



Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, MARCH 12, 1891.

NUMBER 11.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

REV. MORGAN DIX, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, says: "I have no confidence in the judgment or wisdom of those who tell us that the Church must . . . purify politics, elevate the laboring classes, increase incomes, obtain the enactment of laws regulating meat and drink, and for all I know, take up and settle the questions of the currency, the tariff, etc."

IN the minds of almost all religious persons, even in the most tolerant countries, the duty of toleration is admitted with tacit reserves. One person will bear with dissent in matters of Church government, but not of dogma; another can tolerate everybody, short of a Papist or a Unitarian; another, everybody who believes in revealed religion; a few extend their charity a little further, but stop at the belief in God and in the future state. Wherever the sentiment of the majority is still genuine and intense, it is found to have abated little of its claim to be obeyed.—*John Stuart Mill.*

THE *Northern Light*, the official organ of the Knights of Labor of Washington and northern Idaho, Western Central Labor Union of Seattle, and Trades Council of Tacoma, has the following on the Sunday-closing question:—

We are decidedly opposed to closing the World's Fair on Sundays. Sunday, above all other days, is the day when workmen could visit the various places of interest and devote sufficient time to profit by the advantages which such an institution affords to its visitors. The National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union would never have adopted such

resolutions had there been any one to show the injustice of it to the working people, who have to toil daily from early morning until late in the evening. The closing of the World's Fair on Sundays would virtually deprive them of deriving the least benefit from it, and we would rather see that Fair closed all the rest of the week, and open on Sunday, than to see it open every day excepting Sunday.

The laboring men are far from being a unit in favor of Sunday closing.

"What Does the Bible Teach about the Sabbath?"

LAST week, in the examination of this question propounded by Mr. Crafts, we found that, according to his own words, the Bible teaches that the Sabbath is religious; that its observance is to be wholly religious; and that the occupation of persons on that day is to be the worship of God, and "work for the souls of men." It is therefore the genuine expression of the wish of the American Sabbath Union, when the Sunday bills introduced in Congress propose to forbid all *secular* work on that day; that is, all work that does not pertain to the souls of men and to the world to come.

There are yet some other points to be noticed in this inquiry which has been raised by the American Sabbath Union, and also by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We propose, therefore, in this article, to notice what further Mr. Crafts, and Mr. Mott, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union find the Bible teaches about the Sabbath. In the writings of these persons the effort is not so much to find out what indeed the Bible says about the Sabbath, as it is to find out how to get the Bible to sustain Sunday as the Sabbath. Consequently, among the very first of the statements by Mr. Crafts, under this question, is the following which he puts in italics:—

Observe that there is nothing in the record of the original Sabbath to identify it with our Saturday.

He knows that this statement is not true; and the other parts of the same article show that he knows it. For instance, in arguing against the Seventh-day Advent-

ists for holding to the fourth commandment as it reads, he says:—

We only are consistent who accept both groups of like evidence, and believe that the seventh day was observed before the Hebrew nation, and that the Lord's day inherited its birthright at the resurrection.

Now the day which has always been observed by the Hebrew nation is "our Saturday." And the seventh day, which was observed before the Hebrew nation, was the identical day which was observed by the Hebrew nation. Also the seventh day which was observed before the Hebrew nation, was the original Sabbath. Therefore, as the seventh day, which was observed before the Hebrew nation, was the original Sabbath; as that day is the identical one which was observed by the Hebrew nation; and as the day which has always been observed by the Hebrew nation is identical with our Saturday, it is demonstrated by Mr. Crafts's own words that the original Sabbath is identical with our Saturday. This also demonstrates that he knows that that statement which he put in italics is not true.

Nor is this the only evidence which he gives to that effect in the article under consideration. He constantly contrasts the seventh day with the first day of the week, and yet professes to deny that the term seventh day means the seventh day of the week; but in this again his argument contradicts itself, for he adopts as his own the argument of another, in which it is said that,

The Creator observes the week in the development of his cosmos, and crowns the seventh day with his personal benediction. We in fact know the week only as it is marked by a religious day.

It is alone the action of the Creator in working six days and resting the seventh, that makes that division of time which is known as the week. The first series of seven days that ever passed upon the earth was by the Creator made the first week, and the last day of that series—the one upon which the Creator rested which he blessed and which he sanctified—that is the day which he made the Sabbath. Con-

sequently, that was the seventh day of the week. There was no other period or division of time in existence of which it could be the seventh day. The week was the only portion of time there had yet been. The record is that "God did rest the seventh day," and that seventh day could not possibly have been any other than the seventh day of the week. This is precisely what is argued in the foregoing extract. As we know the week only as it is marked by a religious day, as the Creator observed the week in the development of his cosmos, and then crowned the seventh day with his personal benediction, it is thereby proved, beyond a question, that the seventh day which the Creator thus crowned by his benediction, was the seventh day of the week. Consequently, again it appears that Mr. Crafts's *argument* disproves the *theory* which he propounds.

Again, he says that, It can never be proved that the Saturday of our almanacs was the day originally appointed. Now he constantly asserts that the *Sunday* of our almanacs is the day of the resurrection of Christ. And that was the first day of the week. Now as the resurrection day, the first day of the week, is the *Sunday* of our almanacs, it never can be denied that the day before the resurrection day was the Saturday of our almanacs. The Scripture record is that "when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." Mark 16:1, 2. By this, therefore, it is plain enough that the Sabbath is the day before the first day of the week. And as the first day of the week is the Sunday of our almanacs, it is plain enough that the Sabbath being only the day before, is the Saturday of our almanacs.

Again, the Scripture speaking of the day and the fact of the crucifixion: says, "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulcher. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." Luke 23:54-56; 24:1-3.

The day upon which these folks rested was the Sabbath according to the commandment. It was the day before the first day of the week. The day before the first day of the week, is the seventh day of the week. That being the Sabbath of

the commandment, it is thereby demonstrated that the Sabbath according to the commandment, is the seventh day of the week. Therefore, as the resurrection day was the Sunday of our almanacs, the day before, upon which those folks rested could have been nothing else than the Saturday of our almanacs." Let it be borne in mind that this is demonstrated upon the arguments and admissions of Mr. Crafts himself.

Again, the Sabbath of the commandment is the original Sabbath. This being the day before the first day of the week, and therefore the Saturday of our almanacs, it follows inevitably that the original Sabbath was identical with "our Saturday."

This is admitted, too, in the following perfect jewel of inconsistency:—

The Sabbath is a movable feast. A Jewish by-law located it on Saturday; a Christian by-law puts it on the day following, which is just as surely the seventh day in the sense of the commandment as Saturday ever was.

This admits that Saturday "was" once the seventh day "in the sense of the commandment." He says that it became so by a "Jewish by-law," but this statement is not true. The Jews had nothing to do with locating it on Saturday. It was not their work at all. The Lord did this himself. In the 16th of Exodus is the record. The Lord there told them that "on the seventh day which is the Sabbath," there should be no manna for them to gather. Nevertheless the people went out on that day to gather. Then the Lord said, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Ex. 16: 28-30.

By this it is seen that the Lord himself appointed the observance of the seventh day *against the will* of the Jewish nation. Therefore it is as plain as anything can be that instead of it being a Jewish by-law which located the Sabbath on Saturday, it was the Lord himself who located it there: and in so doing he simply gave to that people his own interpretation of his own law, enjoining the observance of the Sabbath. This interpretation he held before them by the absence of the manna every seventh day for forty years. This being the Lord's construction of his own commandment, proves that this is "the sense of the commandment." Now Mr. Crafts says that that day was Saturday; therefore, it follows from his own admission, and it is the logic of his own statements, that the seventh day of the fourth commandment is identical with the Saturday of our almanacs, and that that is the sense of the commandment.

And *this* is what Mr. Crafts finds the Bible to teach about the Sabbath. Then

why does he want a Sunday law to enforce the observance of the Sabbath? As we have often said, so say we now again: It would be altogether wrong and wicked to call for a State or national law to enforce the observance of that day which is indeed the Sabbath; but it is doubly wrong to demand any law to enforce as a Sabbath, the observance of a day which is not the Sabbath at all.

All this which has been admitted in Mr. Crafts's argument, is also confessed in the argument of the Rev. George Mott, in the American Sabbath Union leaflet before referred to. He there says:—

Our opponents declare, "we are not satisfied with these inferences and suppositions; show us where the first day is spoken of as holy, or as being observed instead of the seventh; we must have a direct and positive command of God." We admit there is no such command.—Page 7.

Christians are keeping Sunday and they want laws, both State and national, to compel themselves and everybody else to keep it. What authority then have they or do they claim for the obligation of Sunday? No divine authority; because he plainly says there is no divine command for it. This is plainly saying that Christians have no divine command for the observance of Sunday. That is true. THE SENTINEL has always said so, and now they themselves say so. Yet they blame THE SENTINEL for saying that it is so. Nor is this Mr. Mott's view only. He writes under the official title of "Vice-President of the American Sabbath Union," and that organization sends this forth as one of its official documents on the Sunday-law question.

Nor yet is the American Sabbath Union alone in holding this view. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union likewise occupies the same position. Leaflet number three, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union's department of Sabbath observance, is a concert exercise on the fourth commandment for Sunday schools and "Bands of Hope." From this leaflet we copy the following:—

Question 5.—Why do we not still keep the seventh day for our Sabbath instead of the first or Sunday?

Answer.—We still keep one day of rest after six of work, thus imitating God's example at creation, and at the same time we honor and keep in memory the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who on the first day of the week rose from the dead, and thus completed our redemption.

Question 6.—If Jesus wished the day changed why did he not command it?

Answer.—A command to celebrate the resurrection could not wisely be made before the resurrection occurred. He probably gave his own disciples such directions afterwards when "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

This also plainly confesses that there is no command for any change from the observance of the seventh day, to that of the first or Sunday. By what right then does this organization demand State and national laws compelling people to observe, as an obligation to God, that for which there is no command of God? Where

there is no command of God, there is no obligation towards God. They themselves confess that there is no command of God for the observance of Sunday; yet they demand laws to compel men to observe that day as an obligation enjoined by the Lord. In so doing, therefore, they require as an obligation to God that which they themselves say God has not required.

In so doing they put themselves in the place of God, and require that their will shall be accepted as the will of God. They require that their views, without any command from the Lord, shall be enforced upon all men; and that all men shall be required to yield obedience then as to an obligation enjoined by the Lord. This is the very spirit of the Papacy. That is precisely what the Papacy has done over and over again. That is what made the Papacy that which the Scriptures declared it would show itself to be, the "mystery of iniquity" opposing and exalting itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple—the place of worship—of God showing himself that he is God. And the Papacy has justified itself in those things in the same way in which this organization justifies itself in doing the same thing. That is by tradition, and what Christ "probably" taught or might have intended to teach, or would have taught, if the matter had only been brought to his attention.

Now, in conclusion, let us not be misunderstood. We do not deny the right of any of these persons to keep Sunday. We maintain that they all have the right to keep Sunday if they choose, without molestation from anybody, even though there be no command of God for it. This is their right and they are responsible to God only for the exercise of it. What we object to is their assumption of authority, and their demand for laws, to compel anybody to keep it. Nor do we object to their doing this because there is no command of God for it. We would object just as much to their doing it, though there were ten thousand commands of God for it. No authority but that of God can ever of right enforce a command of God. Men are responsible to God alone for their conduct with respect to anything enjoined by him.

In review of the arguments of the Sunday-law workers, we were brought to the consideration of their own published questions as to what the Bible teaches about the Sabbath, and as to which day is the Sabbath. We have found by their own arguments and admissions that they know that the Bible teaches precisely what the commandment of God says—"the seventh day is the Sabbath."

We have likewise found by their own plain statements, that without any divine command, they have adopted the observance of Sunday, and now demand laws, both State and national, to enforce upon

all, as of divine obligation, the observance of that for which they say there is no divine command.

We have stated to our readers simply, what these organizations say in their officially published arguments for Sunday laws. It was our duty to do so, and the conclusion of the whole matter, the sum of all that has been said, is: As it would be totally wrong and utterly unjustifiable to enforce, by State or national law, the observance of the day which God has commanded; it is infinitely more so, and the very "mystery of iniquity," to enforce, *as duty towards God*, the observance of any institution, or day, or rite, for which there is no command of God.

A. T. J.

Historical Precedents.

THOSE who are seeking religious legislation—a union of Church and State—do not argue the question on its own merits, showing that such legislation is in harmony with equal liberty and the rights of conscience; but instead of this they hunt for historical precedents, as though the practice of our fathers sanctified anything however erroneous, and made wrong right. Accordingly they speak of "securing teachers in all American schools who are imbued with the American spirit, and are able to instruct the children in historic American principles;" and also that in the selection of text books "to see that they do justice to the facts of American history and to conceded American constitutional principles." They say that a school from which the Bible is excluded "is not in the historic sense, an American school, and does not conform to the actual character of American institutions."

If they go back to our colonial history, they will find the beauties of religious legislation exemplified in the persecution of those whose consciences led them to differ from the creed of the majority. And by a very few steps they might trace these "American principles" back to Rome. Our American Constitution was intended to prevent the repetition of religious persecutions. It was designed to protect all in their religious rights, and to give no special favor to any. If the Christian religion can enjoy the equal protection of civil laws, it asks no more. To ask more is contrary to the principles of Christianity—a violation of its Golden Rule.

To go back of the formation of our Constitution for "historic American principles" is to enter the shadow of the Dark Ages. The "conceded American constitutional principles" are not conceded by all, nor by any who justly expound that instrument. Let them come to the Constitution itself for proofs and arguments, and not plead what somebody has conceded. When they find what they want in the Constitution, they will no longer ask for a "religious amendment." Their

argument amounts to this: "Our Government has been a Christian Government from the beginning; therefore the Constitution must be so amended as to make it a Christian Government."

R. F. COTTRELL.

Could They Be Trusted?

THE *Christian*, a religious paper, published in Little Rock, Arkansas, is perplexed over the condition of the political parties in that State, and appeals to the secular press for light upon the subject. The difficulty is that the papers, one and all, affirm that politics in the State are corrupt. "It is a common expression," says the *Christian*, "in the lips of every one, that the politics of this country are as corrupt as hell." But this the *Christian* ironically argues, must be a mistake so far as Arkansas is concerned, "because the leaders are all members of the church in good standing and full fellowship!" "Now you don't suppose," continues our contemporary, "this would be true if we were given to lying, slander, ballot-box stuffing, ballot stealing, intimidation, misrepresentation and bribery? Certainly not. A man who is a member of the church, in good standing and full fellowship, is a saint, or a hypocrite. The politicians of this State are all members of the church, therefore, they are all saints, and the politics of this State are as pure as the driven snow."

After naming a number of the State officers, and giving the churches of which they are members, the *Christian* continues:—

In the lower House of the last Legislature, out of nearly a hundred men, sent up here from all parts of the State, *all but thirteen* wrote themselves down as members of the church. So the secular press is mistaken about there being any corruption in politics. These men seem to be on opposite sides, but they are not. They are all "pilgrims and strangers on the earth seeking a city that hath foundations whose builder and maker is God." "They have crucified the flesh with all its affections and lusts," including desire for office. They have all renounced the hidden things of darkness and are walking in the light as children of the day. They have each pledged themselves to seek for the other's good and not his own, therefore, each candidate is trying his best to secure votes for his opponent; and is ready to deny himself that his brother may be elected.

Then in a graver tone, the *Christian* says:—

In all seriousness, the churches of Arkansas are responsible for the corruption in politics. . . . "Salt is good: but if the salt has lost its savor, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is fit neither for the land nor yet for the dunghill: but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear let him hear." You [the churches] are losing your savor rapidly. You are hardly fit for the dunghill now. It is all your women can do to keep you alive by suppers, festivals, fairs and all kinds of schemes to get a little money out of unwilling contributors. People do not want to support your churches, and if left to your own merits for support you would die in one short year. . . . O Lord convert the preachers and leading members!

This is from a religious organ, and yet

the National Reformers want the politics of the country turned over to the churches in order that the political pool may be purified!

Somewhat Muddled.

In an address delivered by Col. Edwin A. Sherman, of Oakland, California, in Music Hall, Boston, Massachusetts, October 20, 1889, he made some very stirring appeals to the American people with reference to the encroachments of Rome upon our American institutions, and said every American should be awake to the danger threatening our country by Roman Catholic ecclesiastical interference with our public schools. He charges them with "manipulating our conventions, and our public schools, wherever they can." This is evidently true, and they have secured large sums of the public school money with which to educate the Indians and others. This is decidedly wrong, and Mr. Sherman says: "The time is come when the American people, by their representatives in Legislatures, should make their laws so *fast* and so *firm*, amending their Constitution where it may be necessary, that not *one single cent* shall ever be appropriated for any *sectarian purpose whatever*." And we say, let it be so. And how he can so soon take another position directly opposed to that is what the writer does not understand, unless it be that Mr. Sherman is somewhat muddled.

Of the American people, the speaker said: "There is no danger of *our* falling from grace. *We* are true to the Scriptures." "We do not believe that they should be driven out of the public schools. . . . We require our presidents, legislators, judges, and governors to be sworn upon the Bible; then in the name of God, why drive it out of the public schools?" From this statement we see that he is an ardent supporter of the Bible in the public schools, and of course he would have the Protestant version used. Just how he can in one sentence declare that *not one cent* of the public money should be used for any sectarian purpose whatever, and then in another declare that the Bible should be kept in the public schools, is what I fail to see. To keep the Bible in the public schools, means at least to have the teacher read the Bible; and to hire a teacher to read the Bible, would be using the public money for sectarian purposes; because the Bible is a sectarian book; it belongs to Protestants as a sect; and because of it (the Bible) they came out from the Catholic Church. More sects have been produced from the reading of the Bible than from the reading of all the other books in the world. Therefore, to hire a teacher to read the Bible in the public schools, is to use the public money for sectarian purposes; just what Mr. Sherman says should not be done; "no, *not one cent*, should be appropriated for any sectarian purpose *whatever*." How he

can harmonize these two conflicting statements, is not easy to see.

The only reason why he is so opposed to using the public money for sectarian purposes, in the one case, is, because the Catholics are getting the public money, and consequently are teaching the *wrong sectarian principles*; while in the other case, it is all right to use the public money for teaching sectarian principles if those principles are in harmony with Mr. Sherman's theology. Then the wrong is not in the use of the public money, but in the kind of sectarian principles taught with the money. It follows, then, according to his reasoning, that in a country like this, where the majority rule, that the Bible which contains the sectarian principles of the largest number of voters, should be the Bible read in the public schools, and the very evil which he is seeking to avoid, namely, the use of the public money by the Catholics for school purposes, would be used for that very purpose soon; for he says, "eighty per cent of the employes in the departments at Washington, are Roman Catholics. They control your telegraph systems, they are upon your newspapers, and prevent honest reports. . . . They manipulate your conventions, and public schools where they can, they aim for the destruction of your Government, and they breed faster than grasshoppers." Now it will not take a prophetic eye to see what kind of *sectarian* principles would ere long be taught in the public schools, according to Mr. Sherman's own words.

As American citizens, are we ready for such an issue as this? If not, then keep the Bible out of the public schools, and everything else that savors of religion. "Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the Church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep the State and the Church forever separate."*

Mr. Sherman further says of the American people, "There is no danger of our falling from grace; we are true to the Scriptures." Here again he seems to be somewhat muddled with the idea of a wholesale religion,—a national Christianity.

In order for the American people to fall from grace, they must have been once established in grace. Will Mr. Sherman please tell how, and at what time this took place because of their truthfulness to the Scriptures? We know of no such time.

A nation can only be in grace so far as each separate individual in the nation has received the grace of God, that is to say, such individuals as have confessed their sins and been forgiven; thereby being made recipients of God's grace *through faith*, Eph. 2:5, 8. God establishes men in grace so far as they individually receive it by faith, and continue in it, but no further. When we consider that not one-

* U. S. Grant.

third of the American people have so received the grace of God, it is evident that as a Nation we have not yet been established in grace.

As to the benefit derived by the Nation or to the individuals that make up the Nation, because the "presidents, legislators, judges and governors," are compelled to be "sworn upon the Bible" we have yet to learn. A larger part of them do not know what is in the Bible, and a great many of those who do know what is in it, we are sorry to say, do not believe it; for these reasons, why make them take their oath upon the Bible? No, it ought never to be done, it is only a relic of the old idea of the divine right of kings.

H. J. FARMAN.

Newburyport, Mass.

Our D. D. M. D's.

It is generally supposed that the abbreviation D. D. attached to a man's name stands for Doctor of Divinity, while M. D. denotes Doctor of Medicine. We should naturally expect the former to be expert in theological diagnosis and ardent to avert spiritual decay and death, but to the latter are especially entrusted the care of the body and the application of laws for physical health. When, therefore, we see certain Doctors of Divinity the foremost advocates of laws ostensibly in the interests of health, while the large and intelligent medical profession is almost silent, the question arises whether this zeal is most due to the inefficiency of the medical fraternity, the real benefit of the race, or to some ulterior religious scheme under a secular and philanthropic garment. One of the latest prescriptions of this compound school is a homœopathic dose of rest, applied externally once a week, extending from the middle of Saturday night to a corresponding point Sunday night. If the mean temperature of a patient become so high that he objects to the measure and begins to "rave," be he old or young, strong or feeble, he must have the additional treatment of a period of quiet in jail, unless he prefers to take this part of his rest in hard labor to pay the fine his doctors impose, to make him careful not to overwork.

Of course, to a novice in such heroic kindness it looks as if the religious character of the time selected might be uppermost in the mind of its advocates, especially as they frequently call it, in plain language, the "Lord's day," and the "Christian Sabbath," but they strongly assert that this is insulting to their knowledge and skill, for all they desire is a day for the recuperation of hard-worked men, like saloon-keepers and others.

When practicing before the public they likewise give it the learned and technical title of the "civil Sabbath," well knowing that no one can understand that language. This sugar coating disguises the real taste,

however, and many swallow it as eagerly as they would the apples of Sodom, but like the poor woman mentioned in Scripture, under the doctor's care, they grow continually worse instead of better. In fact some who have tried it the longest and hardest and have most faith in it, for others, frequently become so weak that they wander away and buy a newspaper on the day of rest, greatly to the annoyance of their divine doctors.

Why do not the physicians in charge of the case vary the treatment a little and ask for a law to enforce other Christian practices demanded, for the health of the people? Paul tells Timothy to take a little wine for his stomach's sake and for his often infirmities; bread and wine are used by the doctors in Christian communion. Why not have a law to compel every person to accept bread and wine at regular intervals as a "civil communion," for his health. That wouldn't enforce religion at all! How easy it is to allay suspicion by just calling a thing something else! And then, you know, they are so anxious for the poor workingmen, no one can doubt that they mean well; and, besides this, such a course would impress the foreign sons of toil who come to our shores, that this is a Christian Nation.

Then, again, a weekly bath is considered conducive to health. Most of the doctors in the churches agree that water is necessary to Christian baptism, and even immersion is given to chronic cases. Why not unite these results and have a "civil baptism" as a police regulation, for the health of the toiling masses, under the supervision of the churches and doctors of divinity? What a grand healthy country this would be! Civil Sabbath, civil communion, civil baptism, not as religious measures at all, but for the good of the public health. No wonder the D. D.'s are working for such a measure! Indeed, it seems the more that the subject is investigated the larger the field appears, and a few such innovations carefully made would open the way to an immense practice. Those who could not be cured by these methods could be sacrificed in the interests of advancing science.

For the present all who wish to help secure even half a loaf are asked to clamor for the proposed civil Sabbath law to prevent the desecration of the Lord's day; and especially must they denounce those who pretend to see any attempt in this to unite Church and State or to legislate on matters of religion and conscience. Workingmen should be occasionally reminded that it is for their interest to take the medicine promptly, for in some States where such laws exist it has been found necessary to amputate men from society and their families because they did not rest for their health on Sunday.

This, we are assured, is not persecution for religion nor a deprivation of just liberty; it is only enforcing the law!

H. E. ROBINSON.

Some Conclusions Drawn from Sunday-Law Arguments.

In regard to the American Sabbath Union's proposed Sunday law for California, the Pacific Coast Secretary says: "It may operate with inconvenience to some, who contend that they must have the right to sell liquor, run theatres, and do all sorts of works of gain." Now, the Union and its supporters generally denounce these occupations as desperately wicked. But the proposed Sunday law virtually says they are all right six days in the week, even including the day which the commandment says is the "Sabbath of the Lord."

The Union makes the further plea that "the Legislature is bound to enact laws that shall conserve the good order, peace, welfare, and happiness of the people." Then we are left to infer that it will "conserve the good order, peace, welfare, and the happiness of the people" to "sell liquor, run theatres, and do all sorts of works of gain" six days in the week, provided they are prohibited on Sunday. And furthermore, it is proposed to allow that such occupations are all right even on Sunday if the works be done *privately*, and the doers thereof will be "regularly" religious some other day in the week.

Again, it is stated that the proposed law "is to prevent the physical and moral debility which springs from uninterrupted labor." Here, again, we are left to conclude that it is not the nefarious liquor traffic, etc., that the Union is striking at; it is the moral debility of not taking sufficient rest, on the part of the poor fellows who are engaged in the wicked work. Says the Secretary: "Rest on one day in seven better enables men to acquire on the other six days of the week." Is it so very important that liquor dealers should increase their power of acquiring, that everybody must be obliged to observe Sunday as a holiday in order to accomplish that end?

It is not here designed to convey the idea that the Union really wishes to see the acquisition of the rumseller increased, or that they want to see him conduct his business even six days in the week; but such are some of the entanglements into which "civil Sunday-law" champions are continually running, in their efforts to evade the religious aspect of their cause. But their true colors will crop out occasionally, despite the effort to hide them under a cover that is too short at both ends. This is well illustrated in the Union's monthly document for October, where is inserted approvingly, the following expression of Rev. Josiah Strong: "A holiday sabbath is destructive of popular morality, because it is *hostile to religion*, which is the root of morals."

Now the "holiday sabbath" is just what the Sabbath Union has been holding up for the admiration and delusion of the people of California, from its first advent in the State, beginning with Mr. Crafts's first visit. From first to last, the Union's rep-

resentatives have cited all the legal holidays in the calendar as parallels of their proposed Sunday-law. Yet there is nothing that they so much deprecate and denounce as the usual amusements indulged in by certain classes who voluntarily make a holiday of Sunday.

All sorts of saints and sinners may eat, drink, and be merry to their heart's content on the Thanksgiving holiday, and it all goes as exuberant thanksgiving; but if the same gushing outburst occur on Sunday, it is terrible to contemplate. All police courts, on the morning after a general legal holiday, are wont to treat the "drunks" with unusual leniency, and let them off with merely nominal sentences; and the public—saints and sinners alike—smile approvingly upon such tender consideration.

But the Sabbath Union's proposed law for a Sunday holiday contemplates no such considerate solicitude for the overzealous observers of this particular holiday occasion. Not only will the ordinary inebriate fail to receive the customary leniency incident to other holidays, but the industrious citizen who chooses to spend all or a part of the day in honest labor, must be given to understand that on this holiday such labor is a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment. Where, then, is the parallel, so blandly paraded, between the proposed Sunday "civil holiday" and those which have no uncivil phase in the back-ground.

But, according to the Union's own acknowledgment, Sunday is already a holiday in California, in the sense that these agitators would have us believe is their sole aim. Here is their acknowledgment, as set forth in the monthly document before alluded to:—

The Legislature prohibits judicial and official business on Sunday. It likewise enacts concerning commercial business. For instance, notes, when the last day of grace falls on Sunday, must be presented to the maker on Saturday in order to hold the indorser.

The representatives of the Sabbath Union have, over and over again, cited the Fourth of July, Admission-day, Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's day, and Washington's birth-day as illustrative of the Legislature's prerogative to enact a Sunday law. On the strength of these, this people demand that Sunday be made a "civil holiday." The foregoing quotation is proof from their own words that if a civil holiday, such as those now in existence, be all they want, they have it already. The laws in regard to other legal holidays do not compel the closing of places of business, or stop the running of railroad cars, or forbid the voluntary labor of any private citizen. There is nothing estopped on any of those days that is not estopped on Sunday.

Then, having already a legal or civil holiday as rigidly protected as any of those so persistently held up as examples, what must we conclude as to their real

motive in demanding a Sunday law? One would naturally suppose the object of so much labor to be the securing of something not already possessed. Then it must be something not directly asked for. Some of them say, "Half a loaf is better than no bread." What they ask now they ask in the name of physical rest, in the name of a civil holiday, etc., hoping by this means to get some kind of a special Sunday law, a direct legal recognition of the day, and then demand more as sentiment can be worked up among the people.

Clearly, the ultimate aim, whatever the present pretense, is a legal *religious* Sabbath, rigidly enforced as such. And some of the leading ones in the movement do not hesitate to openly avow such intent.—*W. N. G. in Signs of the Times.*

Keep the Schools to Their Own Work.

PROTESTANTS are contending, many of them, for a special religious training in the schools, not of a sectarian character, but general, fundamental.

I am beginning to doubt if the matter of religion can be safely or consistently, or perhaps justly, placed in the common schools, which belong wholly to the people. I do not see how I can justify my opposition to the principles and conduct of the Catholics in this matter, if I insist upon a course which in another way I myself adopt. Ex-President Woolsey, a great Christian scholar, and among the wisest of men, said: "I question very much whether the formal reading of the Bible in school does so much good as to be justly regarded as essential." I believe in my whole heart that religious training is of first importance for the development of full rounded character, and for the saving of men's souls. But that is the mission of the Church, not of the State. "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's"

Multiply churches, multiply Sunday schools, intensify the religious example and training in the family; but keep these common schools of our country to their own work of mingling these children into a oneness of life, a unity of patriotic purpose and love, an intelligent and responsible understanding of the meaning, duties and dignities of American citizenship.

Fellow-citizens: What we need just now in this Republic is a revival of pure Americanism. There is an American life; there is an American character; there is an American history; there is an American destiny, and these are good enough and glorious enough for any man or woman who walks American soil. Allegiance to any other nation let every one here forswear. Alliance with foreign nobility let every American daughter contemn. Every other flag of any other fatherland, let them one and all be left behind, as born or adopted citizens of this peerless American

Nation. We salute with a rapture of loyalty the one flag whose stripes were baptised in the blood of the struggle of a people for its independence, whose stars came forth from the awful darkness of a mighty civil war to shine with an increasing radiance upon a people's commonwealth.—*Rev. George B. Spalding, D. D., Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, New York.*

How Sunday Laws Conduce to Morality.

A LITTLE practical experience is worth a good deal of theory. From the *Boston Herald* I clip an article bearing the suggestive title of, "Tobacco a drug on Sunday." Were it not for lack of space, I am sure the readers of THE SENTINEL would be interested in it all. I shall, however, only refer to a few points, and make one or two brief extracts accompanying them with comments.

It seems that the "Puritan City," the so called "Hub" of the moral and intellectual universe, prohibits by law the sale of tobacco and cigars on Sunday; also the sale of newspapers on the street, after 10 A. M. The industriously inclined bootblack is also prohibited from shining the soiled shoes of even the pious church-goers. Of course it is argued, as usual, that these laws are in the interests of morality and religion, but where is the evidence for such a claim?

The following conversation is vouched for as having taken place between a newsboy, and a bootblack, the newsboy meanwhile secreting his few remaining papers under his coat:—

"We's goin' to be moral, anyhow," chirruped the newsboy as the policeman came up within hearing, "even if we does do widout 'nough to eat. I wouldn't break de law, I wouldn't."

"Neider would I," chimed in the juvenile shoepolisher, who had hidden his establishment—the shoeblack's regulation kit. "I am like de minstrels in Stones's, I doesn't black on Sundays."

The same article gives an account of the Sunday sale, by the druggists, of gin-cocktails disguised as "Woodbury's Antidote."

Many continued to sell their tobacco and cigars in spite of the law, though one clerk testified that on that Sunday morning, although the cigars were there in the case, yet he had refused some fifty would-be purchasers.

Many of the men as they slammed the door behind their retreating forms muttered a word that sounded so much like the "slam," that it was drowned, as it were, in the echo.

One clerk told the reporter that he would not wonder if they soon had a way of disguising cigars.

Then comes the following:—

As if prophetic, the echo of the words still rung in the reporter's brain when he dropped into a druggist's shop, after taking a short ride to the South end, and asked for some cigars. The young gentleman back of the counter handed over a peculiar package that looked as if it might contain cough drops or a corn cure.

"Twenty-five cents," said the young man significantly, "or we can give you something made from a different formula for fifteen cents."

The package consisted of a cardboard 4 x 6 inches, and so folded as to make an elongated case open at the ends. Around this carefully folded was a dark paper wrapper sealed at the ends with red wax. Upon one of the broad sides of the package was printed the following:—

WONDER RELIEF. AN EFFICIENT ANODYNE

To allay restlessness, calm mental and bodily nervousness, and to produce a general state of delightful languor and repose. A palliative for Nervous Cough and paroxysms of Chronic Asthma. An aid to digestion.

PRICE, 25 CENTS.

At the back was printed: "Indorsed by many eminent physicians." Along the sides appeared the following:—

CAUTION—This drug is a powerful sedative poison, locally irritant, and SHOULD BE KEPT BEYOND THE REACH OF CHILDREN.

An infusion of 20 grains of this drug in a half-pint of water (used for an enema) will prove an efficient antidote for poisoning by strychnia. National Dispensatory, 2d Ed. 1880.

The scribe broke the sealed ends and drew forth three good cigars. The clerk of the Court Square establishment had spoken like a prophet.

These things speak for themselves. How much has been gained to the cause of morality and religion by these Sunday laws? Many have sold in spite of the law, and thus, perhaps, taken their first step in conscious willful law breaking. Others have found means of selling under disguise, thus adding to their other sin, that of deception. And all who, on account of the law, have refused to sell, have simply done so for fear of the law and are therefore no better morally than those who have sold, only a little more cowardly. The very newsboys and bootblacks are made, by the law, liars and hypocrites and every would-be purchaser is morally as guilty as if he had succeeded in making his purchase, to say nothing of the additional guilt of swearing at the discomfiture of his failure.

Where is the gain to the cause of morality? *Where?* It is a question that those who believe in morality enforced by law ought to answer. G. E. FIFIELD.

THAT part of religious history written with the blood of martyrs, shows that from time immemorial legislation for Christ's sake has been the work of the devil's ambassadors. Christ himself did not escape. A religion that needs the strong arm of the State to support it, should be abandoned in the interest of good government. Morality cannot be legislated into any man or community.—*Chicago Chronicle-Record.*

UNION of Church and State? The world has tried that for centuries, and reaped a harvest of persecution and bloodshed. Shall we swing backward to those reigns of terror, and try the experiment over again as certain bigots propose? This question is coming up for consideration. Let us be prepared to answer it.—*Progressive Age.*

Sacred Chronology.

BY SYLVESTER BLISS.

THIS work treats of the Elements of Chronology, the different systems, and the various eras, and gives the chronology of the principal events recorded in Sacred History from the beginning on till the death of St. John. It also contains indication of the numbers of the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aid to investigation it is invaluable. The book has been thoroughly revised, and an entire chapter added, on the

PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

This chapter is an exposition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, and gives an **outline of the beginning of History** and

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

New and valuable notes have been added to the original text of the book, making it the most valuable work on the subject of sacred chronology extant. No student of history can well do without it. It contains a **vast amount of information in small space**, and so far from being dry it is as interesting as a story, which it really is. **300 pages**, cloth binding, with side stamp, **\$1.00.**

Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK,
OR, OAKLAND, CAL.

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

- Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
- Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.
Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

- No. 1 Russia leather, for 2 pens, 10c.
- No. 2 " " " 3 " " 15c.
- No. 3 " " metal back, 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 4 " " " 3 " " 20c.
- No. 5 Sealskin, for 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 6 " " " 3 " " 25c.
- No. 7 Russia Leather, for 4 pens, 25c.
- No. 8 Sealskin, " 4 " 40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

MUNN & CO.
SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN
AGENCY for
PATENTS

A pamphlet of information and abstract of the laws, showing How to Obtain Patents, Caveats, Trade Marks, Copyrights, sent free.
Address **MUNN & CO.**
361 Broadway,
New York.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

In English, German, Danish, and Swedish.

BY A. T. JONES,
Editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible.

This Important Work Shows Clearly the Relation that Should Exist Between Church and State at the Present Time, as Proven by the Bible, and the History of the Past Twenty-five Centuries.

- CHAP. I Outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."
- CHAP. II Distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."
- CHAP. III Shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained."
- CHAP. IV Ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution."
- CHAP. V Unmasks "Religious Legislation."
- CHAP. VI Is devoted to the "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the Nineteenth."
- CHAP. VII Shows the workings of Sunday laws when they are enforced.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English. Price, 25 cents; and in German, Danish, and Swedish, over 200 pages, Price, 35 cents, (Illustrated).

THOUSANDS OF COPIES


Should be placed in the hands of thinking people at once. It clearly defines what position American citizens should sustain toward the efforts now on foot to secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK,
OR, OAKLAND, CAL.

DO YOU WANT THE BEST ATLAS

PUBLISHED?

IF SO SEND TO US FOR



This Atlas contains thirty-three imperial quarto maps, 12 x 14 inches, and an index of 20,000 geographical names, so arranged as to show the latitude and longitude of each place named and the number of the map on which it will be found.

This Atlas is a most attractive volume, and is by far the cheapest fine Atlas ever published. Dr. A. T. Pierson, in *Missionary Review*, says of it:—

"In convenient folio form at the amazingly low price of one dollar. We recommend all students to procure a copy to place on their tables for constant reference. We have found it invaluable. It has a copious index by which easily and rapidly to find any city or town or district."

We will send this Atlas prepaid to any address in the United States or Canada for \$1.25.

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS,**
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

- PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
- CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
OR, LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California
Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

Illustrated Curiosity List

With box of Ornamental Minerals, Indian Relics, Curiosities, 10c. "Companion," Illustrated, describing curiosities, 25c. year; Advertisements, 1c. a word. [Mention this paper.]

E. A. BROWNE, FLORENCE, ARIZONA.

GENERAL AGENT WANTED

AGENTS are making from \$75 to \$150 PER MONTH.

FARMERS MAKE \$200 to \$500 DURING THE WINTER

LADIES have great success selling this Washer. Retail price only \$5. Sample to those desiring an agency \$2. Also the celebrated KEYSTONE WRINGERS at manufacturers' lowest prices. We invite the strictest investigation. Send your address on a postal card for further particulars.

LOVELL WASHER CO., 251 Huron St. ERIE, PA.

Barrels of Money
are lost annually through
poor advertisements — Because they are
poorly displayed
and placed.

Barrels of Money
are made annually through
good advertisements — Because they are
well and strikingly
placed.

It is our business to prepare good
advertisements and place them
where they will produce results,
address —

Geo. P. Rowell & Co.,
Newspaper Advertising Bureau
10 Spruce St., N. Y.



NEW YORK, MARCH 12, 1891.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

It is proposed to hold, next October, in Philadelphia, a National Reform Conference, at which papers upon various National Reform topics will be read by leading men in sympathy with the movement.

It is stated that the Sunday Rest League, of Chicago, has a branch organization in every ward of that city, and numbers thirty-two thousand members. One principle of the League is to give municipal support to no man unless he pledges himself to close the saloons on Sunday.

THE Oakland (Cal.) *Times* says that Judge Green, of that city, recently refused naturalization papers to one Rev. Axel Magnus Le Veau, because he "failed to answer the questions propounded to him. The Court advised him to read the Constitution of the United States, and postponed further examination until some future time."

It is stated that the new Mayor of Savannah, Georgia, is moving forward in a rigid enforcement of the State Sunday law, not only closing all saloons on Sunday, but those horrid hot-beds of vice—the barber shops as well. Now if blacking boots and splitting kindling could only be stopped in Savannah on Sunday, the millennium might begin at once.

THE SENTINEL has mentioned the report which the *Independent* was able to make upon the question of Sunday closing as viewed by individual members in the Congress of the United States. It will be remembered that a considerable majority of those who expressed an opinion are in favor of Sunday closing. Now if the question of a Sunday law for the Nation, or even the question of Sunday closing for the World's Fair, should come before Congress for action, can any one doubt that these members who have expressed their opinion in favor of it, would cast their vote as congressmen in the same direction? And in that case, in view of the figures given, can any one doubt that a Sunday bill would pass that body if it were presented?

THE SENTINEL has been sneered at by some people in the United States, for say-

ing that there is danger that a Sunday bill would pass Congress, if such a bill were to come before that body for a vote. We have cared nothing for any of those sneers, because we have known all the time, precisely what we were talking about; and the figures of the *Independent* simply demonstrate that THE SENTINEL is a *sentinel* indeed, and not an *alarmist*.

This is not saying that we believe that those members of Congress do themselves keep Sunday, or have any real regard for it; but because throughout the land, as well as in Congress, there is in the minds of many men, who really care nothing at all for Sunday, a touch of superstition which causes them to fear that there may be something about Sunday and its observance, which they ought not to oppose; and which causes them to think that it would be better for them to keep on what they think is the safe side. They will therefore yield to the superstition instead of looking into the matter for what it is, and acting upon conviction. There will yet be enacted by Congress some kind of a law that will commit this Nation to the doctrine of the sacredness of Sunday.

THE *Baptist Examiner*, of this city, publishes an "appeal to the people of New York," from which we take the following extract:—

An act to repeal what is familiarly known as the "Ives Pool bill" has been introduced in the Assembly, and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Pool bill was passed in 1887, and was ostensibly "for the purpose of improving the breed of horses." Its real purpose was to permit and legalize betting on races or "pool-selling" for five months in the year, suspending during that period certain sections of the penal code. *By a strange inconsistency, an act which the laws pronounce a felony and prison-offense during seven months of the year, is authorized and made innocent during the remaining five.*

There is the same "strange inconsistency" in Sunday laws, which make criminal upon one day of the week those things which are not only harmless upon all other days, but necessary and commendable. Pool bills of the Ives ilk, and Sunday laws should be blotted out together.

A CURIOUS question of conscience was raised at the Philadelphia meeting of the American Sabbath Union. It was this: The new Constitution as submitted by the committee directed the new Board of Managers to divide themselves by lot into three classes, whose terms should expire in one, two, and three years respectively. The Rev. Dr. Barr, of the United Presbyterian Church, took the position that the lot was the ordinance of the Lord, and was never to be resorted to if the same thing could be accomplished in any other manner; and he proposed that the Union should designate the managers in the various classes, notwithstanding that the New York law required them to be divided by lot. The Doctor maintained that the State

had no right to require the observance of a divine ordinance.

The difficulty was gotten over by striking out all allusion to the method of dividing into classes, and simply providing that there should be a board of twenty-one managers, one-third of whom should go out of office and their successors be elected each year.

It seems very strange that men who were assembled for the express purpose of influencing legislation in the direction of compulsory Sunday observance, claiming that the keeping of that day is required by the law of God, should be so tender upon such a point as that raised by Dr. Barr.

In accepting the Prohibition nomination for the Kentucky Legislature, last fall, Mr. Emmet C. Rudolph said:—

If elected, I shall do all in my power to assist in restoring the protection of law to the sanctity of the Sabbath in every community of the State.

This appears to have been the point which Mr. Rudolph especially emphasized, and commenting upon this fact a Western paper says:—

This strikes us as rather strange. We presumed that if a man were elected by the Prohibition party, he would do all in his power to secure prohibition; but this man assures his party that if they elect him, he will exert himself to the utmost to throw a law of protection around the Sabbath.

Well, that is not strange when in some States it is not difficult to find so-called Prohibitionists who say that "if the saloon would only close on Sunday it would be about all we could reasonably ask."

A "CIVIL" Sunday-law circular that is being extensively scattered in California, bears upon its margin, this legend:—

Keep this in your Bible, work and pray night and day, until our Sunday law is restored and faithfully kept.

But what has this to do with a "civil" day?

It is confidently asserted that both ex-Governor Beaver, of Pennsylvania, and Governor Pattison, are in favor of retaining upon the statute books of that State the Sunday law of 1794, which is a fit companion piece for the Sunday law of Tennessee.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO

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

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

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, \$1.00

In clubs of 2 to 100 copies, per year, each, - - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 Bond Street, New York.