiritualism to be true. And in this it leads man into a most positive and dangerous untruth; for the claim of natural immortality is an untruth, and is plainly pointed out as such in the Text Book of the highest science of which man can have any knowledge. And that is a science which deals with spiritual problems and with interests the highest that can pertain to man's existence.

That Text Book plainly states that "The dead know not anything;" that "The dead praise not the Lord;" that the thoughts of man perish at his death. Eccl. 9:5; Ps. 146:4, etc. It declares that God only "hath immortality."

The highest science is the science of salvation, set forth in the Word of Omniscience. That which is opposed to the science of salvation is "science falsely so called;" and such is the "science" which would teach the dogma of soul immortality. It is high time that people everywhere should recognize that salvation is science; that the statements of the Word of God are true science, and that true science has spoken unequivocally against the widespread but pagan doctrine of the soul's consciousness after death.

"'Christian Science' in Its Home" *American Sentinel* 13, 33 , pp. 520, 521.

THERE is a good deal in a name, in spite of Shakespeare's question, especially when it is used to designate a thing with which we are not familiar. An assumed name is usually deemed a necessary part of a criminal's disguise. "Christian science" would no doubt have less attraction for minds in this country were it known as Hindu philosophy, which according to the well-known lecturer and authority on Hinduism, Pundita Ramabai, it really is. In a recent lecture she spoke of "Christian science" and of its fruits as she knew them in India, and what she said of it ought to be read and pondered by every person who is at all inclined to be drawn away in the line of its teachings. It is this:—

"I can tell you I have sounded the depths of that philosophy, and what did I find? I will give you an idea in my own language. It means just this:—

"You are to take the whole universe as nothing but falsehood. You are to think that it does not exist. You do not exist. I do not exist. When you realize that, that is philosophy. Can you realize it? There was once upon a time a great being called Brahma, and that person was no person at all, but something like air, full of joy and

knowledge? I cannot understand it, but philosophy tells you that you have to believe that this being, full of joy and knowledge, without any personality, existed once upon a time. That being had no mind. It did not want to say anything or have anything near it, and therefore, of course, it did not understand anything. Then there came another being just like himself, and that being was nothing but darkness. It was all falsehood. Now this air united with that darkness and assumed personality. It became male and female, and as that person has formed all things, the logical inference is that everything is falsehood. The birds and beasts that you see do not exist. You do not exist. When you realize that you have no personality whatever, you have no life, no knowledge, nothing, then you have attained the highest perfection of what is called 'yoga,' and that gives you liberation and you are liberated from your body, and you become like him, without any personality. You draw on the blackboard zero, plus zero, minus zero, multiplied by zero, divided by zero, and its equals zero. It is just that and nothing more.

"And what has that philosophy done for the people of India? A tree is judged by its fruits. An apple tree cannot bring forth a pear, but it will bring forth its own kind. The grandeur and beauty of that philosophy must be judged by its fruit. You are a people of some feeling. Everything is real. You feel that when other people are starving, you ought to give them something to eat, but out in India they do not feel that. Men do not feel any sympathy for others. They do not feel for people who are starving or being killed in war. In our late famine our philosophers felt no compassion for sufferers and did not help the needy. For why should they help when they claimed the suffering was not real, neither were the dying children real. The first result then of the philosophy is the basest cruelty and selfishness; no compassion for sufferers, and supreme egoism.

"To study Hindu philosophy it is best to visit India

521

and experience it. Plenty of opportunities are afforded even if you go only to Bombay. That city is very large and it is very hot there; but that will make no difference to philosophers who never experience heat at all. The people of India and the philosophers who have studied with the learned men ought to feel alike toward all people and all beings; but they never show a particle of kindness to the women, and their lives are made so unbearable that they want to kill themselves. These philosophers have shown mercy toward all lower animals. They have established hospitals for animals, but they have never established hospitals for women. The preachers who have come over here to preach Buddhism to the American people have established a hospital for animals in Bombay. In that hospital there is a ward devoted to bugs, and a man is hired to feed those bugs on his blood every night. They

never take any thought of the women who are dying under the weight of this philosophy, but they just show their charity toward the bugs. I recommend that hospital for the edification of American students of Buddhism. Let them stay one night in that bug ward. That will pay them for all their labors in studying that philosophy."

September 1, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 34 , p. 533.

CHRISTIANITY is the only true optimism.

CHRISTIANITY means the power of love; politics means the love of power.

THE Golden Rule cannot be run into the mold of legislation.

THE earth is run by politics, but Christianity is the motive power of heaven.

POLITICS is a struggle for the mastery; Christianity seeks not to rule, but to serve.

PEOPLE who claim to be saints and to own the earth may well be viewed with suspicion.

THE theory that the civil ruler is bound to execute the will of God, can become effective only by making the church the power behind the throne.

GOD never patches up a piece of his handiwork that has become marred by sin; he does it over, regenerates it, makes a new creation.

THE use of force by Christ's servants is an argument that his kingdom is of this world. But as the argument itself is false, so those who advance it are false servants.

JESUS CHRIST never held or will hold a political office.

THE purest politics can draw no soul heavenward.

POLITICS has its source in human nature; Christianity flows from the divine nature.

IT would be just as easy to preserve Christianity by law as to preserve the Sabbath by law.

WHEN men try to set up the kingdom of God, they always reserve positions of honor in it for themselves.

IF the pathway of politics tended upward, the pathways of nations would not tend, as all have done, toward decay.

[Inset.] THE "GATEWAY OF POLITICS." IN this day very much is expected from politics by would-be reformers of society. Indeed, from one of the leading reform movements of the age the statement has

come that "the kingdom of God is to enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics;" and this states the principle upon which reform work in general is now being conducted. Through politics, men expect to usher in the millennium. But can the kingdom of God pass through such a gateway as this? Will that kingdom *pass by* the evil and corruption which find in politics their readiest field of action, and are as inseparable from it as they are from human nature? Assuredly not. Rather will it sweep away all these things, leaving neither politics nor political governments. A reform which is in harmony with that kingdom must be separate from politics.

"Sunday Enforcement and Good Government" *American Sentinel* 13, 34 , p. 534.

IN the city of Nashville, Tenn., public sentiment has been agitated of late over the question of the removal from office of the chief of police. It appeared certain that the removal would be made, and it was charged by a class of the citizens standing for certain ideas of "moral" government, that it was the work of the gamblers and Sunday tipplers. We do not mention it to discuss the conflict of the good and bad elements in the city government, but to notice a common idea of good government which came to the surface in connection with this agitation, and appeared in the *Nashville Banner*. In a communication to that journal, a citizen says:—

"In my opinion the time has come when the good people of this city, without severing their party ties, shall say to these law-breakers. 'The party is bigger than the gamblers' association and the Sunday tipplers' association, and if they don't like the party there is plenty of room to quit it.'

"These associations have so manipulated parties as to have an undue weight in public affairs. They must be told that they have no exclusive rights; that seeking the protection of the law in their just rights, they must obey it; that the merchant, the mechanic, the manufacturer, are not allowed to keep open shop on Sunday, and they do not in defiance of law undertake to do it; that the farmer, though his crop—his young corn and cotton—may be choked with weeds, dare not go into the field with his plow on Sunday; that even the Seventh-day Adventist, who is impelled by the strongest religious convictions to give Saturday to his devotions, is not allowed to plow his corn on Sunday, and that the saloon man is not better than they; that the gambler's occupation is certainly not a favored calling; that betting has its penalties, which may be paid and the law satisfied, but keeping gambling houses in a city with its

awful consequences on society cannot and will not be tolerated; and that this community will not quietly submit to the removal of a public officer because he develops a capacity to enforce the law."

The idea which appears all through this quotation is that good government is to be attained by suppressing gambling and liquor selling *on Sunday*. The manufacturer, farmer, and seventh-day observer must observe Sunday, and the gambler and saloonist are not better than they. Hence they must be made to do likewise, and the good people of the city should see the chief of police is retained who will carry this into effect.

Instead of recognizing that gambling and liquor selling are wrong and demoralizing on all days, by their very nature, this idea of good government passes over the inherent evil of these things and lays its stress upon the desecration of Sunday. But good government can not be promoted anywhere by losing sight of the inherent evil of vicious practices. And this is certainly one tendency, and a strong one, of the agitation for the compulsory observance of Sunday. The more the attention becomes fixed upon the assumed sanctity of Sunday, the more tendency is there to see in the desecration of the day a greater offense than in the vicious practice by which it is desecrated; until at length the main evil of gambling and liquor selling seems to lie not so much in the demoralizing nature of such practices as is the fact that they are conducted on Sunday.

In this way the Sunday laws tend really to strengthen the hold these evils have acquired upon public tolerance. The effort that should be directed toward their entire suppression on all days is largely expended in making them conform to the requirements of the Sunday law; and having conformed to its requirements, they by that very thing acquire a degree of respectability in the public view which otherwise would not be possible. Cannot those who desire good city government see the danger which lies in this diversion of the force of public sentiment from the evil thing itself, to its desecration of Sunday? If they cannot, it is not because the danger is not real and conspicuous.

To suppress liquor selling on Sunday only, is to tacitly assent to the traffic on other days of the week. To prohibit it by law on Sunday only, is to justify it *by law* on other days; and behind such a law the evil traffic can take refuge, and hold up its monster head without fear as a *law-abiding institution*. But do lovers of good government want such a condition of things to exist?

Let all such arouse to the danger of the movement which would oppose these evils by suppressing them on Sunday. Friends, you cannot advance in the direction of good government by way of Sunday laws. They are a deception and a snare. To secure good government an evil must be opposed because it is such in its nature, and not because it is connected with what may or may not be wrong, according to the truth or falsity of theological tenets. With such conditions civil government can have nothing to do. Whether Sunday desecration is right or wrong, is a question with which the chief of police of any city, or any other civil officer, as such, has no concern whatever. It is a question to be settled by Scripture, and the truth of Scripture can be settled for an individual only by the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

"The Moral Law and the Civil Ruler" *American Sentinel* 13, 34 , p. 535.

IN the August *Christian Statesman*, Rev. R. C. Allen treats of the "fundamental principles of civil government, specifically considered." Among these principles, as he enumerates them, are the following:—

"9. The only right a man has is to do right.

"10. But man is a sinner and God is invisible. How will moral law be enforced for the time being?

"11. Moral force is sufficient to control moral beings; but physical force must compel immoral beings.

"12. God has instituted civil government for this end, and has clothed the civil ruler with authority to execute his moral law.

"13. God has ordained civil government to enforce his moral law among men that they shall enjoy their rights."

This last assertion is italicized and set forth as being the "principal proposition."

This is the true national reform theory, set forth without any attempt at disguise. Its fundamental proposition is "God . . . has clothed the civil ruler with authority to execute his moral law."

Let us suppose that this proposition is true: what follows?

If the civil ruler is true to the requirements of his office, being clothed with this authority, he will proceed to execute God's moral law upon transgressors as they are brought before him. What then?

The transgression of the law is sin (1 John 3:4); and "the soul that sinneth it shall die." Eze. 18:4, 20.

That the penalty of sin, of every kind or degree, is death, is by the testimony of Scripture too plain a fact to require argument. Adam, in

the Garden of Eden, was told by his Creator that in the day that he disobeyed the command given him concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil, he would surely die. He did disobey, and from that moment he became mortal, and started on his journey to the grave. But mightier than this—a stupendous and unimpeachable testimony to the truth that the penalty of sin is death—is the face of the death of the Son of God on the cross. This was because Adam had transgressed the moral law, and if there had been any escape from the death penalty, this infinite sacrifice could have been avoided. But there was no escape from death, and only through the death of Christ was there escape for Adam and his sinful posterity.

No sinner can enter heaven; this is a fact universally admitted. But he who is shut out of heaven will, it is declared, be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the "second death."

It being unquestionably true, then, that the penalty of sin is death, when transgressors of the moral law are brought before the civil ruler, he being commissioned of God to execute the moral law, it would simply remain for him to execute the death penalty upon every individual who should be found guilty. And as all people upon the earth are sinners, how long would it be before every man, woman and child in the land would be put to death, supposing the civil rulers to be faithful in doing their "duty"? And all this, in order that men "*shall enjoy their rights!*" Imagine the people of a land enjoying their rights under such a régime as this!

And being sinners themselves, it would remain finally for the civil rulers, after having put all others to death, to execute the death penalty upon themselves; and then this theory of the authority of the civil power would have been fully carried into effect! And as the result of it, there would remain not a single living soul on the earth!

Is this what the people want? Is it what those want who advocate a union of the civil power with religion? There can be no such union which would leave out the moral law of God, certainly; and being joined with the moral law, the only possible result would be the execution of the death penalty upon the people, as before stated. This is what union of the State with religion means; and that it does mean just this is as plain as A B C.

But to prevent this, to give the transgressor probation and an opportunity still to obtain the eternal life for which he was created, God at an infinite sacrifice provided the plan of salvation. He sends to man the gospel—the "glad tidings"—expressly to prevent the execution

of his moral law upon him. He made an infinite sacrifice, giving his only begotten Son to die, expressly to save man from being visited with the execution of his moral law. By and law, in the great Judgment day, he will execute his moral law upon all who shall then be found transgressors, and the result to all such will be eternal death.

It is perfect clear, then, that this doctrine which declares the civil ruler to be authorized to execute the moral law of God, is squarely opposed to the gospel. It is as squarely against God and against Christ, as it Satan himself. It is the doctrine of antichrist. It means death, and not life,—death to the state, death to the church, death to everything. Let it be recognized for what it is, and carefully shunned by the American people.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 34 , p. 548.

HE who is harsh in governing others, shows that he has not yet learned to govern himself.

WHEN Jesus Christ reprov'd his disciples for disputing as to which of them should be the greatest, he rebuked politics in his church.

IN a paper read at the Cambridge Congress of Zoology, England, Professor Haeckel said that science has now established the "absolute certainty" that man has descended through various stages of evolution from the lowest form of animal life, during a period estimated at a thousand million years.

This is what "science" says. And in saying this, this "science" says something more.

If man "descended" from the lowest forms of animal life, it was, according to the evolutionary theory, by a change so gradual as to be imperceptible at any point of its progress. The "evolution" must be still going on, the same as in the past, but nobody can see it taking place. Nobody can point to any distinct evolution in animal life that has taken place in his own lifetime, or even in the space of time that is covered by reliable history. The species of the animal world remain to-day just what they were at the time of the earliest human observations. The ape is no nearer to the human now than he was thousands of years ago.

This evolutionary process, then, being so extremely gradual, must have filled the world with forms intermediate between the lowest forms and the highest form, which is man. There ought to be a

gradation from the lowest to the highest form, so perfect that it would be imperceptible at any particular point. This is what this "science" demands, and therefore what it says.

But instead of this, what is actually seen is that the animal world is divided into entirely distinct groups or species, an enormous gap lying between any two of them, for which gaps the evolutionary theory utterly fails to account. As regards man, the highest animal, this gap has been recognized by the use of the familiar phrase, "the missing link," for which there has been so much search. As a matter of fact the "missing link" is not missing between man and the ape alone, but between the ape and lower animals, and between all the different species of animals that exist; and it is not one link merely that is missing, but an endless number of them, enough to account for the slow change from one species to another upon the evolutionary theory.

When "science" asks us to accept a theory as sound which is full of such enormous holes, we must respectfully decline. We have no use for any "absolute certainties" of this kind. We have no use for such "science." The science we believe in says that man was created in the image of God.

If any real evidence could be had in support of the Darwinian theory, we believe it would be found by making man the starting-point of the evolution; for while there is no evidence that the ape is developing into something higher, there is a manifest tendency on the part of many men to sink to the level of the ape.

THE trouble is with the system of imperialism which the country has inaugurated, not that the Government does not mean to govern fairly and well the new trans-marine territory, but that the temptations to corruption in government which a remote province presents, are too great to be long withstood by those who will get the appointment to the office of governor. The words "There's money in it," tell the story of political intrigue and corruption for any matter to which they apply.

September 8, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 35 , p. 549.

THE influence of an upright life is patriotism's best gift to the nation.

THE purpose of the civil power is not to enforce what is right, but to enforce rights.

SEPARATION of church and state does not mean a wicked government or a powerless church.

CAESAR is ever prone to consider himself a god and to demand for himself those things that should be rendered to God.

THE only argument which Cesar knows how to employ is the argument of the sword.

WHEN Cesar turns his attention to the Lord's business, he at once begins to neglect his own.

THE power of the church is the power of the gospel, which is the power of love, which is the power of God.

BEFORE Peter was converted he drew the sword of temporal power in behalf of his Lord; afterwards, he drew the "sword of the Spirit."

[Inset.] "RENDER TO CESAR THE THINGS THAT ARE CESAR'S, AND TO GOD THE THINGS THAT ARE GOD'S."—Jesus Christ Announcing the Principle of Separation of Church and State. THE Pharisees, thinking to entangle Christ in his talk, came to him and asked whether it were lawful to give tribute to Cesar. "But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he said unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:15-22.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 35 , p. 550.

"RECEIVE ye the Holy Ghost." In these words, addressed to sinful flesh, God appeals to his people on the earth, to his church, to be filled with unlimited power; for such is the power of the Spirit.

But while God is thus beseeching men, the very ones who profess to be his followers here are beseeching the legislatures of earth for the power needed to advance the cause of righteousness.

Was there ever a stranger or sadder spectacle before heaven and earth—God beseeching the church to receive unlimited power from on high, which he is ready to bestow, and the church, all unmindful of his words, beseeching the world for the power that belongs to earthly things!

The church could not be guilty of greater folly.

"A Religious Delusion" *American Sentinel* 13, 35 , pp. 550, 551.

IN the columns of the daily press of this city recently space was given to a description of "the impressive ceremony of the taking of the black veil" by sixteen young women, in the chapel of the convent of the "Sisters of St. Dominic," Archbishop Corrigan officiating. By undergoing this "impressive ceremony" these young women are understood to have formally "renounced the world" and taken upon themselves the vows of a life of "charity." This is but one of many similar occasions which are reported from time to time in all parts of the land.

Let us look a moment at this idea of consecration and the religious life.

These young women have withdrawn themselves from all social intercourse with their fellow-beings in the world. They have really renounced their fellow-mortals. Is this renouncing the world?

Certainly not. The world cannot be renounced in that way. Worldliness is in the heart—in the principles of the life. The principles of the world, not the people, are to be renounced.

A person may separate himself from all his sinful fellow-mortals, as did the old hermits, and yet carry with him into his seclusion, as they did, the very worldliness which they think thus to escape. For worldliness, full and complete, is in every heart that is carnal, unrenewed by the power of divine grace.

To "renounce the world" by going off into the seclusion of the convent or monastery, is like a person trying to escape from his own shadow. The one is exactly as wise a proceeding as the other.

And this separation from human society is not only powerless to promote consecration; it is altogether contrary to the will and purpose of the Creator.

God put people in this world to be together. He knew the nature of the beings whom he created, and knew that society was necessary to their welfare. He brings people into this world for their happiness, to enjoy themselves together, not to be miserable somewhere in seclusion. But aside from the enjoyment to be derived from human companionship, he puts people together for their spiritual good. His own work in the earth, the proclamation of the gospel truth, so far from demanding the exclusion of its adherents, demands the exact

opposite. God's servants are the "salt of the earth:" and to be this they must be in the world, mingling freely with all classes of society, and with world-loving people especially. God sends his servants *to* sinners, not away from them.

A ship is built to go in the water. There is danger that the water may get into the ship, and if it does, in sufficient quantities, the ship sinks and is lost. The ship at sea is in the very element, all surrounded by it, which under certain circumstances will prove its sure destruction. There may be a collision, or the ship may run on a reef, or be shattered by a storm, and in any of these ways become filled with water and sent to the bottom of the sea. Ships are being lost by such casualties all the time. The sea is the one great agent of their destruction.

What then shall be done to preserve the ship? Oh, we will pull it up out of the sea upon the dry land; we will put it where the water cannot get to it! Or, we will seclude it in some quiet undisturbed creek or inlet along the shore, where the perils of the sea can never reach it! That would save the ship from the sea, and also render it useless; but even the seclusion of the convent cannot save a soul from the world.

The idea that consecration, that holiness of life, requires the renunciation of society, a life of celibacy, and the somber garb of the convent, is as contrary to the truth as anything could possibly be. It is a travesty upon divine truth, and designed as such by the opponent of truth who invented it. Robert Ingersoll has uttered many falsehoods concerning religion; but he spoke the truth, the gospel truth, in saying that the mother with her babe presented a far nobler and holier picture than the nun with her cross and beads.

Jesus said, in his prayer for his disciples, "I pray not that Thou wouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou wouldest keep them from the evil." The

grace of God keeps his children from evil in the midst of the world. As the channels of divine light and truth to the world, the world is their proper place. When God wants them removed from the society of sinners he is coming himself to take them away. But now, while probation for the world continues, he wants them in the world and amongst world lovers as his witnesses, witnessing by their words and lives to his power to save people from sin, simply by a change of heart—by a new birth, a new creation in Christ.

The "sisterhoods" and "brotherhoods" which are gotten up in this world in the name of religion, with their vows and regulations which set at defiance the laws of nature in order to save the soul, are a sham and a delusion. They represent the worldly and heathen idea of consecration. They are contrary to God and to nature, to revelation and to reason. They lead only to wretchedness and ruin. True happiness, true religion, true charity and holiness, and true success in life, can be found only in the order of life which God has established.

"Separation of Church and State" *American Sentinel* 13, 35 , p. 554.

"KEEP the church and state forever separate," said General Grant, in his address to the Army of the Tennessee. "Very well," says some reader; "suppose he did say it; why refer to it now? I believe in the separation of church and state, and so does everyone in this country; and there is no danger that church and state will be united. It would be contrary to the principles of the Government."

Yes, we reply, it is a fact that the people here do not believe in a union of church and state, in a certain sense; that is, they do not believe the state should be joined with the Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Catholic, or other denominational body, making that the state church and leaving all others out of consideration. That would be discriminately against the other churches, and would be contrary to the Constitution and would meet general opposition from the people.

All this is true enough; but there is more than this to be considered. The principle of church and state union finds another way of expression, in which it is all the more dangerous because it is not generally recognized by the people. And this is in the union of the state with religion.

Are you in favor of the separation of religion and the state?

It is impossible to keep church and state separate if religion and the state are united.

If the state is religious, if it is Christian, it ought to belong to a church. That is plain. The Christian Church ought to include everything that is Christian. It is not true to its purpose unless it does.

When the state therefore professes religion, when it proclaims itself to be Christian, union with the church is demanded by the plain

logic of the situation. And the question, What is the Christian Church? will surely be raised by the state's profession of religion.

And this question will be conducive to anything but peace between the various religious bodies each of which claims to be the church of Christ. We have but to refer to the history of the church in the early centuries to find the matter illustrated in full.

If the state, moreover, is to be Christian, it must enforce religion upon the people, for the state does nothing but by force. And as Christianity is inseparable from the law of God, the "Christian" state must proceed to enforce that law, and execute its penalty, which is death. But true Christianity means life for the transgressor, not death.

Then, "Keep the church and state forever separate." Keep religion and the state separate. Keep religion separate from force; let its power be always the power of love. All this is included in the admonition uttered by General Grant.

September 15, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 36 , p. 565.

THE side of truth is the side of the true majority.

IF you are a follower of God, you will be a leader of men.

A SINGLE word from the throne of God outweighs the earth.

RELIGIOUS truth never requires the support of civil statutes.

LACK of Scriptural support for an institution up by any amount of support from other sources.

PEOPLE make a great mistake when they pass over the question of what is right, to consider what is custom and precedent. Right is always the true precedent.

TO SAY that the Sabbath needs the support of human enactments, is to say that the law of God needs such support; and that is to say that the law of God is very weak.

NO SUNDAY law was ever based upon the argument that the first day of the week is the seventh day, or that one day of the week will do as well for the Sabbath as another.

WHEN men set about enforcing the law of God, they argue that God is either too impotent to enforce his own enactments, or not wise enough to know when or how they should be enforced.

THE platform of religious truth is never overcrowded with church members.

NO REASON for Sabbath observance has ever been or can be devised which will be an improvement upon that specified by the Author of the Sabbath in the fourth commandment.

GOD'S law is the law of giving; man's law the law of requiring.

IN the sphere of moral duties and privileges, ignorance is not bliss.

IT is better to walk alone in the path of right than to follow a multitude to do evil.

ALL religious legislation is an effort to substitute law for conscience in those upon whom it takes effect.

PIOUS motives and sincerity of purpose are not good substitutes for a knowledge of the truth.

NO INDIVIDUAL can find real Sabbath rest save by accepting the divine invitation given to all them "that labor and are heavy laden."

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 36 , p. 566.

THE God of Christianity has been in the national Constitution from the first, his name being inscribed there in the principles of justice and liberty which it embodies. But the National Reform party—the party which confounds Christianity with politics—wants to put into the Constitution a god which would crowd these principles out. They want the Constitution to distinguish between religion classes, giving to the larger the authority to coerce the smaller, contrary to the American and Christian principle of equality before the law in matters of conscience.

The god which could not be put into the Constitution without crowding justice out of it, is not the true God.

"Futile, But Not New" *American Sentinel* 13, 36 , p. 566.

THE experiment of making an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God in the fundamental law of a commonwealth, which a large party in this country is so anxious to try, is not a new one. Not to mention the attempts of former times, made by the nations of the old world, to administer the laws of God by the machinery of the State, we have an example in the constitution of the Southern Confederacy, set up in our own time. It affords a fair illustration of the practical utility of the scheme proposed. The preamble of that constitution said:—

"We, the People of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent Federal Government, establish justice, insure domestic

tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity—invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God—do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Confederate States of America."

This is not so full a recognition of God's sovereignty as political religionists want put into the national Constitution to-day, but it was not void of practical effect. It declared that "we, the people," included the Government set up upon the Constitution, invoked "the favor and guidance of Almighty God;" hence only those were included who were willing to make this religious acknowledgment, which was in itself a confession of faith in the sovereignty and providence of God. The atheist and agnostic were not recognized at all, and could properly have no share in the government, nor claim protection under it.

The preamble of the United States Constitution makes no allusion to God; and as between the two, upon the theory that such an acknowledgment is binding upon the nation, and that to omit it is a sin calling for divine retribution, providence should certainly have favored the Confederate government in its contest for separation from the Union.

But what was the result? Every person knows. The constitutional acknowledgment of God availed nothing. The Almighty did not recognize it. And such an acknowledgment is of no more value to-day than it was in the time of the war.

If God had desired a government to be set up which recognized his sovereignty in its fundamental law, he could have perpetuated the Confederate government. And that he let it go down, is plain evidence that he did not wish it perpetuated. But religious hobby-riders refuse to learn anything from experience.

"A Hindu's View of 'National Christianity'" *American Sentinel* 13, 36 , pp. 566, 567.

THE difference between the so-called Christianity of the national type—that which gives rise to the term "Christian nation"—and real Christianity, is illustrated in the experience of a convert from Hinduism, as related by Professor Max Muller in the *August Cosmopolist*. "I was sitting in my room at Oxford copying Sanscrit," says the professor, when "a gentleman was shown in, dressed in a long, black coat, looking different from my usual visitors, and addressing me in language of which I did not understand a single

word." It was a learned Hindu who had come to see Mr. Muller and was addressing him in Sanscrit. Upon being given some manuscript of the Veda to peruse, he said he did not believe in the Veda any longer, but had become a Christian. An

567

earnest conversation ensued, of which the professor says:—

"It was not long before I discovered a sad and perplexed tone in his conversation, and, though he assured me that nothing but a deep conviction of the truth of Christ's teaching had induced him to change his religion, he told me he was in great anxiety and did not know what to do for the future. What he had seen of England, more particularly of London, was not what he had imagined a Christian country to be. His patron, Dhulip Singh, had placed him at some kind of missionary seminary in London, where he found himself, together with a number of what he considered half-educated and narrow-minded young men, candidates for ordination, and missionary work. They showed him no sympathy and love, but found fault with everything he did and said.

"He had been, as I soon found out, a careful student of Hindu philosophy, and his mind had passed through a strict philosophical discipline. Hindu philosophy in by many respect as good a discipline as Plato or Aristotle, and, Christian though he was, he was familiar with the boldest conceptions of the world as found in the six systems of Hindu philosophy, and he could argue with great subtlety and accuracy on any of the old problems of the human mind. The fact was, he stood too high for his companions, and they were evidently unable to understand and appreciate his thoughts. He did not use words at random, and was always ready to give a definition of them, whenever they seemed ambiguous. And yet this man was treated as a kind of nigger by those who ought to have been not only kind, but respectful to him. He was told that smoking was a sin, and that he never could be a true Christian if he abstained from eating meat, especially beef. He told me that with a great effort he had brought himself once to swallow sandwich containing a slice of meat, but it was to him what eating human flesh would be to us. He could not do it again.

"When he thus found himself in this thoroughly uncongenial society, and saw nothing in London of what he had supposed a Christian city to be, he ran away, and came to Oxford to find me, having heard of my interest in India, in its religion and its ancient literature. He had evidently dreamt of a Christian country where everybody loved his neighbor as himself; where everybody, if struck on the right cheek, would turn the other also; where everybody, when robbed of his coat, would give up his cloak also. All this, as we know, is no longer the fashion in the streets of London, and

what he actually saw in those streets was so different from his ideals that he said to me: 'If what I have seen in London is Christianity, I want to go back to India; if that is Christianity, I am not a Christian.'"

The Hindu convert had made the mistake of supposing that since Christianity was the professed religion in London, the city was a Christian city, just as it is taken for granted by many not of Hindu blood and education, that a nation where Christianity is the professed religion of the people, must be a Christian nation. His mind had not grasped the fact that profession, as regards Christianity, might be no evidence at all of possession; and that the many possessed but a counterfeit of Christianity, no more like the genuine than is a corpse like a living person. It was perhaps not strange that he should have entertained this false conception, having been educated in the formal systems of heathenism, where profession has always its face value; but such a mistake is without excuse in those who have grown up amidst Christian privileges.

The result was fatal to the new life that had been awakened in his soul, and the professor records that after holding his profession for a time in much perplexity and almost in despair, he sought refuge at last in the old religion which he had renounced. It is a sad illustration of a false conception of Christianity and its effect upon the mind by which it is entertained.

THE most poisonous thing in the world, is sin; the most poisonous serpent is that by which Adam and Eve were bitten, in Eden.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 36 , p. 580.

IN the Christian warfare there is never any trouble from bad rations, or from neglect of the One in command.

THERE are never any "dull times" in the vineyard of the Lord. The world was never overstocked with Christians.

IN David's time the faith of a stripling was more powerful than the sword of a giant. And God has not changed.

THAT church and state ought to be kept separate, is a Christian truth as well as a principle of American government. Jesus Christ himself stated it, and we as Christians have a right to state it now. We are not doing anything inconsistent with a profession of Christianity when we state it. Yet the SENTINEL has been sharply criticised on the ground that, since it professed to be Christian and maintained that Christianity could not mix in the affairs of civil government, it had no

business to be telling the people how the Government ought to be run. Such critics should remember that Christ himself is the author and first exponent of this governmental principle, and that to criticise its enunciation is to criticise him. In setting forth this principle the SENTINEL is taking no part in the affairs of civil government. Let the civil government be kept separate from religion; then let it be run as the fortune of politics may decide.

September 22, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 37 , p. 581.

ALL religious legislation puts a barrier between man and God.

NO LAW of man was ever powerful enough to drag a soul to Christ.

THE true evangelist points the weary and burdened soul to Christ, not to the law.

IF the Sabbath is not the seventh day of the week, it is not the seventh day of anything.

SINCE all men must come to Christ to find rest, the rest which the Sabbath law enjoins must be religious.

NO MAN can come to God save through Jesus Christ, and no man can come to Christ save through the freedom of his own will.

INSTITUTIONS which rest upon a basis of truth, are much more stable than those which rest merely upon a legal basis.

THE law of the Sabbath, which commemorates creation, is no more uncertain or imperfect in any way than the laws by which creation is governed.

SOCIETY needs not the restriction of new laws, but liberation from the old laws inwrought in human nature, which hold men in the ruts of sin and error.

IT is religion, and that alone, which keeps the Sabbath rest from becoming a period of aimless inactivity positively demoralizing to mind and body.

PEOPLE who think they ought to legislate upon religious matters should remember that a good motive did not protect Uzzah when he put forth his human hand to stead the ark of God.

CONSCIENCE should be the only compelling power in all religious observances.

IF men would be careful to give to God as much as they exact from their fellowmen, there would be far less hypocrisy practiced in the name of religion.

IF God had not mean to make his Sabbath law plain to human comprehension, he would not have used in expressing it so many words of one syllable.

THE workingman needs the support of a moral strengthening [*sic.*] within, rather than the propping up of religious laws from without.

[Inset.] JESUS CHRIST says, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Those only who accept this invitation will find rest. It must be an act of their own free will. But the Sunday laws are for the purpose of compelling the "heavy laden," and all people, to rest. And to be compelled to rest is not accepting an invitation to rest; free will and forced will are exactly opposite conditions. And therefore those who yield to the Sunday laws—those who are compelled by them—by that very thing shut themselves away from receiving the rest which Christ offers, and which they need. They are shut away from the blessing of God.

"Rest Not Secured by Law" *American Sentinel* 13, 37 , p. 582.

IT was the Lord of the Sabbath who said, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." It is He who gives this same invitation to every weary soul to-day.

The Sabbath was made for rest, and the Sabbath law commands rest; but He who made the Sabbath and gave the law, bids all men find rest by accepting his invitation, "Come unto me."

And by this He testifies that rest can be found by men in no other way. They cannot find rest except they come to Him. They cannot therefore find it through the compulsion of law or in the formal observance of the law.

The purpose of the Sabbath and the Sabbath law be realized only in Christ. He who remains separated from Christ can find no benefit—no rest—in the Sabbath.

And as no Sunday law can bring any soul to Christ, it is certain that no Sunday law can in any way promote Sabbath observance.

Jesus Christ is "the end of the law for righteousness." There can be no observance of the law of righteousness outside of him.

"The Church's 'Mightiest Helper'" *American Sentinel* 13, 37 , p. 582.

A PAPER which is devoted to the propagation of the doctrine that religion and politics ought to be united, says:—

"Were the powers of the state used to protect the Sabbath and maintain its sacredness, to purify the family and prevent vice, it would be the church's mightiest helper."

Think of it: the state becoming the church's mightiest helper! What church, what religion, could hold to such a view? Not Christianity; for that affirms that the church's helper in her contest with evil here is none other than the almighty One above.

No; this is the religion which seeks the help of the state and the pathway of politics. That the state can become the church's mightiest helper is exactly what that religion teaches. It is what every one must accept as truth who holds to the idea of religion in politics. It is the old principle of church and state union. The very essence of that union is the idea that the state can—and therefore ought to—help the church.

But it is not the truth, and brands as false the religion which maintains it. When the church looks for the state to become her "mightiest helper," she turns her back upon Him who said to His people, and for them in all ages, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth;" and "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

"Religion in Politics" *American Sentinel* 13, 37 , p. 582.

IT is said that politics and religion ought to be united; and this, by individuals who profess total dissent from any union of church and state.

But can politics be separated from the state? and can religion be separated from the church? The Christian religion, certainly, is bound up in the Christian Church.

Since then politics cannot be separated from the state, nor religion from the church, how can politics and religion be united without making by that very act a union of church and state? And through what other means did church and state ever become united?

"Note" *American Sentinel* 13, 37 , p. 582.

JUSTICE alone does not represent Christianity; justice alone is not the aim of Christianity. To deal with the sinner as he justly deserves, is directly contrary to Christianity. And therefore any power institute for the purpose of securing justice alone, cannot join with Christianity.

Christianity does not call into use anything which aims at securing justice only. This is why Peter, when he drew the sword to resist the attack upon Jesus, was told to put it up again into its sheath.

September 29, 1898

"The Power of Love" *American Sentinel* 13, 38 , p. 598.

THE power is the greatest power in the universe. It is the power of God; for "God is love." And being the greatest power in the universe, it is the power bequeathed to the Christian Church for the accomplishment of her mission in the world.

It is the power of love that is represented by the cross of Calvary. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son." And the Son of God so loved the lost human family that he voluntarily descended from his throne of glory to hang as a malefactor upon the instrument of torture and death.

The channel of this power—the channel of love—is self-sacrifice. By self-sacrifice, therefore, the Christian Church is to accomplish her appointed work for mankind. In nothing is self to be exalted or ministered unto. There can be no seeking after earthly power, no grasping for worldly honor or position. The Head of the Church renounced the power, the honor and glory that he had in heaven, and sought none of these upon the earth; and so long as she is directed by her Head, the church will manifest only His spirit and character to the world.

The power of love is the opposite of the love of power. This reversal of the divine principle came about in the early history of the church, and there was a strife in the church as to which should be the greatest. And after many years of this strife, the bishop of Rome—the pope—was elevated to the seat of supreme authority and power,—the power not of love and self-sacrifice, but of authority over men, and of worldly honor. The pope became—what he has ever since continued to be—a mighty factor in politics. And when the church engages now in political strife, she is moved by the same spirit which led the church into politics in the early centuries.

As much of political power as was possessed by the dying Son of God upon the cross, as much of worldly honor and pre-eminence as was then his, so much and only that may properly be held and exercised by the Christian Church to-day.

"They Simply 'Put Up With' It" *American Sentinel* 13, 38 , p. 598.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND, speaking in the *Catholic Review* of August 24, says:—

"It is the policy of the Catholic Church—a policy almost as old as the church itself—to support the existing government."

In view, however, of the fact that Italy, while undoubtedly an "existing government," not only receives no support from the Catholic Church, but is made to feel her active hostility, an exchange suggests that certain omissions should be supplied in the archbishop's words to express the full truth, thus: "It is the policy of the Catholic Church, . . . to support [herself at] the [expense of the] existing government." And in case any government will not support the Catholic Church, then her policy is as laid down in a late papal encyclical, which says that while Catholics will "put up with" such a government, "they will never be able, without violating the most sacred duties, to uphold it by their adhesion or support."

The Government of the United States has refused to support the Catholic Church in Porto Rico and the Philippines, and good Catholics are simply "putting up with" it as it is to-day.

October 6, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 39 , p. 613.

WHEN Cesar enters the domain of religion, he does not lay aside his sword.

THE "things that are God's" are not to be rendered to him through Cesar.

TO DECK Cesar in the garments of religions, only dishonors those garments and makes Cesar ridiculous.

STATE religion can be no more than a garment worn on the outside. The sword of compulsion lurks beneath the garb of piety, and the "dogs of war" lose nothing of their character by appearing in the guise of sheep.

IT amounts to the same thing in the end whether the church becomes political or the state religious.

"GOVERNMENT of the people, by the people, and for the people," can become Christian only when the people become Christians.

THE church will look a long time into the turbid pool of politics before she beholds a reflection of divinity.

IN religion, nothing can rightfully come between the soul and God. In politics, the party and the boss come between the individual and his vote. Religion in politics is therefore religion controlled by man.

WHEN the early church was about to be endued with marvelous power, she repaired not to Cesar's throne, but to an "upper room" and the throne of God.

WHEN Christianity ascends the throne of earthly power, she invariably lays aside her robe of pure white and puts on one of scarlet.

THE strife in the church as to which should be the greatest, which began in the days of the apostles, was settled only by sinking the church to the lowest level of degradation.

THE worship that is offered to God through Cesar, will need purifying to make it presentable at the throne.

[Inset.] STATE RELIGION: CESAR—THE STATE—IN THE GARB OF PIETY. CESAR, robed in the vestments of religion, makes an incongruous picture. Such garments were never designed to cover the embodiment of civil authority and power. The sword by which his word is always enforced belies the pretense of the love which draws and persuades men; the fangs of the wolf belie the appearance of the harmless sheep. The hypocrisy of the display is evident. Yet in this country of professed separation of church and state, the state has not wholly laid aside the garb of religion but maintains the appearance of piety in its laws for Sunday observance, its appointment of days of thanksgiving and prayer, its maintenance of chaplains and sectarian institutions, and its gifts of public money and state property to the churches.

October 13, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 40 , p. 629.

THE State can proclaim no gospel but the "gospel of force."

THE mere opinions of some people, in their own view, outweigh other people's rights.

A RELIGION which seeks to erect a despotism among men, is not the religion of Jesus Christ.

THERE can no more be such a thing as Christian civil government, than there can be an American Frenchman.

THE "Christian statesman" of the present day is a person who is too intolerant to be a Christian, and too ignorant to be a statesman.

THE "God" which religious zealots will put into the Constitution, if their plans succeed, will be a god of their own make.

THE people who want God put in the Constitution of the United States, have lost sight of God in the constitution of all creation.

THE zealots who are striving to enact religious legislation in this land, want to blot out the Declaration of Independence, and declare the dependence of the rest of the people upon themselves.

THERE will be no harm in the schemes of the moral reform-by-law party if they will wait for the Lord to make known his will in the matter through some other channel than themselves.

MANY people who claim to be the spiritual descendants of Abraham, seem to have quite forgotten that the father of the faithful was only a stranger and pilgrim on this earth.

THERE can be reform by denying justice.

[Inset.] MAKING ROOM IN THE CONSTITUTION TO "PUT GOD INTO IT." THE scheme to "put God in the Constitution" which is being urged upon Congress and the American people at every opportunity, means that the Constitution shall declare the will of God to be the fundamental law of the land. This would throw the question of what the will of God is, into the courts, and human interpretations of the law of God would become binding upon all citizens. And this would disfranchise and outlaw all disbelievers in the religious doctrines which might thus become established, and the persecution of religious dissenters would be revived. Congress would be no longer bound to "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," but would be bound to do quite the contrary. Equality of citizens before the law would no longer exist, and justice would no longer be secured by the Constitution to the people.

"Imperial American and Imperial Rome" *American Sentinel* 13, 40 , pp. 630, 631.

ROME became imperial when the fabric of the Roman republic fell to pieces. Imperialism came not upon Rome by chance; it came never by chance upon any country. Imperial Rome came because the

Roman republic fell to pieces; and the republic fell to pieces because the capacity for self-government had become lost in the Roman people.

Whenever the capacity for self-government is lost by any people, republican government is with them no longer possible, and imperialism no longer avoidable.

The last days of the Roman republic were marked by the division of society into two opposing classes,—the rich, and the poor. It was marked by the elimination of the middle class—that bodyguard of republican government, holding the balance of power between the social extremes. This class of the people being eliminated, there was nothing to check the struggle between poverty and wealth, which went on continuously. The rich obtained their riches by the most unscrupulous use of power, and the poor were held in poverty by the unscrupulous exercise of the power of wealth. And the poor became possessed of the idea that the state owed them a living, and preferred to depend for a living upon the state, rather than to make vigorous efforts to help themselves.

The political atmosphere was full of the questions to which the struggle between wealth and poverty gives rise. There was the land question: the land was passing from the hands of the people into the control of monopolists, who tilled it by gangs of slaves. Monopoly enabled the man of wealth to shut out competition, just as it does today; and the poor land holder, not being able to compete with the slave owner, became discontented and preferred the life of the city. The people flocked to the cities, and the transfer of their lands to the monopolists, and of themselves to the centres of wealth and political power, only made more unstable the trembling equilibrium of the government.

There was urgent need of purification in politics. The word had become the synonym of corruption. Political power meant the money to buy votes, and the voter was as ready to sell his vote as the politician was to buy it. Public offices were bought and public officials of all ranks were open to bribery. Everywhere gold outweighed justice and a feather outweighed crime.

Industry had dwindled in its meaning until it signified only the pursuit of money. This was the all-absorbing craze among all classes. The poor man sold his vote for money, and the rich man bought it in order that he might use its power to get wealth. There was a general eagerness to get rich, and to get rich without hard work. Immense

fortunes were acquired at a bound by the unscrupulous use of the power of political office. The man who had bribed his way to the position of governor of a province, although he went to his new field heavily in debt came back in two or three years with a fortune which excited the envy and dazzled the judgment of his humbler fellows. The successful adventurer, no matter what his maxims and methods, became an example to be copied if possible.

Another feature that marked the decay of the republic was the development of the innate tendency of human nature to want to get something for nothing. This was a marked feature of life in the large cities. People who were without money wanted to be supported by the state. The conception of the state as a paternal entity endowed with unlimited capacity to support the people had become widespread. From the public granaries, grain was supplied to the indigent populace at a nominal price, while they were entertained at shows provided at state expense. This was the regime which the people preferred to self-support and self-government. They put their dependence upon that which, apart from the people, was nothing but a name; and of course, the fancied support soon failed. The republic was all the time sinking lower into the sea of anarchy and despotism.

Yet at this time Rome as a political division of the earth was rising to the zenith of her power. Her legions, under the leadership of renowned warriors, were sweeping all before them to the extreme limits of the known world. The prowess exhibited abroad gave no hint of the weakness that was a reality at home. But the power of the army was not the power of the republic; it was in reality the power of despotism. This the Romans finally perceived; this, in her own case, the French republic is perceiving to-day; and this the United States will perceive when this republic shall have become the great military power which it now aspires and is planning to be.

Such was Rome in the last days of the republic. And all this was because the people themselves, individually, had lost the capacity for self-government. The principle had become corrupted within them, and this individual corruption was the disease which manifested itself in upheavals in the affairs of state. And the remedies proposed and tried were only to cure the symptoms and not the disease itself; and when at last the would-be liberators of their country performed the desperate deed which

removed from the Roman stage the imperial figure of Julius Cesar, the imperialism within the republic went on unchecked. New and worse symptoms of the disease speedily appeared in the place of those that had been eliminated; new Cesars far more despotic and cruel succeeded to the throne of the first.

And who that has thoughtfully and candidly observed the trend of affairs in the American Republic to-day can fail to discern the same waning of the power of self-government, the same symptoms developing, if yet less advanced, which marked the last days of the republic of Rome? Knowing these, we may be assured what in the natural course of events, will be the end.

"The Power of Christianity" *American Sentinel* 13, 40 , p. 631.

THE Church of Christ was not designed to be a powerless thing in the midst of the powers of earth. Of Christians it is said by the divine Word that one shall "chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight." All Christians, at least, recognize that this statement is truth.

This is the power which God has designed for his followers here. Through them he would make his power known to the world, and to do this—to reveal himself as the Supreme One to whom all the world should look for salvation—he would endue his children with a power vastly greater than any that is known to the world. For in all the world was there never known such a thing as that one person, with any power supplied by the world, turned back a thousand of his adversaries, or that two put ten thousand to flight. But the great conflict between truth and righteousness on the one hand, and error and iniquity on the other, reveals many a scene where one man, standing in the strength of God, has discomfited a host of his enemies. Often in that conflict has the truth appeared that one individual, on the side of God, is in the majority.

And yet, notwithstanding this which God has plainly revealed to the church, and which Christians profess to believe, the church wants to express her power through politics! In politics, where at best she can only measure vote for vote with the world, and where she is hopelessly outnumbered by the world, the church would convince the world of the power of the kingdom of God! Think of it, and think how hopeless and complete must be her failure!

"Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord." This is the way God himself has chosen to make his power known in the

world by his church. And politics is the way the church has chosen! Where at the polls did one vote ever offset a thousand, or two Christian voters put ten thousand of the worldly to flight?

What the church needs to-day is not politics, but purification. Not the purification of politics, but the purification of the church, is the thing that will supply the church with power. And that purification will come, as surely as there is a God in heaven who has undertaken to save men by his power. That power must be made known among men, and it will be. And then will the church of the living God arise and the world will behold her—though but a Gideon's band, it may be—"fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

"Sophistry and Its Fruit" *American Sentinel* 13, 40 , p. 631.

CHURCH participation in politics has this defense from the late Cardinal Manning:—

"Why should the Holy Father touch any matter in politics at all? For the plain reason, because politics are a part of morals. Politics are morals on the widest scale."

That is the plea by which every church and every individual professor of religion justify their participation in politics. The plea is equally good for one and all.

And this plea seems all right in itself; but its fruit is bad, and the tree is known by its fruit, and not by its appearance. The early church went into politics, and the result was, the establishment of the papacy. Had the church kept aloof from politics, no such thing as the papacy could ever have been.

And wherever the church—the papal or any other—has participated in politics, and has had the power to mold the political situation to her liking, there has been persecution and oppression to her religious opponents. There has been a likeness of the papacy, if not the thing itself. The papal church does not stand alone in history as a persecutor and oppressor of the people. That church is the mother of persecution [*sic.*]; but she has had numerous daughters.

It is not true that "politics are morals on the widest scale." Morals are presented on the widest scale in the law of God,—the commandments which are described by the psalmist as "exceeding broad." Politics are the science of civil government—that government which is suited to selfish people. But the law of God is the rule of divine government—the only government in which selfishness does

not appear. Where no selfishness is no other government but the divine one can be possible. And no other than this can harmonize with Christianity.

"The Church on Imperialism" *American Sentinel* 13, 40 , pp. 636, 637.

WHILE a few voices within the church are raised in warning against the policy which would launch the nation upon the sea of imperialism, it is evident that, in general, the church will give that policy her vigorous support. For in it the church sees—or believes that she sees—the opportunity for a rapid and easy extension of her own conquests, which, being those of Christianity, must be for the welfare of all people, and justify the means by which they are introduced.

The tendency of the church is more and more to ally herself with the state in political affairs; to see in political questions the moral questions which belong to her divinely-appointed sphere; to see, in short, as Cardinal Manning expressed it, that "politics are morals on the widest scale." And this the church discerns all the more readily when, as in the present instance, a certain policy on the part of the state contains the promise of an important advantage for herself.

Some impressive words in support of an imperial policy by the Government were spoken on an impressive occasion on the 5th inst. in Washington, D. C. That occasion was the triennial council of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The conference included in its participants the House of Bishops, which is the chief governing body within the church, and among its lay delegates such men as Chief Justice Fuller, of the Supreme Court, J. Pierpont Morgan, the financier, and Captain A. T. Mahan, author of the famous book on the influence of naval power; numbering about five hundred persons in all.

Bishop Tuttle delivered a discourse from the text "Lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes," declaring that "in everyday experience, to hold what is got is quite as valuable a quality of well-balanced human na-

637

ture as to get more to hold." Touching the theme of national expansion, the bishop said:—

"Wide, aye—wide, the work of the church should be. Extension is in the air for us Americans now. If we fall into line at its bugle blast some may claim to our risk and harm that it is an unwonted call, an out-of-the-way call, an unfit call to such as we are. Be that as it

may, the logical course of events is a force not to be counted out, and it may make the sounding of bugle calls and the rolling forward of the chariot wheels of destiny things that we cannot stop if we would.

"We who think are startled and subdued and awed at the responsibilities devolved upon the Union now.

"Now, if the things which we are looking at as citizens are wide and far and deep, how shall we bear it if the church cowers and draws back and lies down? We ought to be, we want to be, the hammer and the arm driving it, to strike hard Hawaii, Porto Rico—go forward to possess the land. The Philippines—if the flag we honor and love is to float sovereign there—go yet in there also. And if the forceful logic of events that we wot of lift the flag into prominence over other regions yet—go ye there, too, to bide and work and help and save.

"We may find China likely to be our neighbor, even in the ordinary sense of mundane locality. In the literal sense and in the catechism's sense she has been our neighbor for years.

"Then for our own countrymen shall this church be content with any narrower aim than to be in zeal and duty and sympathy the American Church.

"Then for our own countrymen shall this church be content with any narrower aim than to be in zeal and duty and sympathy the American Church.

"We need not the fact that we are gathered in the nation's capital to remind us how thick and fast are growing the nation's responsibilities, which are centering here.

"The Anglo-Saxon race seems harnessed to the twofold work of giving to the world the sweets of personal liberty and the restraints of order without which liberty cannot be preserved."

But is not the church right in supporting the policy of national expansion, that she may go to new fields under the protection of the national flag? The answer is that the power of the Church of Christ is not national power, but that of the Holy Spirit, with which the disciples were baptized at Pentecost, and by which the early church proclaimed the gospel with a power and success that have never been equaled since. The divine hand, that is over all the affairs of men, may bring opportunities for the gospel out of war and political strife, even as he has the power to compel the wrath of man to praise him. But it is not for his church to join in the strife or to depend upon any one of the contending powers. Her motto must always be "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord."

October 20, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 41 , p. 645.

THE religious state means always religion enforced by the power of the state.

SIN reigns in this world wherever grace does not reign; and the reign of sin will be just as bad as sin is bad, and sin is as bad as anything can possibly be. Grace, and not legislation, is the effective antidote for sin.

THE state always casts a dark shadow when it gets between God and human souls.

THE state conscience is guided not by the Word of God, but by the popular vote.

WHEN the state professes religion, it cannot consistently remain out of the church; and when the state applies for admission to the church, it logically places itself in subjection to the church.

"THE noonday of the papacy was the world's midnight."

THE first Sunday edict was issued in 321 A.D. by a pagan emperor; and the first shadows of the coming Dark Ages appeared in legislation for the observance of Sunday.

SINCE Christianity means love and persuasion, while the state always secures its ends by compulsion, the state cannot profess to be Christian without making itself a hypocrite.

THE union of church and state extinguished the sunlight of the gospel and lighted the fires of the Inquisition.

TO STAND on the highest earthly eminence, the Christian Church must descend from the heavenly eminence where God has placed her.

FOR the state to become religious, and yet refuse to join the church would be for it to discredit either the church or its own religion.

THE cloak of piety is always in demand by the representatives of intolerance and the enemies of popular rights.

[Inset.] THE DARK AGES COMING UPON THE WORLD FROM CHURCH AND STATE UNION. THE Christian Church went forth to the world from the baptism of Pentecost proclaiming with power the pure gospel, and the light of it penetrated to all countries. But a change came over her attitude of separation from the world, and in the fourth century she clothed herself in the robes of civil authority and ascended the throne of the Cesars. In A.D. 321, the Roman

emperor, Constantine, made an edict commanding the people in the cities and towns to abstain from work on "the venerable day of the sun," which marked the beginning of that legislation which the church has clamored for and defended down to the present. Church and state joined hands, and as the union progressed, the sunlight of the gospel of love became more and more obscured, until the long night of the Dark Ages settled down upon the world. Only this could be the result of uniting religion with the civil power.

October 27, 1898

**"Fourth Century and Nineteenth Century Parallels" *American Sentinel*
13, 42 , pp. 662, 663.**

THE early Christian Church, when it went forth to fulfill the divine commission to "preach the gospel to every creature," met with severe persecution at the hands of Rome. Rome was then pagan, and the measures employed against the Christians were taken in the name of paganism, in the name of the pagan principle which compelled worship of the gods of Rome.

But in spite of persecution, Christianity spread throughout the empire, carrying with it the divine principle of brotherly love and regard for the rights of beings created in the image of God; teaching men to render to Cesar the things that were Cesar's, and to God the things that were God's. Toleration came in the place of persecution, and a final acknowledgment of the right of the Christians, and of all men, to worship only the God of their own choice.

But ere long, a professor of the Christian religion sat on the throne of the empire, and the church which held the name and practiced the forms of Christianity became the dominant power in the land. Church and state were united, and the state did the bidding of the church. And then persecution was again waged, more severely than ever, against those who maintained allegiance to the principles of the divine government. The realm of conscience was invaded, religious freedom was swept away, individual rights were denied, on a wider scale than had been done before. But this time it was done in the name of Christianity. In the name of that which had before proclaimed the right of every man to think for himself and to worship as his own conscience might dictate,—in the very name of that which had de-[sic.] demanded this for all men, all this was denied to men. And that

produced the worst persecution, the worst state of things in politics and society, that the world ever knew. The very light that was in men became darkness, and how great was that darkness was made known by the long night of the Dark Ages.

And now, in this country, is to be seen a parallel to this retrograde movement which brought darkness and ruin upon the world then, and which can only have a similar result to-day. The United States Government arose to proclaim to the world the principles of civil freedom, the right of men to self-government. Its separation from the monarchy of Great Britain was justified by the Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed all men to be created equal and possessed of inalienable rights, to preserve which is the only legitimate object of civil government. Situated in a territory which had become a refuge for the oppressed of other lands, the principles of civil and religious freedom found in this Government the soil for vigorous growth, and the opportunity for a world-wide influence upon man. The right of men to self-government was asserted not only for the citizens of this Government, but for those of all governments on the earth.

But now, the United States Government itself is departing from the principles for which it has hitherto stood. When it arose as a power among the nations, it protested against despotism in the name of the inalienable right of all men to civil and religious freedom. Its policy was that of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But a new policy is coming

663

to the front; territory is now held under the authority of the United States in which the majority of the people have no voice in the Government. This is the case in Hawaii, which is now under military rule, than which a more despotic form of government does not exist. Porto Rico is another district under the like rule, and Cuba and the Philippines are almost certain to be incorporated into the national domain on a similar footing. The dream of American statesmen is of empire, rather than of "Liberty enlightening the World" with the glory of free government.

And all this is done in the name of liberty,—in the name of the Constitution which is the great charter of free government and of the Declaration of Independence by which the national policy professes to be guided. In the name of liberty a government is set up over a people which holds them in unwilling subjection to a foreign power.

Under such a policy the light of free republican government, founded upon the recognition of inalienable rights, must be turned into darkness, and only despotism worse than that against which our forefathers protested can be the final result.

And this is a real and a terrible menace to America to-day and to the world; for the effect of it will be worldwide. As Ex-Secretary Carlisle has said, "Better a thousand times that monarchical Spain should continue to rule a people against their will than that the United States should usurp her place and hold them in subjection in the name of liberty and humanity."

"Reform by Law in the Roman Republic" *American Sentinel* 13, 42 , p. 663.

TO REFORM society by law has always been a pleasing vision in the minds of people who have not learned the truth that every true reform in society must begin in the heart of the individual member of it, by the exercise of his own will. This being so, the experiment is one that has been often tried, and the lesson of the results is plainly written in the pages of history.

The last days of the Roman republic furnish this lesson among many others of value to those concerned in the experiment of republican government to-day. In the last days of the Roman republic society had fallen into moral ruin. The individual no longer held himself in moral restraint; he no longer exercised the power of self-government. And this was what brought the last days of the republic, as it is what must always bring the last days of government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Yet there was left in the public mind a consciousness of the fact that the crimes from which they no longer held themselves back were worthy of punishment; nor was there lacking a zeal to enact laws against them. The experiment of reform by law was afforded a fair and thorough test. Of this history sets before us the following facts:—

"Cesar acted directly with the assembly of the people, and passed such laws as he pleased. Yet it must be said that he passed none that were not good enough in themselves, but they were laws which in fact meant nothing. There was no public character to sustain them, and consequently they were made only to be broken. There was a law for the punishment of adultery, when not only Cesar, but nine tenths of the people were ready to commit adultery, at the first opportunity. There were laws for the protection of citizens

against violence, when every citizen was ready to commit violence at a moment's notice. There were laws to punish judges who allowed themselves to be bribed, when almost every man in Rome was ready both to offer and to receive bribes. There were laws against defrauding the revenue, when almost every person only desired an opportunity to do that very thing. There were laws against bribery at elections when every soul in Rome from Cesar to the lowest one of the rabble that shouted in the Forum, was ready to bribe or to be bribed. 'Morality and family life were treated as antiquated things among all ranks of society. To be poor was not merely the sorest disgrace and the worst crime, but the only disgrace and the only crime; for money the statesman sold the state, and the burgess sold his freedom; the post of the officer and the vote of the juryman were to be had for money; for money the lady of quality surrendered her person, as well as the common courtesan; falsifying of documents, and perjuries had become so common that in a popular poet of this age an oath is called "the plaster for debts." Men had forgotten what honesty was; a person who refused a bribe was regarded not as an upright man, but as a personal foe. The criminal statistics of all times and countries will hardly furnish a parallel to the dreadful picture of crimes—so varied, so horrible, and so unnatural.'—*Mommsen*. In this condition of affairs such laws were nothing more nor less than a legal farce."

And it cannot be denied that similar conditions furnish many a legal farce in the American republic to-day. Good laws may be looked for as the outcome of moral reform, but it is useless to look for moral reform as the outcome of the laws, however good they may be in themselves.

"Behind the Times" *American Sentinel* 13, 42 , pp. 663, 664.

THE *Defender*, a New England organ devoted to Sunday and its compulsory observance, devotes several columns to the publication of queries, complaints, etc., from correspondents. One of these expresses his concern over the Sunday situation in his neighborhood as follows:—

"I wish you would tell me where I can get a copy of the laws in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, that is, something that defines what is in violation of the Sabbath according to the laws of the commonwealth. There has been some work on the Sabbath in this neighborhood lately, and I *know* it was *absolutely* unnecessary, but I do not know as I could *prove* it before the *court* where the case would be tried if they were prosecuted. I went to the chief of police, to see if I could find out what steps were necessary to stop

such work, and he said that 'I would be unable to sustain any case, as the man would say it was necessary work.' It makes me sad to think that in good old New England one has got to sit down and let evil reign supreme. There is something wrong somewhere. Either the laws are not what they should be, or else those in positions to execute them are in league with those that break them."

This is the view of things to which one is educated by the teaching that Sabbath observance must be preserved by law. Unless the laws against Sunday observance can be enforced, "one has got to sit down and let evil reign supreme"! No hope in the efficacy of gospel preaching to overcome evil, no hope in the power of God to regenerate the heart, or in the softening influence of the message of divine love upon even the hardened sinner—no confidence in any power to overcome evil except that of human statutes executed by the sheriff and the courts! How far from Christianity is such a view!

Yes; "there is something wrong somewhere," and not only in that neighborhood, but in every neighborhood the world over. Men are bad, thoroughly bad. The great majority of them are controlled by the carnal mind, and the heart that "is deceitful above all things, and *desperately wicked*." And the great majority of the race have been in this condition almost since time began. Adam, the head and beginning of the race, fell from his perfection and became carnal, in the Garden of Eden. That is the something that is wrong somewhere and everywhere; but the *Defender's* correspondent seems to be nearly six thousand years behind the times in getting at the fact.

There is no use trying to reform society by law. Only that which can transform can properly reform the descendants of Adam. Laws are useless without sentiment to support them, and the sentiment cannot be manufactured by the law. The sentiment is the proper source of the law, and not law the source of sentiment. The transforming power that is available in this world is that of divine grace; and that is as powerful to-day as ever. Relying upon that, no one need ever feel that he must sit down in despair.

"Rome's Advice to the United States Regarding the Philippines"
***American Sentinel* 13, 42 , p. 664.**

THE Roman Catholic view of the proper solution of the religious problems raised by the coming of the Philippine Islands under the authority of the United States is presented in a late issue of the *Catholic World*, by "Father" Doyle. This papal spokesman wants

Protestant missionaries to keep out of the Philippines, and plainly hints at his regret that he has not the power to give his wishes in the matter the force of a command. He says moreover that the passing away of the old Spanish system is a fortunate thing, because with that out of the way the Philipinos will become more attached to the priests—as if it were not a fact that the Spanish government and the Catholic Church are in close alliance, each one giving its sanction to the principles and deeds of the other. We quote the following:—

"The coming of the American system at this time is very providential to the native Filipinos. The loves and the religious associations of their childhood, not that they are stripped of all tyrannous exactions from the civil order, will revive, and the devotion they have always had for the *padres* will assert itself. If in the next few years the administration of affairs is conducted with wisdom, we may hope to win the entire native population to our side. We must learn a lesson from our 'century of dishonor' with the American Indians. If we send among the Tagals 'swaddlers' and politicians to sow corruption and degradation, we shall reap the whirlwind in dissension and revolution. The possession of the Philippines will become a very costly experiment, and what is worse than mere loss of money, our influence, which has been given to us to uplift and free, will be perverted to debauch and enslave. *Were I in authority I would persuade every Protestant minister to stay away from Manila.* [Italics ours.] I would select the most thorough Americans among the Catholic priests of the country, and establish an *entente cordiale* between them and the civil authorities. I would appoint as governor-general a broad-minded military man—one who understands the inner workings of the Catholic religion. He need not be a Catholic, but he should have no antipathies against the church, and should strive to gain the sympathetic adherence of the ecclesiastical authorities. He should proceed in the establishment of courts and tribunals on the American plan, he should look out for the sanitation of the cities, suppression of rampant vice, and, as he is in duty bound, leave religion to its own devices. Proceeding on these lines, we shall not conquer the Philippines so much as we shall win them to our way and methods, and not many years will have passed before we shall have planted among the Orientals the seeds of the freest and best government on the face of the earth."

But the "freest and best government on the face of the earth" would not be where all other religions are excluded except the Roman Catholic. Where such exclusion has been maintained, the governments have been at the very opposite extreme of the freest and best, as witness some of the governments in South America. The purposes of Rome are evidently not changing upon this point.

The statement by "Father" Doyle that a whirlwind of "dissension and revolution" will follow in the Philippines unless care is taken to leave the people under Catholic influence and control, hardly accords with the claim that five-sixths of the people have been converted to Christianity, as is claimed by Catholic authorities. It does not speak very favorably for the Roman Catholic idea of conversion. True Christians are not thus led into raising whirlwinds of violence and crime.

November 3, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 43 , p. 677.

MERE motion, even in a straight line, is not always progress.

THE man who is careless of the truth is often very particular about error.

THE "old-fashioned" methods of reforming society which some modern preachers have outgrown, have not become antiquated with the Lord.

WHEN the state interferes with conscience, it raises its hand against the only barrier between manhood and knavery.

THERE is something very serious the matter with the eyesight of the government when it cannot distinguish the interests of the individual citizen apart from the mass.

THE hardest place in the world with a clear conscience is more comfortable than the easiest place without it.

THE great trouble with the world to-day is that it has forgotten what it ought to have remembered, and discovered what it ought never to have known.

THE pressure of religious legislation always falls heaviest upon the person who refuses to be a hypocrite.

THE righteousness which is set up by the State, is by that fact dependent upon the state, and therefore lacks the stable and permanent character of true righteousness.

THE foundation of all successful government is individual self-government.

ALL religious legislation is an effort to stagnate the current of religious thought, the flow of which maintains the religious life of society.

THE State can exercise no power for the good of its people beyond that of protecting each individual in the enjoyment of his rights.

IT requires neither education, wealth, nor political influence to be a despot.

[Inset.] THE INDEFINITE SABBATH AND THE DEFINITE SUNDAY. SPEAKING to his congregation concerning the observance of the fourth commandment, the preacher says it doesn't matter about the particular day of the week; God isn't particular about that, but merely requires that we observe one day in seven, and this we do by observing the first day of the week. But an individual who chose to observe the seventh day of the week instead of the first, in harmony with God's Sabbath law but contrary to man's, discovered that the particular day of the week was really a most important matter in the view of the upholders of the Sunday law. He found himself under arrest for not observing the particular day of the week "commonly called Sunday," and the preacher explained to him very positively that his arrest was altogether proper, because in not observing that particular day he had desecrated the Sabbath.

"The Development of Despotism" *American Sentinel* 13, 43 , p. 678.

TO ANY people seeking to avoid the despotism which in civil government has so often trample human rights under foot in the past, a knowledge of the source from which it is likely to arise, is of prime importance.

The cry which is heard against the oppression and tyranny that are felt in the land, is directed almost invariably against the man of wealth, the representative of the Trust, the aristocrat. And that he is not innocent of the charges made, for the most part, is not to be denied; but the man of wealth is by no means the only source, or even the chief source, of danger.

It is a significant truth, which should be known by all and forgotten by none, that the despotism of the Roman empire,—that "furious and crushing despotism," the worst probably that ever darkened the civilized world, arose not from the aristocracy at all, but from the people themselves.

The aristocracy were represented by the Roman senate; their purposes were carried into effect by that body. But in the days of Julius Cesar, before the empire was set up, the power of the Roman

senate was broken and dissipated. It remained a part of the Roman government only in name. The shaping of the affairs of government was wholly in the hands of the people, and of their idol Cesar. "In legislation, the senate was totally ignored; Cesar acted directly with the assembly of the people, and passed such laws as he pleased." ¹¹ The people themselves, having lost the power of self-government, set up over themselves a despotism far worse than that which had incited their struggle against the patricians.

Turning now to the American Republic, we cannot shut our eyes to the plentiful evidence of despotism lurking within those organizations and movements directly representing the common people,—despotism which has on occasions boldly avowed itself. In the State of Illinois a few years ago, for example, by the fiat of one of these organizations, railway travel within the State was completely paralyzed, and the governor was obliged to ask of an individual in no office of governmental authority, permission to travel by rail within the boundaries of his own State. And to-day, in this same State, we see owners of mine property debarred by the governor under a threat of armed interference, from the right of operating their mines by such labor as they see fit to hire,—a right which, however obnoxious its exercise may be to some citizens of the State, they undoubtedly possess under the fundamental law of the land.

Let it be remembered, also, that the tyranny which is set up in the name of the common people passes more rapidly than any other form into the despotism of one-man power. It was so in the republic of Rome; it was so in the French Revolution; and it will be so in the Republic of the United States.

The common people are oppressed; that is true. But in most cases the worst oppression which an individual suffers is self imposed. The worst misgovernment is that of the individual who cannot restrain himself. Let the people learn true self-government, let them maintain the principles of manly independence in their own lives, and the despotism of wealth will crumble away. But if they choose to oppose tyranny with more tyranny, only worse tyranny can be the result. If they choose to "fight the devil with fire," they cannot complain if they are the victims of a conflagration.

November 10, 1898

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 44 , p. 693.

NO STATE could be weaker than that whose citizens were unable to support themselves.

THE truth most loudly proclaimed by the church in calling for the aid of state legislation, is that she has lost the support of God.

LAWS are enacted to uphold rights, not the individuals to whom the rights belong.

THE light of the world's highest wisdom has never proved an antidote for moral darkness.

A SUNDAY law can never rise above the character of a religious quarantine.

WORK is not an enemy of the human race, but idleness and stagnation are enemies. A country is never so prosperous as when all its people have plenty of work.

NO SABBATH law is needed to uphold the right of the workingman to a day of weekly rest.

WHEN the church speaks one word for the workingmen on the subject of Sabbath legislation, she speaks two words for herself.

THE night is for physical rest; the Sabbath for spiritual rest.

IT is possible to make a person rest in such a way that it becomes more tiresome to him than work.

TO ADMIT that it is the duty of the state to detect and punish even one sin, as such, is to justify the Inquisition and the persecutions of the Dark Ages.

THE "powers that be" were not ordained of God to support the Christian Church or to be the means for the conversion of sinners.

[Inset.] THE WORKINGMAN DECLINES THE SUPPORT OF RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION. THE movement which aims to establish religious observances in this land by legal sanction, has long been represented as an effort in behalf of the workingmen, who it is said are compelled to work seven days in the week, and thus lose the day of rest. The falsity of the claim that workingmen are compelled to work on the Sabbath, is demonstrated by the fact that 50,000 people in this country observe the seventh day by abstaining from work, yet who are as much "compelled" to work seven days in the week as are any who observe the first day. The workingmen through their organizations have repudiated the idea that they have not strength enough to take care of themselves, and manhood enough to obey the dictates of conscience on the point of Sabbath observance. He who

has faith in God, needs no other support in obeying the divine commands; and he who would not obey God without the support of the legislature, proclaims there by that he is a moral cripple.

"Christianity and Civic Interests" *American Sentinel* 13, 44 , pp. 694, 695.

IN the November issue of *The Defender*, is printed a speech by Rev. J. B. Carruthers, telling how Christianity should be "applied to civic interests." The writer states that at present Christianity is applied only indirectly to such interests, which falls far short of what the church desires. He believes that "the Christian can be a power, according to his ability in the political and social life of the community." In outlining his plan of church work for civic reform, this clergyman says:—

"The church at the present time is utterly ignored by the politician in making up his slate. Must it always be so? The saloon holds both of the leading political parties in its power. Either party, when in power, will protect the saloon against any prosecution that threatens to do it any serious injury.

"It is the duty of the church to teach the masses through good laws, enacted and sustained. A well-regulated community gives the average man a moral uplift. With our old methods of 'letting outside questions alone,' we have reached a condition of things where the New England Sunday is something of the past, and the saloon holds sway in the good old state of Maine. What shall we do? Draw up some strong resolution? We have done that in the past; we have drilled down to the very bed rock of the Sunday and the saloon question. The resolutions, the holes, are all right; what we need now is to charge them with a generous amount of moral, civic dynamite. Let Christians go into the caucus and help to make or break the slate.

"What is the church doing to mould the civic sentiment of the community? Shall the church be 'like a weather cock, that changes with every wind, or like the mountains that change the course of the winds?' We need some intelligent, united action before the church can make itself felt against the great evils of the day. The Congregational Church, the church of our fathers, is well equipped to lead in this work.

"It certainly is the duty of the church to look after the moral interests of a community, and to aid in removing the causes of immorality and crime, and, as this can be done in no way so well as by the church acting in its civic capacities, we need in New England a non-political organization, so organized, manned, and financially

sustained that it can demand that our laws be enforced. The masses are coming to believe, and are encouraged in their belief by corrupt lawyers and corrupt politicians, that the laws are not made to be kept. When the Christian citizens are organized in a civic organization, they will be able to impress the masses, the politician, and the officials with the fact that good laws are made to be respected, and, by so doing, politics will be purified, and we will be able to rid our communities of many evils that now menace their peace and prosperity, and hinder the advance of the kingdom of God."

This is a plain proposition to turn the church into a political organization. Under the present order of things he says, the church cannot "make itself felt against the great evils of the day." What is the remedy? "Let Christians go into the caucus and help to make or break the slate."

Christians are ambassadors for God. As such they proclaim to all men the gospel of salvation through faith in Christ. They do this in fulfillment of the instructions of Him who said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." But now, in this year A. D. 1898, it has been found by one of these ambassadors—by a certain class of them, rather—that this method of work will not do. God's ambassadors must copy the methods of the politicians. They should have been copying the methods of these worldly men from the first. Evidently the Lord must have made a mistake in his instructions upon this point!

"It is the duty of the church to look after the moral interests of a community," and in no way can this be done "so well as by the church acting in its civic capacities," demanding "that our laws be enforced." The church should do this in order that politics may be purified and serious obstacles be removed which hinder "the advance of the kingdom of God."

What Christians, who are such in deed as well as name, do for the community in which they reside, is plainly stated in the Scripture declaration that they "are the salt of the earth." By them the whole earth is preserved from destruction. But how are they the salt of the earth?—as politicians? as voters? as caucus manipulators? Did Christ himself figure in any of these things, or the Christians of his time? And have Christian methods of work changed between that time and the present? To assert it would be to say that God himself has changed.

"Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set upon a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick." This states the position and work of the Christian Church. She is the light of the world, and therefore must be above the world. Lighthouse lamps are not fixed on a level with the earth. And when the church descends from her divinely-appointed station, above the world, down to the arena of politics, she puts herself on a level with the world, and her light is no longer seen by souls adrift upon the sea of time and in danger of shipwreck.

695

When professed ministers of the gospel turn from the gospel and advocate political work as the only effective way of accomplishing the reforms needed in society, they deny the power of godliness, and proclaim that we have reached an age of apostasy in the professedly Christian Church.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 44 , p. 708.

A LITTLE internal expansion would be far better for the United States than much annexation of outside territory.

THE nation which gives itself up to the pursuit of glory, is very apt to become dazzled by its brightness and make a fatal misstep.

A CENTURY ago our forefathers fought Great Britain because of antagonism to the principle of "taxation without representation." Now the nation is about to impose this same thing upon the territory it has conquered from Spain.

YOU may think there is no danger of a revival of intolerance in this "free country." But the very fact that you and so many other people think this way, constitutes one of the chief causes for fearing that such a calamity may be realized.

THERE can be no such thing as liberalizing a bad law. A thing that is bad ought to be cast out; a bad principle ought to be repudiated altogether. To dress a bad principle in the garb of liberality is only to disguise its evil; and evil in disguise is worse than evil in all its ugliness. Let the bad principle be replaced by a good one. This will apply directly to the matter of Sunday legislation. A "bad" Sunday law is really less dangerous than the so-called good ones.

THE best government is not that which does most to "help" an individual in his own affairs, but which leaves him most at liberty to help himself and develop the traits of true manhood.

November 24, 1898

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 46 , p. 725.

THE man-made Sabbath is upheld from beneath; the Lord's Sabbath is sustained from above.

IT is no more sinful to openly work on the Sabbath than to obey the law in the letter, while hating the spirit of it. No Sabbath keeping is truly such which is not prompted by love to its Author.

CHURCH history is largely a warning to the church against going into politics.

THEOLOGICAL dogmas are not made any more truthful, stable, or valuable by being embodied in the law of the land.

IT is the business of Christians in this world to let their light shine by their good works, not to try to compel people to shine whose works are evil.

"IN union there is strength," does not apply to a union of church and state. An unhappy marriage is a source of great weakness to both parties.

ALL immorality is sin; and the remedy for sin is not law, but the gospel.

PEOPLE who attend properly to their own morals will have all they can do without trying to supervise the morals of their neighbors.

SINNERS cannot be driven out of the pathway of sin. They must be led.

RELIGIOUS error is always frantically calling for a law to support it, since it has no strength in itself.

WHEN the church goes into politics, it is only politics, it is only to be expected that politicians will go into the church.

THE sanctity of any Christian institution cannot be lost because people disregard it, or preserved by arresting and punishing people who refuse to observe it.

THE political compass is altogether too changeable to be a safe instrument by which to steer the ship of Zion.

[Inset.] THE CHURCH IN POLITICS—AMS IT MUST RESULT TO THE CHURCH. THE church is seemingly bent upon entering into politics, thinking that thus she can most surely and quickly attain to the long-sought goal of her desires, where righteousness will be established in the earth, and those conditions of peace and prosperity prevail which in fancy she has associated with the setting up of the

kingdom of God. But it is the old deception by which the church of former times was lured upon the rocks of worldliness and utterly wrecked; and only the same result can follow now. Union with the civil power means disunion from the spiritual power of her Lord, and the consequent paralysis of her spiritual strength. Once caught in the currents of worldliness which flow so strongly toward the goal of political ambition, she will find herself powerless to stem the tide, and spiritual shipwreck will be the inevitable result.

"Predictions vs. History" *American Sentinel* 13, 46 , p. 726.

TERRIBLE things will happen, say the advocates of "Christian citizenship," if Christians keep aloof from politics. To this the answer is that terrible things *have* happened—the worst that ever darkened human history—because "Christians" went into politics.

For it was a religio-political union between Christianity (as represented by the church of Constantine's day) and the state, in the person of the emperor, that set in motion the hideous machinery of religious persecution,—that ushered in the long and terrible period of massacre and torture worse than death, done in the name of religion; that spread a pall of blackness over all that was bright in human life, turned loose the worst passions of human depravity, and deluged the earth with human blood, regardless of age and sex. All this actually took place upon the earth, and continued for centuries, because "Christians" *did not* keep aloof from politics; because, in other words, they entered into the business of conducting the affairs of the state.

Constantine and the church both felt themselves in need of power. So Constantine gave his power as emperor to the church, in return for the power exercised by the church upon men through religion. A partnership was formed for the control of the affairs both of church and state,—a partnership in which ere long the church became the directing and controlling head. This was the church in politics; but the church could never have gone into politics if its members, as individuals, had refused to do so.

And all this was done by the church—by "Christians"—from a very pious motive. It was done in order that society might be reformed and elevated,—and more than this. It was done to usher in the kingdom of God. It was believed that this was accomplished, or speedily to be so, after Constantine had professed conversion to Christianity. When his mother sent him from Jerusalem some "nails of the true cross," to be

used as bridle bits for his war horse, it was counted a fulfillment of Zachariah's prophecy that "what is upon the bridles of the horses shall be holiness unto the Lord." And his act of appointing his sons and nephews to be sharers in the authority of the government, was associated with the fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 7:16, "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom."

The church in her political measures has never lost sight of this vision of the setting up of the kingdom of God. From that day down to the present her efforts to shape the affairs and wield the authority of the civil government, have been with a view of advancing the fulfillment of the prophecies relating to this event. And this same idea and purpose crop out in much that is said to-day upon the necessity of active political work by members of the Christian church. The motive of such activity to-day is not a new one, but is in fact identical with that which inspired the "Christian" church in all the ages of her union with the state.

With this very good and very pious motive, Christians—in the early days of the church—went into politics, and history has recorded the terrible result. Then let the church—let Christians—keep out of politics. Then whatever disasters *may* come, if they will do this, there can be no possibility of a repetition of the worst calamity that ever brought ruin on church and state.

"What Will the Protestants Do?" *American Sentinel* 13, 46 , pp. 726, 727.

LAMST week we gave the first half of the remarkable letter of the Washington correspondent of the *Baltimore Daily American*, as printed in that paper, October 15, 1898, declaring and justifying the fact that as the result of "numerous conferences with Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland" on the subject, "It is the determination of President McKinley that the Catholic churches [in Cuba] shall be kept open, and that public worship shall be amply provided for," and "To this end sufficient money will be advanced by this Government to support the Catholic Church."

It was *stated* by this correspondent that "this will only be regarded as a temporary loan and when law and order are fully reestablished on the distracted island, the Catholic Church will be expected to maintain itself like every other church."

Do you notice the trickery in this sentence last quoted?—It is said that this Government money "will be only a temporary loan." Now the natural complement of that expression would be that "when law and order are fully re-established on the distracted island, the Catholic Church will be expected to *pay back this money*. But instead of that we find only the elusive statement that while this money "will be only a temporary loan" "till law and order can be re-established," yet "when law and order are fully re-established" instead of *paying back* this "temporary loan" it is only that "the Catholic Church will be expected to *maintain itself* like every other church."

Then whereabouts does the "temporary loan" come

727

in? When the money is never to be paid back, how can there be about it any of the character of a loan either temporary or otherwise? The truth is of course that it is not, and is not expected to be, a temporary loan at all; but an eternal gift.

The correspondent next makes an open bid for all the other denominations in Cuba to sanction this unlawful course of the Catholic Church and President McKinley, by themselves doing the same thing. He says:—

"Such free Protestant churches as exist in Cuba are supported either by contributions of their congregations or by the mission funds of their respective denominations. At the same time, if a demand were made on this Government that the same favors be extended to Protestant churches and clergymen in Cuba that it is intended to extend towards the Catholics, that is to say, undertake *the entire responsibility for their support*, it is assumed that this Government could not consistently refuse to do so."

This is an attempt to play again upon the Protestant churches, the identical trick that was played upon them by the Catholic Church, in connection with the Indian schools, in the first year of Mr. Cleveland's presidency, by which fourteen "Protestant" churches and the United States Government were entrapped; and from which the Government has not yet been able to free itself.

It is true that if this demand were made by the Protestants the "Government could not consistently refuse," since the Government is doing all this for the Catholic Church. And more than this, the Government cannot consistently do this for the Catholic Church *without doing the same for all the Protestant* churches. The Catholic managers of this scheme know this full well, and therefore this shrewd suggestion is made to the Protestants, that they may again

be entrapped and so hide the inconsistency of governmental support of the Catholic Church. Will the Protestants of the land repudiate this designing suggestion, expose this evil scheme, and demand that the United States Government shall maintain the only *lawful* as well as the only *consistent* attitude—that of absolutely refusing to furnish a single cent or cent's worth of support to the Catholic Church, or any other church; or to the "priests and high church dignitaries" of the Catholic Church, or the ministers of any other church, in Cuba or anywhere else? If the Protestants of the land will *not* do this, *why will they not?*

That correspondent suggests that the Protestant churches and clergymen in Cuba "demand" that the United States Government extend to them "the same favors that it is intended to extend toward the Catholics." This is also intensely suggestive that the Catholics got these favors upon "demand." The rest of this remarkable letter shows the basis of this demand of the Catholics. We have no space for it this week, and must therefore postpone the analysis of that till next week. However, from a careful study of it, we are prepared to say that for cool, essential deviltry it must bear the palm.

Meantime let all bear in mind that so far this Washington correspondent makes plain, that "It is the determination of President McKinley that the Catholic churches [in Cuba] shall be kept open, and that public worship shall be amply provided for;" that "To this end sufficient money will be advanced by this Government to support the Catholic Church;" and that this means that the Government "undertakes the entire responsibility" for its support.

A. T. J.

"Religion vs. Rights" *American Sentinel* 13, 46 , pp. 728, 729.

THE view which some good people take of their moral responsibilities in connection with the affairs of their neighbors, is well illustrated by the following which appears in the correspondence column of the *Defender*. This journal is the organ of Sunday enforcement in New England, and has been sending out through that section extracts from the Sunday laws of the New England states; and in reply once recipient writes:—

"I received your extracts from the Sunday law. We have a grocer and provision dealer, who persists in keeping open his store on the Sabbath. The day passes very rarely when he does not have from three to six customers, and often more. Some of the children from

ten to fifteen years old, I have seen repeatedly come from the store with groceries or meat. Sometimes on returning from prayer-meeting I have counted four or five young boys purchasing candy and cigars.

"I have placed a copy of the Sunday laws where he could not fail to see it; but the Sabbath following, the store was opened as before.

"I have no ill-feeling against the man. He is my neighbor, I would not injure him. But I do not think it is right or consistent for me as a Christian to allow him to injure the mind of his own children and mine."

The last sentence contains the kernel of the argument. The writer, being a Christian, feels that it would be wrong for him to allow the minds of the children and the morals of the community to be injured by non-Christian practices. Whether keeping open store on Sunday is an injury to any person or not, is purely a religious question; and he views it in the affirmative not because he is a man asserting the rights of created beings as such, but because he is a professor of religion. Because he has chosen to profess religion, other people are to be restricted in their actions by the law of the land. This is what his view, simply analyzed, amounts to.

But human liberties rest on no such narrow basis; they cannot thus be subjected to the human will. They rest upon the broad ground of the common inalienable

729

rights shared by all mankind alike, irrespective of religious belief or variations of personal condition. And this is the only proper ground of civil legislation. Based upon narrower ground, as the believers in Sunday sacredness would have it, legislation can only invade the rights which it ought to protect. The field of religious belief is properly the field of moral suasion, and of that only.

"Wrong Ideas of Intolerance" *American Sentinel* 13, 46 , pp. 733, 734.

THE *Altoona Mirror* (Pa.) reports that several men have been discharged by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company for refusing to work on Sunday, the work being such as the men deemed unnecessary on that day. The *Mirror* says that if the report is true, "the company is taking a step dangerous to one of the cardinal principles of the American Constitution—freedom to follow the dictates of conscience; and some method of halting such interference with the

right of the individual to do what he believes is right, should be sought at once."

This expresses a common idea of religious intolerance, which people who are themselves religiously intolerant are more apt to hold than any others. The idea is, in short, that a business firm or corporation is intolerant if it does not make it easy for its employÈes to practice the principles of their religion. If it does anything to make the pathway of obedience to conscience less smooth than could be desired, it is said to be inter-

734

fering with freedom of conscience, and opposing a fundamental principle of the Constitution.

At the same time it would be said by these people that a law which would compel observers of the seventh day to make a Sabbath day of Sunday, was not in any way intolerant, or opposed to the principles of free government.

A Sunday law lays the hand of force upon individuals of whatever occupation, and there is no escaping from it except by moving out of the country. There is nothing optional, or in the nature of a contract, about the operation of the law of the land. But work for a business corporation is an optional matter entirely. No person is compelled to work for a firm that will not accommodate its business regulations to the requirements of his religion. There is no involuntary servitude in this country outside of its penal institutions. Such a thing is expressly forbidden by the Constitution.

There is all the difference in the world between turning the power of the government against an individual to compel him to a certain line of conduct, and the enforcing of a business regulation which causes inconvenience to an individual on account of his religion, by a corporation which has no authority over him whatever outside of his relation to it as an employÈ. He may of course be thrown out of a job; but that is no interference with his rights as a individual of society. No individual has an inalienable right to a job.

People who turn from the observance of the first day of the week to the seventh day, are almost always, if employÈes, thrown out of work in their former positions; but they never think of complaining that their rights have been infringed thereby.

The Constitution does not undertake to say how corporations or any parties shall run their business; if it did it would be the laughing-stock of the nations, instead of commanding their respect. It deals

only with the business of government; and its principles are violated by governmental interference with conscience and by nothing less.

December 1, 1898

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , p. 741.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , p. 741.

SIN never suffers much from the rebukes of sinners.

IMPERIALISM for the peoples of foreign lands to-day means imperialism at home to-morrow.

THE Government cannot support both the Catholic Church in Cuba and the principles of republican government in the United States at the same time.

GOD would rather an individual should do wrong, than be forced to do right.

THE size of an act makes no difference in the size of the principle which it involves.

THE principles of despotism are wont to masquerade the garb of philanthropy or of piety.

[Inset.] THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CUBA, TO MAINTAIN WHICH THE U. S. GOVERNMENT MAKES A "TEMPORARY" LOAN. THE United States Government proposes to see that the Catholic churches in Cuba are kept open as they have been under the rule of Spain, and to this end will appropriate whatever funds may be necessary for the maintenance of priests and other essentials of Roman Catholic worship. This will be a "temporary loan" for such a time as may be necessary before the church in Cuba shall be able to support herself,—so say the Catholic prelates which the Government has consulted in the matter. It is a support which may be kept up indefinitely, without any compensation in return, besides being in flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of free government. What do the American people think, and what will they do, about it? See articles on next page.

"The Government Supporting the Church in Cuba" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , p. 742.

IT is proposed by the United States Government—after due consultation with several distinguished Catholic prelates—to make a

"temporary loan" of the people's money for the maintenance of the Catholic Church in Cuba. It would be too bad for this church to be obliged to suspend operations in the island, or to be seriously crippled in her work, even temporarily, for lack of funds. So, as this Government has undertaken to supervise affairs in Cuba, and there is no appearance of funds forthcoming from any other source, they will be supplied from the United States treasury. Such is evidently the conception upon which this remarkable proposal rests.

This proceeding is of course a gross violation of the truth reposed in the officials responsible therefore, as the representatives and servants of the people, sworn to uphold the Constitutions and the fundamental principles of republican government. But aside from this, the query naturally arises, What is the Catholic Church in Cuba, that it should be essential to maintain her even at the sacrifice of American principles? What great benefits for the Cuban people depend upon the continuance of her rule? What dire calamities would follow from the lessening, even temporarily, of her efficiency?

Happily the moment is opportune for finding a satisfactory answer. The evidences in the case are plain to every Protestant mind, but we do not need to apply to any Protestant source of information. A notable and trustworthy Catholic authority has spoken on the point,—even no less a person than the Spanish general, Weyler. Elsewhere in this issue we print some references to a letter written by General Weyler to the Queen Regent of Spain on the subject of what the Catholic Church has done for Spain. In this letter he states that she has done nothing at all, but on the contrary has stood in the way of all reform and progress, and has been the robber of both the government and the people. The letter is, in short, "the most frightful arraignment ever made of a religious denomination." And coming from General Weyler, it must be accepted as a reliable statement on the subject of which it speaks. That leading citizen of Spain has had abundant opportunity to know whereof he speaks, both with reference to the Spanish government and country, and the Roman Catholic Church.

This is a statement of what the Catholic Church has done for Spain. And what is true of Spain in this respect, is true of Cuba to an equal and even greater degree. For in Cuba the Catholic Church has had full sway, without serious opposition from any source, for centuries.

And now, when General Weyler, himself an eminent Spaniard and a Catholic, denounces the Catholic Church in almost unmeasured terms as the robber of the people and an incubus upon the country,—behold! professed Protestants who stand at the head of this American Government propose to give money from the public treasury to the Catholic Church in Cuba, in violation of fundamental American law, because it is so essential that this church in Cuba shall continue on in her career unchecked!

To a true Protestant, it should be evident that the very reason why Spanish dominion in the island has been broken, is that, the bars of intolerance being let down, the people, so long robbed in purse and bound in superstition and ignorance, may have a favorable opportunity to free themselves from the yoke of a religious despotism.

And what business has the Government to make a "temporary loan" of the people's money to any church, or for any purpose not authorized by the Constitution? That is setting a very bad example, to say the least. The principle of that proceeding has been sufficiently tested in numerous cases of "temporary loans" made to themselves by trusted employees of banks and other institutions. It is a principle which the courts and all experience have pronounced to be bad in the extreme.

"What Will the People Say?" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , pp. 742-744.

THE remaining portion of that remarkable letter of the Washington correspondent of the *Baltimore Daily American*—October 15, 1898, is as follows:—

"The administration fully realizes the objections that will arise in this country, from certain sources, against even a temporary sustenance of the Catholic Church in Cuba. But it has been given ample assurance by the Catholic authorities that the church shall be placed on a self-supporting basis as soon as it is possible to establish the new order that has been brought about by the Spanish evacuation.

"Archbishop Chappelle will be entrusted with liberal powers to institute such of the reforms as demand immediate introduction. It is likely that the responsibility of supporting the church in Cuba will eventually be assumed by the Catholics in this country.

"In determining to support the Catholic priests in Cuba until their church can take care of them, President

McKinley has acted wisely from other points of view than mere humanity. The Cuban priests, as in all countries whose population is densely ignorant, exercise complete control over their parishioners. Apart from the cruelty of withdrawing all aid from these priests, it is easy to believe that the new American government in Cuba would have at its very inception built up a dangerous set of enemies if the priesthood of Cuba were given reason to regret the present of the American flag on the island. The Spanish government at Madrid could easily give the American government some dearly-bought information as to the malign influence that is in the power of a hostile clergy to exercise. Ever since the first Carlist uprising in 1833, every movement directed against the government of Spain has found its principal support in the clergy of Spain, who almost to a man are Carlists."

Is it true that objection will arise only "from certain sources" against governmental "sustenance of the Catholic Church" and "the vast number of priests and high church dignitaries" in Cuba? Is it true that the *whole people* of the United States have so far forgotten the fundamental principles of the nation, or else have so far fallen under the influence of the Catholic Church, that against the Government undertaking "the entire responsibility" for the support of the Catholic Church in Cuba, objection will arise only "from certain sources"? Why will not objection arise from the whole people everywhere?

All money given by the United States Government for keeping open the Catholic churches, and providing for public worship in those churches in Cuba; all money paid by the United States Government to "the vast number of Catholic priests and high church dignitaries" in Cuba; must be obtained by taxation, must be raised in revenue, laid upon all the people. Of the money now being paid by all the people for revenue—stamps on drafts, deeds, mortgages, and what not, a portion must go to the "support of the Catholic Church," and "the vast number of priests and high church dignitaries" in Cuba. For is it not published by this Washington correspondent that "it is the determination of President McKinley," coached by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, that "sufficient money shall be advanced by this Government to support the Catholic Church" in Cuba? Will all the people of the United States allow this thing to be carried on at their expense without protest? Our fathers who made this nation, said that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical." They therefore abolished the practice and repudiated the

principle. Will the people *now* sanction the revival of the practice and the reestablishment of the principle?

The second time in this letter we are told that assurance is given "by the Catholic authorities that the church shall be placed on a self-supporting basis as soon as it is possible to establish the new order." And again we inquire, What confidence can be placed in any such assurance in presence of the fact that this governmental support is of the same identical priests and high church dignitaries, and the same identical system, that, though having had "complete control over their parishioners" for four hundred years, yet, have never taught them to support their church and clergy, but have kept them "densely ignorant" as this correspondent declares them to be to-day? When this is the record for four hundred years of governmental support, what is the value of "ample assurance by the Catholic authorities that the church shall be placed on a self-supporting basis" *while governmental support is continued*? In view of such a record, no assurance, by the Catholic authorities nor by anybody else, can be ample, that the church shall be placed on a self-supporting basis, while governmental support is continued.

Another, and the final consideration, which shows that no such thing as the self-support of the Catholic Church in Cuba can ever be expected, is, that while it is *promised* by the Catholic authorities that "when law and order are fully re-established on the distracted island the Catholic Church will be expected to support itself," yet, at the same time, there is presented the abominable *fact*, which amounts in effect to a threat, that "the Cuban priests exercise complete control over their parishioners," who are "densely ignorant," and would prove "a dangerous set of enemies if the priesthood of Cuba were given reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island"!!

That is to say: The government of Spain has always supported the Catholic clergy and the Catholic churches in Cuba. And *now*, the United States having supplanted the government of Spain in Cuba, if *this* Government does not "Undertake the entire responsibility for their support" "the priesthood of Cuba" will be "given reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island." *Then*, having *such* "reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island;" and having "complete control" of their "densely ignorant" parishioners, "the new American Government in Cuba would have at its very inception built up a dangerous set of enemies." Therefore, to placate this "dangerous set of enemies" the Government of the

United States must "undertake the entire responsibility for their support." And accordingly "President McKinley has acted wisely" in determining that "sufficient money" shall "be advanced by this Government to support the Catholic Church!" And if anybody does not believe that it *is* wise thus to placate these "dangerous enemies" then "the Spanish government at Madrid could easily give" him pointers in "some dearly-bought information as the malign influence that is in the power of a hostile clergy to exercise"!!!

Then with "the vast number of priests and high church dignitaries" composing a clergy of such a "dangerous" and "malign" disposition as that, having "complete control" of their "densely ignorant" parishioners, and, upon such considerations as this, demanding gov-

744

ernmental support *until* "law and order are *fully* re-established," what prospect can there be that governmental support would ever cease? because what prospect can there be that law and order would ever be *fully* re-established while the cessation of the governmental support of such a priesthood must be the sure consequence of the full re-establishment of law and order, and the prevention of the full re-establishment of law and order rests completely with the "dangerous" and "malign" priesthood who receive the governmental support which is to continue only until law and order are fully re-established?

Again we must remark that this argument in behalf of governmental support of the Catholic priesthood of Cuba, based upon the "dangerous" and "malign" disposition of that same priesthood, is, for cool and essential iniquity, surely entitled to the palm.

But are the people of the United States ready for all this? Will they all bear it all without protest?

A. T. J.

"Imperialism Against the Declaration of Independence" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , pp. 744, 745.

NOW THAT the United States Government has started in on a policy of imperialism, the upholders of this policy are conscious of the necessity of justifying it in the face of the fundamental principles of republican government to which such a policy is squarely opposed. And this, accordingly, they are attempting by various means to do. And naturally, the arguments which they put forward for the purpose are both novel and startling. Here, for example, is one by the Hon.

Hosea Knowlton, Attorney-General of Massachusetts, which is quoted approvingly by the *New York Sun*. The *Sun* boldly declares that there is no natural right of suffrage; that the idea that government without the consent of the governed is un-American, is wholly erroneous; and then quotes this statement by the Hon. Mr. Knowlton of Massachusetts as very "neatly" showing this fact:—

"The Declaration of Independence has nothing to do with political rights. It has always been true that a majority of our people have not had anything to say about the Government. The people of the territories have no right to vote. Until recently no colored man was allowed to vote in the South. You may say this last fact was settled by the war, but that was not what the war settled.

"The war decided that the negro should be free, and nothing more. No descendant of the Chinese nation can vote. No Indian can vote. And the largest and best-behaved portion of our population has never had the right to suffrage in any considerable part of the country.

"In other words, the great principle on which this Government was founded did not concede the natural right of suffrage. The Declaration of Independence declares for 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' which, being freely translated, means the right to acquire property.

"When any one, therefore, says that there is danger that the whole body of the inhabitants of Hawaii will be precipitated upon us as voters, or that the Malays of Luzon will soon be running Congress, he does not know what he is talking about. Forty-five States manage the Government of this country, and no one else can exercise the right of suffrage until they give him permission."

We confess that we never knew before that our patriotic forefathers of Washington's time wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence and fought through the Revolutionary war to vindicate their "right

to acquire property"! No American history that we have yet seen intimates that they were not at the time freely acquiring property in proportion to their business ability to do so, or that Great Britain ever attempted to interfere with them in this pursuit. What history does affirm in this matter is that Great Britain proposed to tax the American colonies without allowing them political representation in parliament; which meant that she proposed to govern her American colonies without their consent. The colonies stood for the principle of government by the consent of the governed; and to affirm this principle before the world they put forth the Declaration of

Independence, declaring in it, as self-evident truths, that all men are created equal, endowed by creation with certain inalienable rights, and that to preserve these rights is the only legitimate purpose of civil government. To say that all this, and the long struggle which followed, were for the purpose of vindicating their "right to acquire property," is not only to set aside plain historical facts, but to cast contempt upon the Declaration of Independence and its signers, and to rob that document of all the meaning which has made it glorious in American history, and marvelous in the estimation of the world.

If the Declaration of Independence does not affirm the consent of the governed to be a primary requisite of just government, it does not affirm anything, and might as well be cast as a hypocritical play upon words.

This bulwark of American rights and liberties is now boldly attacked by the champions of imperialism for the sake of new possessions abroad; and in doing this, they of necessity sweep away the safeguards of liberty and justice at home.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 47 , p. 756.

THE world's need of Christianity was never more strikingly demonstrated in every place than it is to-day, at the close of the nineteenth century. Civilization and the triumphs of science have not sufficed to bring prosperity and happiness to the people; they have not solved the problems which confront and perplex statesmen in every civilized land. Christianity alone can solve those problems to the satisfaction of all parties. Christianity breaks down every barrier between a man and his fellowmen; its working is unhindered by differences of race, color, or social or financial conditions. It teaches every person self-government and self-support, eliminates covetousness and substitutes in its place brotherly love, and puts the desire to serve in the place of the natural disposition to rule. When men will exemplify these principles in their lives, every problem of good government will be effectually solved.

THE only disarmament which will ever bring universal peace to the world is the disarming of the mind that is filled with the carnal elements of hatred, envy, and strife. And this must be an individual work, performed through the agency of divine grace.

THE worst people in the world—the farthest removed from God in character—are those in whom selfishness is most fully developed, whether in rags or silks.

A PERSON who does not care about his neighbor's rights, is in a fair way to be defrauded of his own.

December 8, 1898

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 48 , p. 757.

HE who dies to self, lives for all mankind.

IT has always been the tendency of nations to outgrow the principles of liberty and equality with which they started out,—to become intoxicated with the sense of great power and wealth, and to imagine they are still progressing when in reality they are going rapidly to decay.

EXPANSION may be due to a healthy growth, or it may be only a bloating which indicates that the system is diseased.

THAT which threatens the welfare of the individual, threatens equally the prosperity of the nation.

THE devil is not much disturbed by the spectacle [*sic.*] of sinners "rebuking sin" at the ballot box.

DESPOTISM means that one individual shall rule others; free government means that each individual shall rule himself.

RIGHT principles are stronger than armies and navies, and the latter cannot support a nation when the former are abandoned.

NATIONAL duty is not best perceived through the smoke and haze of the battle field, nor the voice of wisdom most clearly heard amidst the exultant shouts of victory.

THE politician is concerned for the success of his party; the true statesman desires only the prosperity of the nation.

THERE can be no more un-American form of government than that which would abolish the distinction between sin and crime.

[Inset.] IS THIS TYPE OF STATESMAN HENCEFORTH TO SHAPE THE DESTINY OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC? UNDER the guidance of the men who now stand at the nation's head, the policy of government by the consent of the governed, which the nation has followed since its birth, has been exchanged for the policy of imperialism, which means government of people not by themselves but by others and against their will. The inhabitants of Hawaii are now

ruled under the military authority of the United States, although they are not now, nor were ever, at war with this nation; and the inhabitants of the Philippines are to be brought under the same rule. But the Declaration of Independence expressly asserts that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and the national Constitution was made the embodiment of this principle of government. Hence they are squarely opposed to the imperial policy upon which the nation is now launched, and are by that policy relegated, virtually if not literally, to the political junk-shop. And this means a complete revolution, and the downfall of free government in the Western world.

"Free Government a Divine Institution" *American Sentinel* 13, 48 , p. 758.

FREE government is a divine institution. It did not originate among men, but is the very government of heaven itself. It came down to earth as a gift from God.

The government of God has the appearance of a monarchy; yet it is not a monarchy, as monarchies are understood here. It is in reality "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Lincoln's famous definition describes no government more perfectly than the divine government, and only in the divine government is his definition fully realized.

The incontrovertible proof of this is seen in the fact that the kingdom of God will include no individual who is not able perfectly to govern himself. Every individual who fails in this respect will be shut out of that kingdom, and solely for that reason. This power of perfect self-government being then a necessary qualification for each individual under the government of God, it can only be that each individual is to exercise this power, and so perfectly to govern himself, in that kingdom.

So thoroughly unlike God is everything that is arbitrary and despotic,—so far is he from desiring to be an autocratic ruler over his creatures—that he will tolerate nothing of this character in his universe. He will shut out of it everything that is contrary to free thought, free speech, and free action.

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" on this earth, is little more than a theory; it has never been realized in the past, and is not to-day. The Republic of the United States is based

upon this theory of government; but in it the theory falls very far short of realization. The Republic is permeated with despotism in every part. The trouble is that so few of the people are able to govern themselves. No individual who cannot govern himself is fit to govern other people; and his participation in the government tends rather to infringe the rights and liberties of the people than to preserve them. Every slave of passion or ambition is a natural despot.

The purpose of the gospel in the earth is to restore, to all who will receive it, the power of self-government which was lost by the fall in Eden, and thus to prepare subjects for that real "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," which the Creator is ere long to set up.

"A Revolutionary Procedure" *American Sentinel* 13, 48 , pp. 758, 759.

REFERRING further to the scheme for the governmental support of the Catholic Church and the priests and high church dignitaries in Cuba, which is being fastened upon the Government of the United States by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland through President McKinley, it is worth while to consider the principles that are involved *according to the views of the men who made this nation.*

The contest which developed and established the governmental principle of total separation from religion, and from any recognition of it, as finally reflected in the Constitution of the United States, was focalized in "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," which was brought before the General Assembly of Virginia in 1777 or 1778.

That bill proposed for that State the identical thing that is now being worked upon the national Government—the support of the clergy from the public treasury.

The men who made this nation as it was made declared that that "bill exceeds the functions of civil authority;" that "the enforced support of the Christian religion dishonors Christianity;" and that "to compel a person to furnish contributions of money in the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

These views prevailed throughout the whole country, and the principle was embodied in the national Constitution and the supreme law, in the provisions refusing governmental recognition of religion. And now when President McKinley has "determined that the Catholic churches [in Cuba] shall be kept open and that public worship shall

be provided for; and that to this end sufficient money will be advanced by this Government to support the Catholic Church: it is perfectly plain that in this "determination" he is proceeding directly contrary to the fundamental and constitutional principle of the nation.

Again: Of that bill they said that "The same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only, of his property, for the support of one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever;" and that "Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance."

Now the difference between levying a direct tax for the support of religion, and the appropriation to the support of religion of *funds already raised by taxation*

759

is a difference only in form and not at all in principle; is merely a difference in method and not at all in fact. It is hardly possible that the President would determine to levy a direct tax for the support of the Catholic Church and clergy in Cuba: certainly he would say that such a thing would be unconstitutional. But whatever is forbidden to be done *directly* is equally forbidden to be done *indirectly*. And as certainly as the levying of a direct tax for such a purpose would be unconstitutional and subversive of fundamental national principle, so certainly the advancing for such a purpose, of money already raised by the Government, is equally unconstitutional and subversive of fundamental national principle.

If the President can advance for the support of the Catholic Church threepence only of the money of all the people and oblige the people to submit to it, he can with equal right and authority oblige the people to conform to the wishes of that church in all cases whatsoever. Thus this thing that has been "determined" "differs from the Inquisition only in degree. "The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance."

The Washington correspondent reported that this thing of the national Government supporting the Catholic Church in Cuba, is done in order that the Catholic clergy there may not be made "a dangerous set of enemies" by having "reason to regret the presence of the American flag on the island:" it is to avoid "the malign influence that is in the power of a hostile clergy to exercise." This is nothing else than the employing of religion as an engine of civil policy.

The man who made this nation, said of that "Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," that it implied "either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or *that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy.*" And upon this they declared that "the first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages and throughout the world; *the second [is] an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.*"

They declared that the "fruits" of this thing, upon a trial of "almost fifteen centuries" had been "more or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both superstition, bigotry and persecution." And that such has been precisely its fruits in the remaining one hundred and twenty years, unto this time, in Cuba is certain from the statement of this same Washington correspondent that though there is in Cuba a "vast number of priests and high church dignitaries" who "exercise complete control over their parishioners," yet the "population is densely ignorant," and "have never been taught to support their church and clergy by direct voluntary contributions;" and that this same clergy is of such a dangerous and malign disposition that unless the Government of the United States shall now continue the support that the Spanish government always gave, "it is easy to believe that the new American government in Cuba would have at its very inception built up a dangerous set of enemies" in this priesthood.

And to continue the old system of things which the makers of the nation repudiated, but which has been continued by Spain, is the very thing that this Washington correspondent says President McKinley has determined to do, as the consequence of "numerous conferences with Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland." In other words, the President has espoused, and is committing the national Government to the very principles *in toto*, which the makers of the nation distinctly and in fullest detail repudiated, and fixed their repudiation of those principles in the national Constitution and the supreme law as they intended and supposed *forever*.

This is a complete revolution: silent it is true, but none the less a revolution; and a revolution backward at that.

A. T. J.

"The Church and State System in Utah" *American Sentinel* 13, 48 , pp. 760, 761.

THE Mormon system has been from the first a system which united church and state; like the papacy, it has made the church supreme in both religious and civil affairs. And in this respect Mormonism remains to-day what it was in the days of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young.

Under the control of this system, the territory of Utah was received into the Union as a sovereign state. The nation refused to receive polygamy, and compelled this (as it thought) to be thrown out; but it took in a union of church and state. And now it is discovering that this church-and-state system was the real evil of Mormonism, and the real argument against receiving the territory controlled buy it into the Union. For it is now seen that the Mormon Church rules in Utah, and that under its rule the baneful branch of polygamy which was lopped off from the parent tree by the sword of the civil power, is budding into new life, and bids fair to develop again as of old. Upon this point the New York *Independent*, under the heading "Mormonism Again a Foe," speaks the following:—

"There has been a disposition among the Christian

762

people of the nation not to judge the Mormon people too harshly since they professed humility and promised that they would abandon polygamy out of respect for American opinion and would never again countenance the union of church and state. Reports from Utah that they were breaking these pledges and that it was never intended to keep them have been received from time to time, but all have felt that the proof must be of the strongest before the nation would be justified in believing it must bring pressure to bear to compel good faith. The time seems to have come, however, when forbearance is no longer a virtue and when the Mormon problem must be faced without compromise and the Mormon people taught that Americans will not tolerate plural marriage within their country.

"The Mormons themselves have given us the convincing proof by sending to Congress an ardent polygamist, one who is thoroughly identified with Mormon interests, and who was elected after fair warning had been given that his triumph would be considered a notice that polygamy was to be forced 'down the throats of Congress and the American people.' He says he has taken no wives since the anti-polygamy manifesto, but was justified in maintaining his relations with those to whom he had been united before; and that the law against such association adopted by the

Mormon legislature—like some Connecticut blue laws—is not enforced because there is no sentiment behind it. This contention, however, cannot be admitted, as the Mormon leaders and representatives pledged themselves again and again that the last vestige of the system had been wiped out before statehood was granted and that it should never rise again to plague the nation.

"What guaranty have we that the Mormons will obey one part of a statute more than another? If there is no public sentiment requiring the enforcement of a law against cohabitation with polygamous wives what sentiment will enforce one against the taking of more wives? When Mormon authorities and even the governor of Utah are engaged in flaunting the divinity of the 'celestial marriage' system, is it probable that they will long refrain from putting it into execution once more?

"It would be an affront to the American people and the Christian churches for Congress to allow Mr. Roberts to hold his seat in the House of Representatives in the face of his plain defiance of the national demands. It seems impossible that some means should not be found of unseating him without trouble under the former anti-polygamy laws, the amnesty proclamation of President Harrison and the enabling act of Utah, and this means should be taken without hesitation. The Mormon people should be shown that no polygamist will be seated in either house of Congress, as a warning that the nation is prepared to take stern measures against such a practice. Measure should be devised to punish those who do not heed the warning."

Mormonism is not "again" a foe; it has been such all the time; and the mistake of the American people was in not recognizing it as such, without polygamy the same as with it. For that mistake they may yet pay dearly. Mistakes made upon such a point are always costly.

The nation required the Mormon Church to discontinue polygamy and promise that it would never be revived. But the promise of a church that maintains a union with the state is not to be trusted. The American people apparently begin to realize that the promise of discarding polygamy is not to be kept, and it will be well if they discern the real reason why Mormonism has proved itself irreconcilable with American government.

December 15, 1898

"Some Pertinent Questions" *American Sentinel* 13, 49 , p. 774.

IN view of the expressed purpose of the United States Government, to support the Catholic Church in Cuba, by a

"temporary loan" from the public treasury, it is in order for American citizens to ask the following questions:—

1. Have the Cubans themselves expressed any desire for the support of the Catholic Church? or is this to be done only in deference to the wish of Catholic prelates in the United States?

2. What evidence is there that the Catholic Church in Cuba is not rich enough to support herself?

3. If the Catholic Church in Cuba cannot support herself, does not the burden of her maintenance properly fall upon the Catholic Church outside of Cuba?

4. If the Government ought to support the Catholic Church in Cuba, because she is poor, ought it not to support poor Catholic churches in the United States?

5. Why should the Government support only the Catholic Church in Cuba, and not the Methodist, the Baptist, Episcopal, and all other churches in the same land?

6. To what benefits can the Government point as certain to result from its support of the Catholic Church?

7. Since no government maintains any other than the established church, is not the Roman Catholic Church virtually made by this support the established church of the United States.

8. If "this is a Christian nation," is it not a Catholic Christian nation when it supports the Catholic Church and no other?

9. By what clause of the Constitution is the Government authorized to give or loan money to the Catholic Church?

10. Has the Government any right to tax the people for the maintenance of any church?

11. Is it still an approved principle of American government that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?

12. If the government can compel people to pay taxes for the support of the Catholic Church in Cuba, can it not by the same authority and right compel them to perform any other religious acts?

These are pertinent questions. They apply to a real situation which now confronts the American people. The germ of despotism which is being nourished in this proposition to support the Catholic Church, will surely grow to full development if the people allow it. To nip despotism in the bud is far easier and better than to cut it down after it has become a giant tree.

"The Necessity of 'Imperialism'" *American Sentinel* 13, 49 , pp. 774, 775.

OF the zeal for the spread of slavery, in his day, Abraham Lincoln said:—

"I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its just influence in the world; . . . and *especially* because it forces so many really good men among ourselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticising the Declaration of Independence."

This exactly describes the new American policy of imperialism. This also is causing many to "criticise the Declaration of Independence." Leading men and leading papers, of the country, who would naturally be thought ready to keep silent when the Declaration speaks, actually criticise it, and in fact repudiate it.

The statement that is now so glibly and suerciliously made that the people of the newly-acquired territory "are not fit for self government" and must therefore be held in subjection and governed by force "until they shall become qualified for self-government," plainly cannot stand a moment in the presence of the great principles of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain *unalienable rights*, among which are life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness," and "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." And simply because such views cannot stand in the presence of the Declaration, the Declaration is criticised and set aside.

But who is it that decides for the people of the new island possessions, that they "are not fit for self-government"?—Not themselves; for they have been fighting and struggling for years against that very claim put forth by Spain and others. Has the statement any more truth when put forth by Americans, contrary to their own Declaration and fundamental principles? What right have Americans, any more than Spaniards or Russians, to decide for other people that they are not fit for self-government? Wherein is America different from Russia or Spain when she decides for these people that they are not fit for self-government, and then counts them rebels, and fights them and oppresses them, when they do not accept the decision?

Plainly enough this whole thing, being in open disre-

gard of the Declaration of Independence, is an "open war with the fundamental principles of civil liberty," and positively "deprives republican example of its just influence in the world." And as that which did all this in Lincoln's day was hated by that great lover of liberty, why should not this which does the same things in our day be hated by every lover of liberty now?

In his day Lincoln said that the Declaration of Independence was "assailed and sneered at, and construed and hawked at, and torn, till if its framers could rise from their graves they could not at all recognize it." That thing is being done again. At that time it was done in the interests of the spread of slavery; *now* it is done, and has to be done, in the interests of imperialism. At that time Lincoln said, "If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out!" And when, at such a suggestion, his audience cried out, "No, no!" Lincoln answered, "Let us stick to it then; let us stand firmly by it then." And so it is time to say again.

For ten years it has been written that the United States would yet "repudiate every principle of a republican government." If we are not just now in the time when this thing is being done, how much further will things have to be carried in this direction before we shall be in the time of the doing of that thing?

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 13, 49 , p. 788.

THE Mormon Church is in politics again, or rather, never went out of politics, and the issue of polygamy is again to the front in Utah. If the Mormon Church had gone out of politics, the sovereign State of Utah would not now be under Mormon control; but the Mormon Church did not go out of politics. Having the example of the popular churches in the United States before her, and remembering the arguments made to the effect that Christians above all others ought to take an active part in politics, she felt that it was her duty to remain in politics; not however, that the church as such assumed any part in politics—not at all; but each member of the church as a professed believer in the Christian religion and therefore in duty bound to participate in conducting the affairs of state, made himself active in politics; and somehow, the politics of the State took on an essentially Mormon aspect!

If this appears to any one like the Mormon Church being in politics, let him remember that it is the duty of Christians, as such—a duty especially impressed upon Catholic Christians by the pope, and upon Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Baptist, and other Christians by clergymen of their respective denominations, to see that the state is modeled upon Christian principles; and it was with this plain duty before them that the Mormon Christians of Utah went to the polls to cast their votes. That persons were elected to office (the Mormons being largely in the majority) who believed in and practiced the doctrines of the Mormon religion, and even that a congressman should have been chosen whose existing household includes three wives, is only what was naturally to be expected. Will not a Catholic naturally vote for a Catholic, a Methodist for a Methodist, or other Christian voter for one of his own denomination, as being the candidate who will administer his office most nearly in harmony with the principles of the true religion? How then can it be expected that Mormon voters will do anything else?

The Mormon Church has the same right to go into politics that any other church has; and she is justified in doing so by the same logic.

But by the principle that Christians should keep out of politics, as being citizens keep out of politics, as being citizens of a government which is not of force but of love, the Mormon Church would be debarred from politics in Utah, and a Mormon State would not to-day be a thorn in the side of the American Federal Union. And every other church professing to be Christian would be debarred from politics in every other state; and the dark cloud of impending calamity in the form of church and state despotism, would not to-day be hanging over the American people.

That principle, and that alone, stands to-day between this nation and people, and the worst form of despotism that has ever cursed mankind.

¹ "Two Republics," p. 55.