



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 16, 1890.

NUMBER 3.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

It is time for the National Reformers to cry out for the restoration of papal rule in Italy. They regard Romanism as better than "political atheism," and it seems that with the mass of Italians there is no halfway ground. A writer in a religious journal says that "in swinging away from the Romish Church, comparatively few stop at Protestantism. The majority know little respecting it, and apparently care as little about it." This is not a matter of surprise since they have been religious by law so long that they naturally regard all religion as simply a synonym of tyranny, and as soon as they have the opportunity they very naturally break away from the restraint which has been so galling to them.

AN exchange notes the fact that "a certain amount of religious liberty has been granted in Finland, which, though it does not go very far, is, at all events, a welcome installment. It only at present gives professed Christians of any sect the right to educate their own children, though not those belonging to members of the State Church. Marriages contracted by members of acknowledged sects will in future be legal. Different views of Christianity will no longer make any difference in the privileges and duties of the citizen, and these prerogatives are extended so far as to give Christians of any sect the right of entering Government service.

"Religious demonstrations and processions are, however, prohibited, and as the Salvation Army has gained a footing in the country, no doubt they will soon come into collision with the authorities on that point. The Government has undertaken to examine into the doctrines and beliefs of every

dissenting sect, and also to keep a close account of them; it has cut a nice task out for itself and it remains to be seen how the plan will work. It appears that any members of the community not professing some form of Christianity are still to be debarred the rights of citizenship, nor are they allowed to form organized communities or educate their children."

The Blair Amendment Resolution.

HERE is the Joint Resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States, as re-introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Blair, December 9, 1889:—

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States as provided in the Constitution:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonies, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonies, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.

This is identical with the original resolution introduced by the same gentleman in 1888, with the exception of the clause relating to the Christian religion. The original resolution said that the children should be taught "in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and in the principles of the Christian religion." Whereas, this one reads, "in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity." But nothing has been gained by this change. If it was intended to give the resolution less of a religious tone or character, by changing "the principles of the Christian religion" for "principles of Christianity," the change is hardly worth the effort required to make it; because the principles of Christianity are certainly the principles of the Christian religion. Christianity is nothing else than simply the manifestation in life and character of the principles of the Christian religion. The insertion of the word "non-sectarian" as describing the principles of Christianity which should be taught, simply makes tautology in the section because the following part of the section is wholly taken up in the effort to say that no sectarian doctrines, beliefs, or ceremonies shall be taught or inculcated in the public schools.

Which of the principles of Christianity are sectarian and which are non-sectarian? If Christianity, itself alone, is not sectarian, then none of the principles of Christianity can possibly be sectarian. If any of the principles of Christianity be sectarian, then all of them are. Because Christianity as it is, is a definite and positive thing. It is not a wishy-washy mixture of fast-and-loose principles. For this reason alone, to say nothing of any other, every man who has any respect for Christianity ought to oppose this amendment with all his might.

Section 1 as it stands, if it stood alone, is worthy of the hearty support of every person in the United States; because it

declares just what ought to be an inhibition upon all the States. There is a question whether the States are not already forbidden to do this under the Fourteenth Amendment, but if it be not certainly decided there, such an amendment as the first section of this resolution should be adopted as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Then the States would stand upon the same level as the Government of the United States. If this were once done, and then the legislation, both State and National, were kept in harmony with the Constitutional provisions, then religious liberty in this country would be perfect, as it ought to be. But unfortunately for that measure in this resolution, its whole value is nullified by sections 2 and 3 of the same resolution.

Although section 1 distinctly says that no State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, yet section 2 just as distinctly says, that each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools, in which there shall be taught the knowledge of the principles of Christianity. Now the only way in which any State can establish and maintain anything, is by law. Therefore, if the matter stops with the second section, each State in the Union would be required, by section 2, to do what, by section 1, it is distinctly forbidden to do. But to prevent this contradiction in the terms of the resolution, section 3 comes in and declares that "the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided." By this, it appears, that although no State can select for itself any religion that might suit it best and make and maintain laws respecting the establishment of that religion, the United States will select the religion for all the States, and then require that each State shall establish and maintain that religion. None of the people of the States are supposed to be capable of deciding this question for themselves, but a majority of three-fourths of the States are considered capable of deciding it for themselves and for all the others. Education would thus become a national matter, and would no more be subject to State control. This amendment, then, would nullify that part of Article VI of the Constitution which declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under this Government. Because, according to this amendment, a religious test would necessarily have to be required as a qualification to the office of public school teacher, everywhere in the United States.

But the leading question of all to be decided, if this resolution should be adopted, is, What are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity? Granting the assumption of the resolution that such a distinction

exists, the question then is, How shall the United States Government discover just what they are? Christianity is represented in the United States by probably a hundred different denominations. Each one of these holds to something different from all the others, which makes it the particular denomination it is. No one of these, therefore, can be taken as representing the non-sectarian principles of Christianity. Therefore, the only course to be pursued by which the United States Government can find out what are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity, is, by a general consensus of the principles of Christianity as held by all of the denominations in which Christianity is represented in the United States. This could not be secured by an examination of the creeds of the different denominations, because the leading denominations themselves do not agree upon their own creeds. There would be no remedy, therefore, other than to call a general convention of all the denominations of the United States to discover what principles of the Christian religion are held in common by all and are therefore non-sectarian in this country. This is the idea of the author of the resolution, as stated in a letter to the secretary of the National Reform Association, December, 1888. He said:—

I believe that a text book of instruction, in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian Church, both Protestant and Catholic, and also those who are not actively associated with either.

Let such a general convention of the representatives of Christianity in the United States be called; let the principles of Christianity which they should agree are non-sectarian, be formulated; that would be a national creed. Then let the United States Government adopt that creed and enforce it as a part of the instruction in all the schools of the nation, and that would be nothing less than the establishment of a national religion. All the children of the country from six to sixteen years of age would then have to receive that as Christianity, and so would have to receive their religion from the State.

Nor would it stop with the children, because the probabilities are that in a national creed there would be some things, if not many, that would not be Christian principles at all. The parents who are Christians and who desire that their children shall be Christians would soon discover this and when their children were taught in the schools those things which are not according to Christianity, the parent would at once tell the child that he had been falsely instructed, that such was not Christianity; and could read directly from the Bible to show that it was not Christianity. This at once would bring on a controversy between the United States Government and the parents of the children. The question then would be, whether the Government

would allow its authority to be directly opposed, and its purpose to be frustrated in its task of inculcating the principles of Christianity on the minds of the youth in this country. If the Government should yield and allow the parents out of school to undo what the Government has done in school, then the Government might as well stop before it begins; for if one parent can do this they can all do it. On the other hand, if the Government insists upon teaching the child religiously, what the parent does not want that child taught, then the parent will take his child out of school and keep him out of school. And if that shall be allowed, the Government will be no better off in the work of securing general education that it is now.

But as section 3 pledges the power of the United States to the support and maintenance of such a system of public schools, and as section 4 empowers Congress to enforce the provisions of the whole resolution by legislation when necessary, it is not to be supposed that in the controversy the Government will yield to the parent. If, therefore, the Government hold on its course, compulsory attendance at the public schools would have to be the next step; and the next step after that would be to prohibit the parents from teaching the children out of school that which is contradictory to what the Government has taught in school. Thus it is clearly seen that to say that under such an amendment as this all the *children* of the country will have to receive their religion from the Government does not fully state the case by any means. The truth is, that under it, all *the people* of the United States will have to receive their religion from the Government. What the Government should say the principles of Christianity are, that would have to be received as Christianity. There could be no appeal. The Government makes itself supreme in all things, steps in between the parent and child, and so lands itself at once into downright paganism under the garb of the Christian name.

Nor is this all. It could not be certainly known for more than two years at a time what the principles of Christianity were that should be received from the Government. Because in the general convention of all the denominations that would have to be called at the first to discover what are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity, it would be to the interest, as well as the bounden duty, of each denomination to get just as many of the principles of that denomination into the creed as possible. No one denomination could get all its principles recognized for that would make the creed sectarian; consequently each one striving to get in all it could, the result would be a compromise, with the hope by some future effort to succeed in getting more of their principles into the creed. With the creed once formulated,

and Congress empowered to enforce it by legislation, it would then be to the interest of each denomination to secure just as large an influence as possible in Congress. This would be necessary to each one of the denominations as a matter of self-preservation if nothing else, in order that if each denomination could not get enough influence in Congress to control legislation positively in its own interests, yet so that it might have sufficient influence to prevent legislation that would be prejudicial to its interests. Thus every church would be turned at once into a political club and every pulpit would become a stump. As a Congressional election occurs every two years, it would so happen that every two years the national creed would be put to the test. And as the majority would decide whether the creed should stand or be revised, it would depend altogether upon how the vote went—whether a man was orthodox or a heretic. The majority might be as narrow as a half dozen or even one, and everyone of that narrow majority might have been drunk when he voted, yet that would make no difference in the result. When the majority had once decided upon the question of orthodoxy or heresy that would be the end of the matter, you would be orthodox or heretic as the vote should stand.

Does anybody who has any acquaintance with history need to be shown that this is only a perfect parallel, in outline, to the formation of that union of Church and State in the fourth century which developed the Papacy and all the religious despotism and intolerance that afflicted Europe for ages? Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. It became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity it was that should be the religion of the empire.

The emperor said, The Catholic Church. Then as there were two great bodies,—the Arian and the Trinitarian,—each claiming to be the Catholic Church, and as the question turned upon a hair-splitting point in theology, a council had to be called to decide what was the Catholic Church. Accordingly the Council of Nice was convened by imperial command. An imperial creed was established, which was enforced by the imperial power. Whoever would not subscribe to the creed should be banished. All but three in the convention signed the creed. These—Arius and two of his associates—were accordingly banished. Constantine's sister was an Arian. When she came to die she had an Arian bishop to attend her and sent for Constantine to come to see her before she should pass away. He went; she besought him to recall Arius from banishment. He did so, and commanded that he should be received as a member in good and regular standing in the orthodox church. The orthodox bishops refused to receive him.

The emperor declared that he should be received. The bishops persisted in their refusal, and the emperor called out the troops: for was it not an imperial religion that had been established? Was it not established by imperial power, and was it not to be maintained by imperial power? When the orthodox bishops saw things going so far as that, they prayed that Arius might die, rather than that the Church should be polluted by his presence so forced upon it. Accordingly, Arius very conveniently died.

Not long afterward Constantine himself died; the empire fell shortly to two of his sons, Constans and Constantius. Constans had the western part of the empire, Constantius the eastern. Constans was a Trinitarian, Constantius was an Arian. In the dominions of Constans all Arians were heretics under the ban of the law; in the dominions of Constantius all Trinitarians were heretics under the ban of the law. Soon Constans came to his death, and Constantius was sole emperor; then the Trinitarian was a heretic wherever he was. And all the time there was intrigue upon intrigue, and council upon council was called, to revise the creed. And all this to such an extent that the Christian profession was put to an open shame amongst the pagans. It was parodied in the pagan theaters; and one pagan writer said truly enough, that the bishops spent their time in nothing else than in rushing from one part of the empire to another, engaging in council after council to find out what they believed.

This is but a picture, and not in the least overdrawn, of what would occur in the United States should such a measure as Senator Blair's proposed amendment ever be enacted into law. As that was the Papacy, this would be a living likeness to it. As nothing but evil ever came from that imperial recognition of Christianity, so would nothing but evil ever come from this national recognition of Christianity. And yet, as plain as all this is to any man who thinks, or who knows the A B C of history, there are some United States senators and many professed leaders of theological thought who are in favor of it. But are the American people ready to annul their Constitution, and to cast away all their rights under it?

No grander mark of political wisdom ever appeared upon this earth than was displayed when the fathers of this Republic declared that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government;" and that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But the lessons which these mighty men learned are now well-nigh forgotten. Let these noble lessons be newly learned and held forth before all the nations; so shall the principles of liberty indeed enlighten the world.

A. T. J.

A Minister on the Situation.

THE following letter from the pastor of a Christian Church in Kirksville, Mo., will commend itself to the good sense of our readers:—

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: I am in receipt of two copies of your most excellent paper, and have read them with care. Am in sympathy with the work to be accomplished by the publication of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, because I am convinced that any effort on the part of our law-making powers to unite Church and State would sooner or later prove a fatal blow to the welfare of this Republic.

The mission of the SENTINEL is a noble one, and a copy should be in every family in this whole country.

It is not the province of our Government to unite Church and State, nor even to indicate in the Constitution that this is a Christian nation. If those who are so anxious to unite Church and State would take a little time to read the history of such unions, it would cool their ardor, I am sure. Those blind enthusiasts who would do such a foolish and hurtful thing, certainly exhibit a very great want of knowledge of human nature and the principles of government. The peculiar constitution of man and the character of our Government, forbid the creation of any such relation. The condition of things that obtain in the Republic of Mexico at this time, should admonish every sensible American citizen. Let the good work go on.

The Minneapolis Preachers.

THE proceedings of those Minneapolis preachers, an account of which we published in the SENTINEL of January 2, is of more than passing interest to the people. It reveals some of the spirit that inheres in this Sunday-law movement all over the nation. That iron-clad agreement and the boycotting action of the preachers under it, show how far they have departed from the methods and the spirit of Jesus Christ, whose ministers they profess to be. This, however, is not the beginning of that movement in Minneapolis. It has a history, and the history runs back nearly two years. In the spring of 1888, Dr. Josiah Strong, of this city, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of the United States, visited Minneapolis and met with a committee of pastors of that place who had been appointed to confer with him upon the matter of organizing a branch of the Evangelical Alliance of that city. Several conferences were held, and plans were formed; but owing to the nearness of the summer vacation, no definite action was taken at that time. Rev. D. D. McLaurin, of the Church of Immanuel, Minneapolis, was given charge of the plans formed, and of organizing the active work according to the plans. The first definite step toward

organized action was taken Monday, October 15, 1888, at a meeting of the Minneapolis ministers in the Y. M. C. A. parlors. There the objects and the plans of the organization were quite fully set forth. One of the objects of the organization, and the one which is of special interest in this connection, is to take "a prominent part in State and municipal politics and government, watching closely all State and city legislation. In its name, and upon its recommendation, bills will be introduced into the Legislature and such legislation as will increase the penalties for the violation of the Sunday laws of Minneapolis will be especially favored and pushed."

The plan of organization, is a central alliance governed by an executive committee, and under the direction of this, ward alliances are formed as auxiliaries. Through the ward alliances a company of visitors is organized to make a thorough house-to-house canvass. To each of these visitors is allotted a division comprising ten families. These are to be visited once a month regularly to ascertain their condition and needs with the special design of getting them to attend church. All the churches, Catholic and Protestant, of the city are united in the alliance.

Upon all this matter of the organization and the work of this alliance we should not have a word to say except in commendation if it were in fact evangelical or if there were any evangelical intent in it. But as its object is political and not evangelical, we can never have anything to say of it except to denounce it as contrary to every principle of the gospel. Evangelical is defined as being "agreeable or consonant to the gospel or the truth taught in the New Testament." The gospel is not political, it never can be furthered, but only hindered and corrupted by political methods such as are embodied in the plan of this Minneapolis political preachers' alliance. It is proper that people should attend church, it is perfectly proper that proper methods should be employed to induce them to attend church; but when political methods are employed to get the people to go to church for the purpose of increasing the political influence of the churches, then such churches are just about the worst places that the people could be induced to go.

About the time of the organization mentioned above, Dr. McLaurin said that "The ministers of the city believe that Christian unity is strong enough now to make itself felt in ways that churches separately have little influence." But, when Christian unity is strong enough to make itself felt politically, as the purpose of this alliance is, then the more of such strength Christian unity feels, the less strength it actually has. The only strength the Christian, individually, of the Christian Church collectively, can ever have to profit is the strength of Jesus Christ. And that strength is never made manifest in a

political way. The only power that Christians ever can possess for good, is the power of godliness which can never be exerted by political means.

The steps taken by the Minneapolis ministers as printed in the SENTINEL of the 2nd are the fitting sequel of the plan and object of the organization of the Evangelical Alliance of that city in October in 1888. Compulsory methods belong to the organization, compulsory religious observance is the object of Sunday laws, and that they should resort to boycotting pressure to compel both their fellow ministers and the people to conform to their wishes is only to be expected. And when such methods are so readily resorted to at the first, what will they not do at the last? The Evangelical Alliance and its secretary both had better stick to their evangelical work or else stop calling it evangelical, and give it its proper name of political at once.

From California.

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: Sunday-law advocates in California may rejoice on general principles that the SENTINEL has been removed out of the State, but fortunately that class are yet a minority. There is one feature of the removal, however, that even its friends may rejoice at,—it is a forward move, and a long one too, against the efforts of the mis-named National Reform party which it is set to oppose. America, that part of it which is really American, reaches from ocean to ocean, and Californians are happy to know that your journal can remove its publication office from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast and still be American. And now that you are squarely planted in the great commercial metropolis and political center, your old-time neighbors bid you God-speed on your noble mission. When you shall have fairly warned the people of these United States of the full meaning of national Sunday laws, and religious amendments to the Constitution, and all kindred encroachments upon their liberties, your full duty in the matter will have been fulfilled, whether they heed your warning voice or not.

SILENCE ON THE BLAIR BILL.

Notwithstanding Senator Blair's promptness in the introduction of the pet schemes of the National Reform Association and American Sabbath Union; and notwithstanding the text of these measures has reached us by mail in Congressional print; it is noticeable that not a word, at present writing, has appeared in the newspapers of the State. The telegraphic news entirely ignores the bills, and the leading religious journals have likewise kept silent. Whether this is a part of the program of the managers of these measures at Washington, or whether it is an indication of the small interest felt in such matters by the press, is a question which

your correspondent is unable to answer. I am curiously waiting to see how long the silence will continue.

ON THE ALERT FOR FOREIGN FOES.

If some foreign power were to propose restriction upon our privileges as a people, though the portentous cloud should not wear a tinge of the blackness of darkness manifested in these Blair measures, there would be a "clash of resounding arms" along our coast. When Germany put on just a little swagger in presence of our august national dignity at Samoa, the Monroe doctrine suddenly let out a great tuck in its spacious garment, covering about half the Pacific Ocean, and all classes of journals,—big and little, daily and weekly, religious and secular, vied with each other in wails about our defenseless coast.

When a United States revenue cutter seized a couple of Canadian vessels engaged in poaching seals in Behring Strait, and the British lion growled but faintly, there was an imaginary invasion of our western coast in the minds of the editorial fraternity from British Columbia to Mexico, and there was a perfect deluge of military reports and newspaper demands for large appropriations for harbor and coast defenses.

BUT,

When there arises in our midst a spirit of religious intolerance seeking to control the Government, and whose aim is to strike out of our fundamental law the very principle of civil and religious liberty upon which our nation has grown and prospered more than a century, our otherwise alert and enterprising press is mum. Although these same measures were made so prominent in the last Congress, and are thrust in so early at the present session, after persistent canvassing of the country during all the interval, yet our sagacious defenders can see no danger.

In the case of danger of foreign invasion, prevention is the cry upon the appearance of the first speck of threatened hostility; but the reply to such internal menaces often is, "Oh, if the Blair bills should pass, the people would rise in armed resistance to their enforcement." Such is the dependence of many who are opposed to the principles of religious legislation in general. But why not be as precautious concerning the far greater evil, as they are suspicious of the lesser possibility? Organizations in every State in the Union comprising prominent men of every shade of politics and religion, and national organizations of great influence, besides the prestige of like enactments in nearly all the States, merely waiting Congressional action in order to give full force to their intolerant provisions, present a massive front too ominous to be ignored. Ignorance of what such measures mean, in the light of popular history, is impossible on the part of any man who aspires to the rank of enlightened journalism.

Is it possible that the publishers of our great newspapers, as well as our great politicians, who are recognized as leaders in national policy and national thought, are so lost to the interests of the country as to lie dormant in regard to such issues? Can it be that these National Reform measures, championed in Congress by Senator Blair, will be allowed to go by default? Or that having been tacitly encouraged by silence on the part of opponents, they may attain such a degree of apparent popularity that the press and the politicians will feel constrained, if not to openly advocate, at least to offer no opposition? It looks as though such would be the case. And indeed leaders in the movement have expressed hope for success from this very cause. We shall soon see if they have prophesied aright.

W. N. GLENN.

Oakland, Dec. 26, 1889.

State Theology.

[This article taken from Rev. Dr. Spear's "Religion and the State" will be of special interest at this time because of the effort being made by certain misguided religionists to secure an amendment to the national Constitution requiring that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught in the public schools. It is worthy of a most careful and thorough reading.]

THE term *State* means any distinct and independent body of persons occupying a given territory and united together under some form of civil government. The governmental organization of a State for the purpose of enacting and administering law, is practically the State itself. It is such as the agent of its legal operations. By the term *theology* is meant the science of God, embracing what is assumed to be known in regard to him and consisting subjectively in human beliefs with reference to the Supreme Being. What men thus believe is their theology; and if they believe in the doctrine of God at all, the natural sequel is some form of religious worship. The combination of the ideas indicated by these terms gives a *State theology*, or a government in which the State asserts a legal doctrine or creed in regard to God and stamps the same with its own authority. The State, then, is a theological State. Its opinions, whether in respect to God himself or the duty and mode of religious worship, form a part of its laws: and this distinguishes them from *individual* beliefs or convictions that rest merely on private judgment, and, hence admit of no coercive enforcement.

The natural and, as a most ample experience shows, the sure result of State theology is either such an identification of Church and State that the two are practically the same thing, or such an intimate legal union of the two that they mutually act through each other. In one case the State is the Church and the Church is the State; and in the other, though formally distinct as organisms, they are, nevertheless, blended in a common set of functions

in respect to religion. In both cases we have the union of ecclesiastical and civil powers, and in both we have religion with the sanction of human law impressed upon it.

Every State theology must necessarily have some *specific* character; and as to what it shall be—whether Pagan or Christian, and, if the latter, whether Catholic or Protestant—the State itself must be the judge. Its opinion on this subject it expresses through the edict of a king or the vote of a legislative assembly. It does the work of a theological professor, adding thereto the power of the civil arm. It teaches by command. Its dogmas are laws. All the reasons which demand or justify a State theology at all equally demand that it should be put into effective action. If it be the right and duty of the State to have a theology, then it is its duty to be governed by it and to govern the people by it. The least that it can do is to devise the ways and means of asserting, perpetuating, and enforcing it. If it is worth anything it deserves this tribute. State patronage, State disabilities or penalties for dissenters and State administration are the logical corollaries. To this there can be no just objection, since if the State *ought* to have a theology, then it ought to use the necessary means to maintain and administer it. It should see to it that not only the children in the public schools, but also the adult population—indeed, all the people—enjoy the benefits thereof. That would be a very queer theology which the State first adopts and legalizes and then leaves to shift for itself. We hold it to be the duty of the State to sustain its own theology, provided always that theology comes within its proper sphere.

This, moreover, would be practically an easy task if all the people thought exactly alike and their common thoughts were faithfully represented by the theology of the State. Such, however, does not happen to be the case.

What, then, shall be done with those who dissent from this theology and decline to conform to its requirements? This question the State must answer, and generally does so answer as to involve the principle of proscription or persecution. It is a fact wide as the world and spread all over the records of history that State theologies have with great uniformity been persecuting theologies. Christ and his apostles and their followers were persecuted by the State theology of the Jews. Pagan Rome had such a theology, and for three bloody centuries she wielded its power against the Christians. Constantine established Christianity as a State theology and made it a persecuting power. The State theology of the Roman Catholic and that of the Protestant show the same record. State theology drove the Puritans out of England and murdered the Huguenots in France. It made our Puritan

fathers persecutors. Mohammedanism as a State theology and Paganism as such are marked by the same feature. The missionary efforts of modern times to propagate Christianity among the heathen meet with one of their most formidable obstacles in State theologies, and the same was true of like efforts in the apostolic age. It is a general fact that the moment theology allies itself with the State and commands its powers it becomes persecuting in respect to all who dissent from it, and that, too, whether it be Pagan or Christian, Catholic or Protestant. History paints this fact in lurid colors.

Nor is there anything strange or unnatural in such a fact. It results from the very nature of the case. The theology of the State is a part of its organic or statute law, and, of course, it should be sustained by its authority and power. Heresy is, hence, a *crime* as really as murder, and as such it should be punished. So the State reasons, and that, too, correctly, provided we accept the doctrine of State theology. Catholic States and Protestant States have reasoned in this way. What we call religious persecution State theology calls punishment to prevent crime. What we call religious liberty it calls a dangerous exercise of private judgment. Saul of Tarsus was a conscientious persecutor, regarding himself as doing God service; and it is but just to say that State theologies have generally been conscientious in their deeds of murder and blood. They have not looked upon themselves as ruffians and outlaws, but rather as the conservators of the divine honor and the true interests of souls. The thoughts of an after and a wiser age were not their thoughts when they trampled the religious rights of men into the dust and shocked Heaven, if not earth, with their cruelties. Religious zeal misdirected is a terrible passion: and all State theologies, because administered by men, are apt to have this zeal.

We present, then, the disabilities, the persecutions, and the martyrdoms, which are so conspicuous in the history of State theology, as more than suggesting that there must be some radical mistake in the doctrine itself. A doctrine that can by perversion turn the mild and genial religion of Jesus into a flaming persecutor, and make it a ferocious enemy to religious liberty as vested by God in individual souls; a doctrine that undertakes to adjudicate upon questions lying exclusively between the soul and its Maker; a doctrine that substitutes carnal for spiritual weapons; a doctrine that resorts to the law of force, where nothing is pertinent except the peaceful persuasion of argument and the gentle and loving voice of entreaty; a doctrine that in practical execution becomes an abominable despotism exercised over the bodies and attempted over the souls of men—yes, such a doctrine has written upon its face in letters of light the glaring evidence of be-

ing essentially and fundamentally wrong. Judging it by its fruits, we find it difficult to use terms sufficiently intense to describe the degree of that wrong. Its prevailing principle is hostile alike to God and man, although it professes to be the servant of both.

It is, moreover, a significant fact of history that Christianity has always prospered most in the true sense when it has had least to do with the State and the State has had least to do with it. For the first three centuries it was the theology of individual conviction, resting simply on its own evidence, holding no other relation to the State than that of a persecuted religion, and doing its entire work by the use of spiritual means; and then it was that it spread itself among the nations of the earth with a purity and power that have never since been exceeded. Then it was that venerable and pompous systems of Paganism yielded to the resistless energy of its moral march. Afterward it became a State theology; and then, in the hands of the State, it was not only corrupted and half-paganized, but at once assumed, and for centuries maintained, the character of a persecuting religion. All the persecutions of the Romish Church, and, indeed, all the persecutions that have existed in the name of Christianity, have had their basis in State theology. If God should be pleased to constitute a theocracy on earth, and by inspiring it guarantee its infallibility, then it would be the duty of men to bow to its authority; but until we have this fact established by appropriate evidence the conclusion drawn from history is that the State should confine itself exclusively to things temporal, and leave theology to the individual convictions and private judgments of men. This is certainly the truth in respect to Christianity.

There can be no doubt that a true theology in the heads and hearts of the people is a very important and much-needed influence for good in relation to civil government; yet it does not follow that the State is the proper party to take care of this theology, to define it, to teach it, to support it, or in any way invest it with the sanction of law. Those who set up the proposition that religion is essential to morality, and also the further proposition that morality is essential to good government, and then infer that the State should establish and support religion are guilty of a palpable *non-sequitur* in logic. The truth of their premises does not prove that of their conclusion. It may be true (facts show it to be so) that the State will receive the largest and purest contribution of morality founded on religion when the latter is left entirely to the educational influences of the family and the church; and if so, then State theology is not only a superfluity, but a positive damage to the best interests of the commonwealth.

Those who drew the plan of our national Government built the system upon the

principle that religion and civil government were to be kept entirely distinct; and, for the most part, all the State governments are constructed upon the same theory. The general character of both is that they neither affirm nor deny any doctrine in respect to God and that they command no duty as a religious duty. They deal with the temporal rights and obligations of citizenship, without any reference to the question whether the citizen is a religionist or not. His religious faith is no part of his citizenship and no criterion of his rights. It confers upon him no immunities and imposes no disabilities. It is a matter between himself and his God, and with it the civil authority does not concern itself. He is not forbidden to be an atheist and not commanded to be a Christian. He forfeits no rights by being the one and gains none by being the other; and as between these two extremes of opinion, the State does not undertake to decide which is the true and which is the false opinion. Such is the great American principle in respect to the sphere of civil government. This principle, being the exact antipode of State theology, admits of no reconciliation with it.

We submit this summary of thoughts in regard to State theology for the consideration of those who insist that the public school system of this country shall be made the instrument of religious education. The practical meaning of this demand is that an American State shall in its public school adopt the principle of State theology. Have those who make the demand well considered the fact that they logically ally themselves with all the religious despotisms that have ever existed among men? They in effect accept and advocate a principle which has in all ages been the enemy of religious liberty, against which heroes have fought, on whose cruel altars martyrs have bled, and whose historic enormities are sufficient to startle the world. They assume that an American State has a theology to teach and support; and in this one assumption they pass the Rubicon, and grant what never did anything for Christianity but to corrupt and weaken it as a moral and spiritual power.

They Are Papal Allies.

In commenting upon certain abominations taught by Romanists as Christianity, the *Ironclad Age* has the following which is none the less true or sensible because it was said by an infidel paper:—

“Yet this is the religion that Popery is scheming to have taught at the public expense in our free schools. And the Protestant Church is actively assisting the Papacy in this treason. God in the Constitution, Christ as the supreme ruler, “the principles of the Christian religion” to be inculcated in the free schools—these are the battle cries alike of Popery and Protestantism.

Nor does Protestantism seem to realize that if God is placed in the Constitution, it will be the papal god: if the principles of the Christian religion are to be inculcated in the public schools, it will be the principles of said religion as defined and practiced by Popery.

“Protestantism seems blind to the signs of the times. It doesn't seem to note that the Papacy, that has impoverished and ruined all the old countries, is now cutting loose from those countries and concentrating its strength in the United States. The Papacy, united and possessed of immense wealth, is stronger politically to-day in this country than all the divisions of Protestantism in their disunited condition. Catholics by the hundreds of thousands are flocking to our shores. Their first and last allegiance is to the Pope, yet they are almost immediately on their arrival endowed with citizenship in fifteen of our States. Rome, by its consolidated vote, rules all the great cities in the United States to-day; and either of the great political parties that would dare openly to antagonize the Papacy would be snowed under out of sight in any general election in the United States if that election were to come off next week. Nothing but a unity between Protestantism and all the liberal and non-religious elements of this country will save it from the fate that has befallen every country where the papal beast of blood has been allowed to roam unrestrained. And the sooner this is understood the better for the country.”

An Excellent Thought.

The *Christian Advocate* of this city, has the following item which contains an excellent thought which those who want Congress and our several State Legislatures to remove by legislation all the difficulties in the way of church work would do well to consider. The *Advocate* says:—

An attempt is sometimes made to explain the slow progress of religion in our large cities on the ground that the conditions of society are peculiarly unfavorable to evangelical Christianity. We are told that many of the inhabitants are German infidels and atheists, Italian and Irish Catholics, Jews and pagans, and that these are not easily reached by the gospel, and therefore aggressive movements are not to be expected. Certainly these elements are antagonistic to Protestant Christianity, and present serious obstacles in the way of its progress; but did the gospel ever yet find a field which was free from antagonistic elements? Has the gospel any other aim than to meet and overcome hostile forces and reduce a world of enemies to subjection? Human nature is one the world over, and the gospel is perfectly adapted to the work of saving men without respect to class or nationality. Wisdom to wield the sword of the Spirit is all that is wanting, and this wisdom cometh down from above.

If in harmony with this suggestion, the churches would pay more attention to wielding the “sword of the Spirit” and a little less to invoking the aid of the State, much good might reasonably be expected to result, not only to sinners but to the Church itself.

A WRITER in a religious contemporary says that Italy is a hard soil for the growth of Protestantism. On the one hand are the Romanists, upon whom no impression can be made, and upon the other the Infidels, upon whom still less impression is possible. Unbelief among the Italian men, he says, is general in Rome, and their absence from Church is conspicuous.

This state of affairs is not to be wondered at since it is the legitimate result of the Church and State regime which has so long cursed Italy. Men may be compelled to observe the outward forms of religion, but that does not make them truly pious, and when the compulsion is removed they will surely go farther in the other direction than though they had not been coerced. Coercion in religion breeds hatred, and hatred is the very opposite of Christianity.

A RELIGIOUS paper has the following, which we pass along for the benefit of our religion-by-law friends:—

“The foolishness of legislating on Bible doctrines should be discovered by the comments which such work calls forth from the average newspaper. The following is a case in point. The Presbytery of Cincinnati having voted that all infants dying in infancy are saved, the Cincinnati *Inquirer* of Nov. 20, 1889, comments upon the action as follows:—

“By a vote of twenty-two to eighteen, the Presbytery of Cincinnati concluded that ‘all infants dying in infancy are saved.’ Bless their dear little hearts, how they must rejoice at this declaration! But let them pause a moment and reflect upon the solemn fact that a change of only three votes would have damned them forever.”

The *Christian Advocate* of this city says:—

That idleness is a prolific cause of vice and crime is made clear by facts constantly coming under the observation of those who read the papers and study the condition of society.

This is true, and being true is it not a little strange that so many of those who know that it is true are in favor of laws compelling people to be idle one day each week. There can be no doubt that Sabbath keeping is a good thing; but habitual idleness one day each week is not Sabbath-keeping; only those who keep a Sabbath, in any proper sense of the word, who observe the day unto the Lord. The *Advocate* is right, “idleness is a prolific cause of vice,” and therefore all laws that foster idleness foster vice,

TEN LECTURES ON NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

NOW READY!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

We do not mean that a National Sunday Law is now ready, but that a treatise under this name, prepared by Alonzo T. Jones, is now ready for circulation.

This pamphlet contains the arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, and in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest bill, which Mr. Jones presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Dec. 13, 1888.

Mr. Wilbur F. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

“MIGHTY INTERESTING READING,”

And Mr. Jones's comments will make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruption, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments.

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is

Based on Scripture and History, Constitution and Law,

Showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday-law movement of the fourth century, the Sunday-law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair Sunday bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States.

The work contains one hundred and ninety-two pages. Price, 25 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors 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 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, and Those Who Are Making it.”

Chap. V unmasks “Religious Legislation,” calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill, now pending in Congress.

Chap. VI is devoted to the “The Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth.”

These and other topics of equal interest make this treatise INDISPENSIBLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

IS A PAMPHLET OF 176 LARGE OCTAVO PAGES. PRICE 25 CENTS.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position We, as American Citizens should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

“CYCLOSTYLE,” “MIMEOGRAPH,”
“COPYGRAPH.”

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated “Redding Inks.”

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

WATERMAN'S IDEAL FOUNTAIN PEN.

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feeding the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation (capillary attraction) and simple construction (a split) that have been used by the ordinary dip pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST material, workmanship, and principle of operation. Don't waste your time or shorten your life with any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING 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. Russia leather for, 3 pens . . . 15c.

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.

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

By HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue of the *Sentinel Library* which contains a *verbatim* report of a powerful lecture delivered by this well-known speaker, in Oakland, California. Price, 4 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page premium book—“Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance,” containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40. Address,

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,
OAKLAND, CAL.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 9, 1890.

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.

OWING to a lack of funds the "publication of documents of the American Sabbath Union for 1890" has been postponed.

THE field secretary of the American Sabbath Union announces that he will make another lecture trip across the continent and back, starting across in April and reaching the Atlantic again in August. Definite dates and places of giving the lectures, are not yet announced.

THE local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia was presented in the House of Representatives by Representative Breckinridge, of Kentucky. The Speaker referred it to the Committee on Education and Labor, but by request it was afterward referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. We hope to have a copy of the bill for comment in our next issue.

WE have received a circular from the secretary of the American Sabbath Union, announcing that the Union is to hold a convention at Washington, D. C., January 30 and 31. "Everybody" is invited, but "especially the friends of the American Civil Sabbath in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia." "The leading purpose of the convention" as announced "is to urge upon Congress the request of the commissioners of the District of Columbia" for a Sunday law. The circular announces that "distinguished Senators, Congressmen, pastors and others are expected to speak" besides Mr. Crafts.

COLONEL SHEPARD of the so-called Sabbath Union, is making himself ridiculous and bringing religion, which he is supposed to represent, into contempt by such utterances as the following which is attributed to him in a speech before the recent Dominion Evangelical Alliance:—

The West Shore and Hudson River Railways, which were started for the purpose of running Sunday excursions, were driven into bankruptcy by the Lord. A new management cut off the Sunday traffic as far as possible, and now their finances are in good condition. At one time no Sunday elevated trains were run on the Sabbath, when it was arranged that a train should be asked for by a Christian minister, who, by the way, very soon was called away from earth.

It may do to talk this sort of stuff to people who do not know the facts in the

case, but it will not impress others very much. The truth is that the West Shore Railroad was driven into bankruptcy by a most ruinous competition. Then it passed under the management of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. The rates were increased and the number of trains reduced, and the Vanderbilts make money out of it. *And Sunday trains both freight and passenger are run*, and have been all the time, both on the West Shore and the New York Central.

It is stated that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has issued a pastoral address on non-church-going and its causes, which it asks to be read over the pulpits in all the churches on a convenient Sabbath. It points out that in Glasgow, the most populous city of Scotland, there are not fewer than one hundred and twenty thousand persons who are alienated from public worship. It is further remarked that there is a similar and alarming proportion of people in other towns, and even in rural parishes, who habitually absent themselves from church.

It may be interesting to remember in this connection that Scotland is probably the most strict Sunday observing country in the world; but it seems that something more than simply refraining from work on Sunday is required to make people pious, or even to insure their attendance at church. Evidently that which Scotland needs (?) is a law requiring every body to attend church who is not excused for some good and sufficient reason. The National Reformers should see what can be done for the country of the Covenanters.

We should like for some of the people who favor the suppression of base ball on Sunday, to point out what there is about a base-ball game that is uncivil on Sunday any more than on any other day. No one pretends that the playing of a game of base-ball is uncivil in any sense. It cannot be shown that it is in any way uncivil on Sunday, and it is not because of any incivility in it that they propose to suppress it on Sunday. Nor is this all; the playing of base-ball is not even irreligious. It is true that men who are not religious play base-ball. It is equally true that men who are religious, and strictly so, can play base-ball and still be religious. Then it is not because the playing of base-ball is either uncivil or irreligious that they propose to suppress it on Sunday; it is solely because Sunday is held by certain people to be a religious day, and that it is to be devoted to religious exercises; and as the playing of base-ball is not a religious exercise, therefore it is not consistent with the religious observance of a day. Consequently the only purpose of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws is to enforce the observance of it as a religious day. It is to compel people who are not

religious to pay religious tribute to those who pretend to be religious. But if the Government is to do this in one thing when it is demanded, why not in everything else as it may be demanded, and have a thorough-going union of Church and State at once. That will be the outcome of a national Sunday law.

THERE was lately organized, in the City of New York, a league professedly to maintain American institutions. We have not yet seen a copy of its constitution or any official statement of its objects, but from what we can gather from the newspaper report, it seems to be more than anything else an organization to maintain American Protestant institutions as against Catholic institutions. Like most of the attempts in this line, that have lately been made, this looks too much like an attempt to put Protestantism in the place of legal recognition rather than Catholicism, and no American institution can ever be defended by any such means as that. Protestantism as an established religion, is only the Papacy in principle and under another name. We shall give our readers more particulars in this matter hereafter.

"ONE of the most prominent characteristics of the American Sabbath Union, says its organ, the *Pearl of Days*, is its broad basis of practical Christian union for one national, civil, and religious object. Its only 'shibboleth' is the preservation of 'the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.' It has no 'shibboleths' no other motto upon its banner. For this supreme end Protestants and Roman Catholics can and do co-operate, even if they are not incorporated in the institution itself. Religion and patriotism combine together to keep and to hand down to succeeding generations the blessing of 'the Lord's Day.'

Certainly the object of the so-called union is "civil and religious;" it is civil in that it demands that the civil power enforce a religious institution; and it is religious in that the great underlying motive of the leaders in the "union" is the exaltation of Sunday because of the sacredness which in their minds attaches to that particular day. The term "civil" which they use is simply sugar used to catch flies that might not relish the odor of Church and State vinegar.

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 towards a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAID, \$1.00.

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 75c.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.