



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 3, 1892.

NUMBER 43.

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.

THERE is a phase of the Sunday legislation by Congress that has not been set forth as it deserves to be outside of the record of the proceedings of Congress itself. We refer to that phase of the subject in which Congress assumed the position of interpreter of the divine law.

In the *Congressional Record* of July 10, 1892, page 6614, is the following:—

MR. QUAY.—On pages 122, line 13, after the word “act” I move to insert:

“And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath day.”

The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The Secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part enclosed in brackets.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The part indicated will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

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

THE foregoing is all that was said or done in relation to the question that day. The next legislative day, however, the question was taken up and discussed. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson of Nebraska. And in the *Record* of July 12, pages 6694, 6695, 6701, we read as follows:—

The language of this amendment is that the Exposition shall be closed on the “Sabbath day.” I

submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. The Sabbath day is not Sunday.

The words “Sabbath day,” simply mean that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words, “Exposition on the Sabbath day,” and insert “mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.”

MR. QUAY.—I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole.

MR. HARRIS.—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—It will be again reported.

THE CHIEF CLERK.—On page 122, line 13, after the word “act” it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting:

“And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.”

This amendment was afterward further amended by the insertion of the proviso that the managers of the Exposition should sign an agreement to close the Fair on Sunday before they could receive any of the appropriation; but this which we have given is the material point.

ALL of this the House confirmed in its vote accepting the Senate amendments. Besides this, the House had already, on its own part, by a vote of 131 to 36, decided that Sunday is the “Christian Sabbath;” and by a vote of 149 to 11 that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. And thus did the Congress of the United States, at the dictate of the churches, not

only take sides in a religious controversy and discuss and decide a religious question, but put itself in the place and assume to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the divine law. For, from the official record of the proceedings there appears these plain facts:

1. The divine law was officially and in its very words, adopted as containing the “reasons” and forming the basis of the legislation. In other words, the legislation proposed only to enforce the divine law as quoted from the Book.

2. Yet those to whom the legislation was directed and who were expected to execute its provisions were not allowed to read and construe the divine law for themselves; and this for the very reason that there was a possibility that they might take the divine word as it reads and as it was actually quoted in the official proceedings, and shut the Exposition on the day plainly specified in the divine word which was cited as the basis and authority for the action taken.

3. Therefore to preclude any such possibility, Congress assumed the prerogative of official and authoritative interpreter of the divine law, and declared that “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday,” is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the divine law—that “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday,” is the meaning of the word of the Lord which says: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.”

THIS is what the Congress of the United States has done. And in the doing of it, has violated every rule and every principle that governs in the interpretation of law. A leading rule for the interpretation of law is this:—

In the case of all law, it is the *intent of the law-giver* that is to be enforced.

What then was the intent of the Law-giver when the Sabbath commandment was given? Did the Lawgiver declare, or show in any way, his intention? He did. He declared in plain words that the *seventh day* is the one intended to be ob-

served. Nor did he leave them to decide for themselves which day *they* would have for the Sabbath. He did not leave it to the people to interpret his law for themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week, kept up continuously for forty years, the Lord showed his intent in the law. The people were fed on the manna in their forty years' wanderings between Egypt and Canaan. But on the seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion; and that which was gathered on the sixth day would keep over the seventh day, which it could not be made to do on any other day of the week. By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of the day mentioned in the law quoted by Congress. And by keeping it up so continuously and for so long a time he made it impossible for the people then to mistake his intent; and has left all future generations who have the record of it, without excuse in gathering anything else as his intent than that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Therefore when Congress decided that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the meaning of the divine law which says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," it plainly set itself in contradiction to the word and intent of the Most High.

—o—
ANOTHER established rule is this:—

"When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction; they must be followed." And, "Where the intent is plain nothing is left to construction."

Are the words of this commandment quoted by Congress, plain words? They are nothing else. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the whole commandment. Then under the rule there is no room for any construction; much less is their room for any *such* construction as would make the expression "the seventh day" mean "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Fitting to the point the New Testament has given us an interesting and important piece of narrative. In Mark 16:1, 2, are these words:—

And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought 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 sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

These people arose *very early in the morning* of the first day of the week; yet *the Sabbath was past*. Now Congress has legislated to secure respect for the Sabbath on "the first day of the week." Such a thing can never be done however; because Inspiration has declared that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. It matters not how early our illustrious and devout Congress and the World's Fair Commission, may get out and around "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," they will be too late to find the Sabbath there, for the Lord says that *then* it is "*past*."

—o—
AND it is the Sabbath according to the commandment, too, that is past when the first day of the week comes—the Sabbath according to this very commandment which Congress has officially cited. Here is the record:—

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 sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had

prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in and found not the body of Jesus. Luke 23:56 and 24:1-3.

Here is the plain word of the Lord stating plainly and proving conclusively that "the Sabbath day" according to the very commandment which Congress has officially cited, is the day *before* "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," and that the Sabbath day, according to this commandment *is past* before "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," comes at all, no matter how early they may get up the first day of the week.

—o—
It is true that the churches are at the head of all this, and that Congress did it at the dictation and under the threats of the churches. It is true that the churches have put this false interpretation upon the commandment, and then saddled it off thus upon Congress. This is all true, but that does not relieve Congress from one whit of the guilt of perverting the law of the Most High, of forcing into that law a meaning that was never intended to be there, and of putting itself in the place of God and assuming the office of interpreter of his laws. Congress had no business to allow itself to be forced into such a position. Judge Cooley—"Constitutional Limitations," page 67—says:—

A court or legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written Constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty.

The theologians gave to the Sabbath commandment a construction which was not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the commandment. They then went to Congress and demanded with threats that it allow itself to be influenced, by these theological sentiments and political threats, to give to the written Constitution of the Government of the living God, a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the founder of that Constitution. And our national Legislature did allow this sentiment to influence it into doing that very thing. Such a thing done to a human Constitution, an earthly statute, being justly chargeable to reckless disregard of official oath and public duty, what must be chargeable against such an action with reference to the divine Constitution and the heavenly law? The national Legislature—the Congress of the United States—has allowed the churches to draw it into the commission of an act with reference to the Constitution and laws of the living God, which if done only with the laws of men would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty. And both Congress and the churches are without excuse in the doing of it.

—o—
By this legislation, at the dictate of the churches, Congress has distinctly and definitely put itself and the Government of the United States into the place where it has established, and proposes to enforce, the observance of an institution as sacred, and as due to the Lord, which not only the Lord has neither established nor required, but which is directly contrary to the plain word of the Lord upon the subject of this very institution and its observance as due to the Lord. And in the doing of this Congress has also been

caused to assume to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of Scripture for the people of the land and for all who come into the land; and puts itself in the place of God by authoritatively deciding that an observance established and required by the State, and which it calls the Lord's, is the Lord's indeed, although the Lord plainly declares the contrary.

—o—
IN thus submitting to the dictates of the churches, and making itself the official and authoritative mouthpiece for the theological definitions and interpretations of the divine law, the Congress of the United States has given over the Government of the United States into the hands of the combined churches. A forcible American writer has long ago stated the principle thus:—

To permit a church—*any* church— . . . to dictate, beforehand, what laws should or should not be passed, would be to deprive the people of all the authority they have retained in their own hands, and to make such church the governing power, instead of them.*

This is precisely what has been done before the eyes of the people of the United States in this Sunday legislation of the Fifty-second Congress. The combined "evangelical" churches, including the Catholic Church, as a united body on this question, did dictate under threats that this law should be passed. Congress did permit it, and did yield to the dictation. And in so doing it did deprive the people of the governmental authority which they had retained in their own hands by the Declaration and the Constitution; and did make the churches the governing power in the Government, instead of the people. "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," is gone; and there has been established in its stead, the subjection of the people, by the churches, and for the churches.

This the Congress of the United States has been led by the churches to do. And in the doing of it, it has caused this enlightened Nation, the example and glory of the world, to assume the place and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the Church. And it is a burning shame.

A. T. J.

Religious Legislation.

[The St. Paul *Daily News* has expressed its editorial views upon the effort to secure, in the coming session of Congress, a reversal of the action of the last session in the passage of the Sunday closing proviso attached to World's Fair appropriations. The editorial expression of the *News* is republished below.]

CONGRESS has been rather freely criticized for its action in attaching to the World's Fair grant, a proviso that the Fair must not be open on Sunday, and a movement has been started to secure the abrogation of this provision at the December session. It is felt, and not without considerable reason, that the recent action of Congress is inconsistent with the principles of individual liberty of conscience, upon which our Government was founded, and may be looked upon as a direct movement in favor of the union of Church and State. Prompted by this sentiment, the promoters of the new movement call on the people to hold meetings all over the country, and pass reso-

* Hon. Richard W. Thompson, "The Papacy and the Civil Power." Page 45.

lutions requesting and instructing their representatives in Congress to vote for the repeal of the Sunday closing condition in the World's Fair appropriation.

This appeal will scarcely be without some effect, and many meetings of the kind desired will doubtless be held as soon as the presidential election excitement is over, when there will yet be time left to take action on the other matter. The condition imposed by Congress appears on its face to be in direct violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides that Congress shall pass no laws respecting the establishment of any religion or prohibiting the exercise of any religion. Judge Storey, one of the ablest judges, declared that the object of the framers of the Constitution was not alone to prevent the establishment of a national religion, but also to prevent any religious legislation. Now a minority of the population of the country come forward and say they want legislation and Congress yields to them, utterly ignoring the vast majority who have protested against any such interference with their constitutional rights.

Religious Proclamations.

AN interesting question arose recently, in this State, in regard to the President's Proclamation declaring October 21st a legal holiday. The Governor of New York issued no proclamation; and the question that arose was, "Does the President's Proclamation make the 21st of October a legal holiday in New York?" The law of New York makes New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Christmas, and every general election day, public holidays; also any other day appointed or recommended, by the governor of the State or the President of the United States, as a day of thanksgiving or fasting and prayer, or other religious observance.

The view of the matter generally taken in this city was thus expressed by a leading lawyer:—

The President of the United States has appointed or recommended that Friday, October 21, 1892, be set apart as a holiday, and in that proclamation the President recommends that the people cease from their daily vocations and devote themselves to such exercises as may best give honor to the discovery of America. *He further recommends that the people assemble in the churches, and by religious exercises, in a fitting manner, give expressions of gratitude to Divine Providence for the divine care which has directed our history and blessed our people. By this proclamation the President has set aside this day especially for religious observance, and by so doing he has brought the day within the provision of the New York statute as being one set aside for religious observance.* It seems to me there can be little doubt that the President's proclamation makes October 21, 1892, a legal holiday in the State of New York.

It does not seem necessary that the Governor of the State of New York should make any proclamation upon this subject in order to make to-morrow a legal holiday any more than it would be for the Governor to make a proclamation making New Year's Day a legal holiday, for the New York State statute makes any day set apart by the President of the United States for religious observance a holiday just as much as the same statute makes New Year's Day a legal holiday.

It has so long been the custom in this country for the President and the governors of the several States to appoint an annual thanksgiving day that very few people think strange that it should be so, and never stop to inquire as to the propriety of a civil ruler setting apart a day for religious purposes. But the way in which this has been put in the foregoing

legal opinion, presents this matter in a little different light. In this opinion it is said, and correctly so too, that the day was "set apart by the President of the United States as a day of religious observance." This leads to the inquiry, What right has the President, or any other civil officer, to set apart a day for religious purposes?

The framers of the Constitution certainly had no thought of conferring upon the President the power to set apart days for religious purposes. President Jefferson, who certainly understood the real intent of the Constitution as well as any man, refused to issue any religious proclamation, and in a letter to Rev. Mr. Miller, near the close of his second term, gave his reason thus:—

I consider the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, disciplines, or exercises.

Under the rule laid down by Chief Justice Waite, namely, that to ascertain the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution, we must go "to the history of the times in the midst of which the provision was adopted," religious proclamations are clearly excluded. Of this amendment Jefferson said that it directly precluded the United States from assuming an authority over religious exercises.

To the plea that a thanksgiving proclamation was only a recommendation, Jefferson said:—

But it is only proposed that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should indirectly assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded them from. It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty, on those who disregard it; not, indeed, of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription, perhaps, in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a law of conduct for those to whom it is directed?

Concerning the effect of such proclamations on religion itself, Jefferson said:—

I do not believe it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the religious societies, that the general Government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the times for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets; and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, where the Constitution has deposited it.

Jefferson and Madison were the two men mainly instrumental in securing the First Amendment to the Constitution, and both regarded it as interdicting any official recognition of religion whatever. Mr. Madison in a letter to Edward Livingston, July 10, 1822, said:—

There has been a deviation from the strict principle in the executive proclamations of fasts and festivals.

If it be urged that Madison himself issued such proclamations, it will be sufficient to answer that in this same letter to Mr. Livingston, and directly upon this subject, he said:—

Whilst I was honored with the executive trust, I found it necessary, upon more than one occasion, to follow the example of my predecessors.

Mr. Madison offers an excuse but no justification for his action. But we now see that what was then only a custom has now come, especially in the light of the Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, to be regarded as law. But this only illustrates the danger in such cus-

toms. Jefferson boldly maintained that the First Amendment prohibited the issuing of religious proclamations; Madison assented to the proposition but yielded to the custom under protest, but now our President assumes without scruple to set aside a day especially for religious observance and directs the churches how they shall observe it, and everybody meekly and unquestioningly accepts his action as all right. The Nation or at least those religiously inclined in it worship as their high priest—such at least for the occasion—directs. And such direction is clearly in violation of the intent of the framers of the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution. C. P. B.

What Are The Facts?

ON the first day of last February, the *Mail and Express* of this city, published the following dispatch from Chicago:—

THE INFIDELS' SCHEME FAILS.

SALOON-KEEPERS IN CHICAGO FAVOR CLOSING THE WORLD'S FAIR ON SUNDAY.

CHICAGO, Ill., Feb. 1. The efforts on the part of the officers of the Infidel Society, known as the American Secular Union, to enlist the aid of saloon-keepers in the proposed mass meeting to oppose the Sunday closing of the World's Fair have failed. Nine-tenths of the saloon men said they were heartily in sympathy with the movement to close the Fair on Sunday. Nearly all of the Turner Societies and labor organizations in town, however, will unite with them in making a plea for a mass-meeting to be held at Central Music Hall two weeks hence.

Now the same paper denounces the statement as a lie, and has devoted considerable space to "nailing the lie." In order to know the truth of this matter, one of the editors of this paper addressed a letter to the secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association in Chicago, asking him to ascertain if possible, the real position of the saloon-keepers of that city upon the question of Sunday closing, and to communicate to us the result of his investigation. His reply is as follows:—

Chicago, Ill., Oct. 19, 1892.

C. P. BOLLMAN,

43 Bond Street, New York.

Dear Sir: Your letter asking in regard to the statement that the saloon-keepers of this city are opposed to an open Sunday Fair has been received. It is, I think, undoubtedly true that many of the saloon-keepers are opposed to Sunday opening of the Fair. When we were securing our petitions here opposing congressional action closing the Fair on Sunday, we found this to be the case. None of our regular workers made a business of soliciting signatures from saloon-keepers, but they did ask some whom they found standing at the doors of their saloons, and in many cases were told that they did not care to sign a petition that would interfere with the prosperity of their business. A gentleman in this city who secured several thousand names to the petition, told me that he worked among saloon-keepers as well as among other business men, and that he found that some utterly refused to sign the petition; others signed it after it was explained that the principles involved were of more value than their temporary gain from a closed Fair would be; and others signed willingly.

Truly yours,

A. F. BALLENGER.

It thus appears that saloon-keepers like church-members are divided upon the question of Sunday closing of the great Fair. It seems very likely that the proprietors of those saloons adjacent to the Fair grounds would like an open Fair, trusting to be benefited by the increased Sunday traffic that might reasonably be expected to come to them. Those in other parts of the city doubtless feel that they would do a better business on Sunday if the Fair were closed. This is the

reasonable view of the matter, and clearly indicates that a large majority of the Chicago saloon-keepers are not in favor of keeping the great Fair open on Sunday; for comparatively few of them could hope to be benefited by anything that would regularly attract people to one particular part of the city.

This conclusion corresponds also with statements made by others. In a letter to the *Boston Investigator*, of October 19, Mrs. M. A. Freeman, Corresponding Secretary of the American Secular Union, says:—

When the American Secular Union mass-meeting was held last winter, the saloons were visited by members of the board. Not a saloon-keeper would contribute toward the effort to secure an open Fair on Sunday. Every one declared in favor of Sunday closing. They wouldn't endorse a movement, they said, that was so plainly opposed to their own interests.

The conclusion seems irresistible that in this matter of Sunday closing a large majority of the saloon-keepers of Chicago, and the Sunday preachers are of the same mind—they expect to be mutually benefited by excluding people from Jackson Park one day in the week. C. P. B.

Sad Words from Tennessee.

THE following extract from a private letter written by an old gentleman of seventy-five, a member of the Springville Seventh-day Adventist Church, at Springville, Henry County, Tenn., tells its own story:—

I have been thinking to-day a good deal about what we would do if I should be sent to jail the latter part of January, as I certainly would be if tried for Sunday work. I presume we would have to hire a boy to take care of our little stock. I can hardly see how the family would get along without some one, and, further, if I am imprisoned about February 1, it would prevent me getting any crop in next season. But perhaps it is wrong to borrow trouble on account of these things, and perhaps I may not be among the arrested ones. The Lord will provide, and I hope I may have sustaining grace for every trial. Let us hear from you when you can find time to write, and pray for us all that we may overcome through the blood of the Lamb.

Four days later another letter from the same hand says:—

I am indicted along with some thirteen others of our church, for working on Sunday. Brother Ward told me so yesterday evening. Just who are indicted we do not exactly know. The sheriff told the person who told Brother Ward that we would be arrested either this week or next. Now what we shall have to do will be to shape ourselves as best we can for my imprisonment somewhere near Feb. 1, 1893, as conviction is sure to be the result of trial for working on Sunday. I suppose we may be allowed to go on one another's bond for our appearance at court.

The first extract told its own story. The two together tell their story. What is the story which they tell? Is it a story of the enforcement of just laws, in harmony with the injunction, "Love thy neighbor as thyself"? Is it a story of neighborly loving kindness. Does it emphasize the boast that here, in this land of the free, equal and exact justice is meted out to all? Or does it mark as with the thunder clap of approaching doom,—that all our boast has become a mockery? Justice hides her face in shame. Equality before the law is at an end. Persecution reigns. Children are called before grand juries to criminate their parents as to their non-observance of a religious doctrine. Old age is threatened with the shame of public trial and the danger to life and health in confinement to the county jail, or labor in the chain-gang on public roads. Neighborhood inquisitors

insinuate that there is no reason why women also should not suffer equal penalties for their loyalty to conscience and their courage to protest.

It would be no wonder if such things as these should cause the heart to grow weak and language to fail. But this must not be; those who, in truth, love God and neighbor and native land, must speak, and that immediately, with heart of courage and no uncertain voice. W. H. M.

Organizing to Enforce Sunday in California.

A CORRESPONDENT writes from Santa Barbara, Cal., of the formation there, on October 11, of a County Sabbath Union. In the course of the meeting these resolutions were adopted:—

Resolved, 1st, That this organization be called "The Santa Barbara County Sabbath Union," and be auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union.

2d. That it is our conviction, that in the absence of a State Sunday law, immediate efforts ought to be made to secure a county closing ordinance.

3d. We pledge our hearty co-operation with all good people to secure a Sunday law for our State.

4th. We urge upon pastors the necessity of making the doctrine of the Lord's day more prominent in the presentation of gospel truth.

5th. We urge upon Sunday-school teachers and parents the importance of giving larger attention to instruction regarding the Lord's day.

6th. This organization will use its utmost endeavor to prevent the desecration of the Lord's day by ball playing and other forms of popular amusement.

7th. This Union pledges to aid the civil authorities in the enforcement of the existing Sunday ordinance and such others as may be enacted hereafter.

Short addresses were made by different ministers present, in favor of the resolutions, in which it was said by one, in effect, that unless California should soon have a Sunday law on her statute book the work of the gospel would come to a standstill in California. Another said: "Our movement has many opposers, and the worst class of opposition comes from Seventh-day Adventists. The Jews are willing to submit to the law, but Seventh-day Adventists persist in carrying on their business in open defiance to the law of the land. *We must have an effective Sabbath-law*"

The matter of exemption clauses was raised by this question, which was handed in and read: "If we allow an exemption clause in favor of those who conscientiously keep another day as the Sabbath, will not this be used by some who are not Christians, and the law, in a measure, be ineffective?" To this the answer was made that no trouble need be anticipated on that score, "because it can be readily shown, through the people of the community in which such people live, whether they are conscientious in profession or not."

Another minister thought the discussion of that question useless, for, "As for these Seventh-day Adventists—why there is only a handful of them any way, and as for me, I waste no time on them. I don't regard them as worth the powder and shot to blow them up." All present were not of this opinion, for a Presbyterian gentleman arose and said: "I want to say in behalf of these seventh-day people that I know them to be honorable citizens, and just as good Christians as we are. I want to see fair dealing with everybody."

This called out from the minister who had already been most prominent in the meeting a dissertation upon the Sabbath

question, in which he attempted to show that Sunday was really the seventh day, prefacing his argument by the assertion that it was through ignorance that many were deceived in this matter.

At this point a Seventh-day Adventist, who was present, surprised the assembly with a short exposition of the principles of civil and religious liberty, but this same minister, who had advocated the resolutions the most zealously, replied promptly: "It is a fact that Church and State have a nearer relation than most people are aware, in the enforcement of Sunday laws, but the constitutionality of Sunday laws are now no longer a matter of argument. *The Supreme Court has settled that question in its late decision.*" He then read extracts from the opinion of Justice Brewer in the Trinity Church case holding that this is a Christian Nation, etc.

That there was considerable dissent from the positions taken by the resolutions, and those who spoke in their behalf, was shown by the remarks of laymen, and also of some ministers, in conversation after the close of the meeting, when they acknowledged that they believed it an error to attempt any coercion in matters of religion.

Meetings and discussions similar to this which our correspondent has recounted are occurring all over the country. They are very significant. It is worthy to be noticed that Justice Brewer's decision has now become the canon law of the Church and of the land, beyond which it is already impiety to inquire. The tide is rising rapidly.

A Tennessee Paper Disturbed.

THE *Christian Patriot*, published at Morristown, Tenn., is disturbed by the attitude of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, and says:—

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is continually yelping and snarling that our Sunday laws, which if enforced would secure to every laborer a Sabbath of rest, is religious legislation; because these laws are founded upon the fourth commandment and the religious convictions of the people.

Let us see. The laws forbidding murder and felonious assaults are founded on the sixth commandment and the religious opinions of the people. The laws forbidding lewdness are built on the seventh commandment and on Christianity. The laws forbidding stealing are founded on the eighth commandment. The laws forbidding perjury are founded on the ninth and third commandments. The law punishing bigamy is established on the first chapter of Genesis.

We trust that no unbeliever will be misled by the ill temper displayed by the *Patriot*, and imagine that Christianity is in any sense responsible for the unkind thrusts contained in the first paragraph of the quotation. All such things are due not to Christianity but to the lack of it.

THE SENTINEL does maintain that Sunday legislation is religious legislation; and this the *Patriot* virtually admits, and attempts to justify it. It is, however, an error to say that laws forbidding murder, lewdness, stealing, perjury, etc., are founded on the law of God as revealed in his word. Such laws existed long before the Scriptures were written, and have always existed among people totally unacquainted with divine revelation. Every offense mentioned by the *Patriot* has been punished by civil law in heathen nations and tribes with absolutely no reference to any divine law, but simply because the practice of any of these things is subver-

sive of civil order and destructive of the most obvious natural human rights.

We learn from Gen. 12: 18, 19, that over nineteen hundred years before Christ and almost five hundred years before the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, the king of Egypt recognized the right of Abraham to his own wife. And according to Miss Amelia B. Edwards, and George Rawlinson, both noted Egyptologists, the ancient Egyptians had a social code little behind our own. This does not detract in the least from the law of God as revealed in the Scriptures; it only shows the wisdom of the Creator in implanting in man such a sense of justice as would make existence not only possible but also enjoyable, to a certain extent, even under the darkness of heathenism.

That eminent moral philosopher and Christian, John Locke, thus sets forth this principle in defending the perpetuity of the marriage relation:—

The end of conjunction between male and female, being not barely procreation, but the continuation of the species, this conjunction betwixt male and female ought to last, even after procreation, so long as is necessary to the support and nourishment of the young ones, who are to be sustained by those who got them, till they are able to shift for themselves. . . . Wherein one can not but admire the wisdom of the great Creator, who having given to man foresight, and an ability to lay up for the future, as well as to supply present necessity, hath made it necessary, that the society of man and wife should be more lasting than of male and female amongst other creatures.

The principles thus applied to marriage by Locke, are equally true of all natural social relations; they are indicated by, and the rules that should govern them may readily be deduced from, the very nature of the relations themselves. We are not dependent upon revelation for a knowledge of the mutual obligations resting upon intelligent, social beings; for the Creator has written the laws that should govern human intercourse in the great book of nature, as well as in the volume of his revealed will. This truth is recognized in the Declaration of Independence, in the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The principles of God's moral law are not self-evident. It is true that they appeal to man's better nature when brought home to his conscience by the divine Spirit, but it is nevertheless true that man can not "by searching find out God." It is, therefore, upon the law revealed in nature, and not upon the law revealed in holy writ, that all just civil laws are based.

It is obvious from the principles stated that God could never commit to man the administration of His written law. That law being spiritual is vastly more than a civil code; it is a moral law; and God as the only moral Governor must administer it himself or else abdicate his throne. For if it were the province of the State to interpret and administer the law of God, the subject of that law would ask, not, What does God require? but, What does the State require? Not, What does the law of God say? but, What does the State say about the law of God? Thus, man's thought and loyalty would be diverted from God to his vicegerent, the State.

And not only would men seek merely to know the will of the State, caring little whether or not it was also the will of God, but the State being the divinely ordained interpreter and administrator of the di-

vine law, God himself would be bound by the action of the State. That which the State prohibited would be sin; and that which it permitted would be virtue, regardless of the real purpose of the divine Lawgiver. For it is not supposable that God would clothe the State with authority to define and enforce his law and yet hold the subject responsible for the errors of the State.

But that mistakes are made when the State attempts to define the divine law is admitted. The *Patriot* says:—

We have no laws which are not based directly or remotely on the Bible. Some of them are bad laws; because our exegesis is bad, and they do not truly represent the teachings of the Bible.

And yet men must be governed by such laws under civil penalties—even when they believe that they are contrary to the law of God, and when to obey them is to violate their conscientious convictions of duty toward God! Does any man in his sober senses believe that God ever ordained such a system? Does it not the rather bear the impress of "that man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God"? C. P. B.

Newspaper Comments on Persecutions in Tennessee.

REFERRING to the recent trials and imprisonments of members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Tennessee for working on Sunday, the *Baltimore Sun*, under the head, "Are There Blue Laws in Tennessee?" says:—

A story comes from Tennessee which recalls the old times in Massachusetts when people had their ears cut off, and were branded with hot irons, to promote the cause of religion. . . . To put the brand of a felon upon good citizens merely for obeying their consciences by observing the Sabbath of the Old Testament and engaging in an occupation in a remote field on Sunday, seems to bring back the old days of witch-burning and branding for heresy.

The *Des Moines weekly News*, of October 4, comments upon the same as follows:—

A shameful outrage was recently committed at Paris, Henry County, Tenn., in the trial and punishment of four Seventh-day Adventists for performing ordinary farm labor on Sunday, after having observed the seventh day as the Sabbath. After lying in jail over six weeks, three of these Christian men were, on Monday, July 18, marched through the streets in company with some criminals, and put to work shoveling on the common highway. All three were men of families, one fifty-five and another sixty-two years of age, and all are vouched for as good citizens. Tennessee ought to make haste to make such outrages legally impossible.

The *New York Independent* of October 6, thus expresses itself:—

We have again and again, during the last few years, had occasion to express our profound indignation at the administration of Tennessee law as applied to some country farmers belonging to the Seventh-day Adventist body, who, after having faithfully kept the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week, worked in their field on the first day of the week. This prosecution has been renewed, and three men of families, one fifty-five and another sixty-two years of age, were convicted, and have, during the summer and autumn, been working out their fine, being set to work with criminals at shoveling on the common highway. They refused to pay their fine, declaring that it was unjust, and that they were liable to be arrested again as soon as they were released. We have said before, and we say again, that this is bad law, bad morals and bad religion.

The *Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times*, of October 9, prints the article in the *Baltimore Sun* from which we have above

quoted, styling it "a scathing arraignment of the authorities in our West Tennessee counties, for persecuting good citizens of those communities for working in their fields on Sunday." Continuing, the editor of the *Times* says:—

The citizens in question are Seventh-day Adventists, a church that observes Saturday as its Sabbath, and, when able to do so quietly and so as not to disturb their Sunday-keeping neighbors, work on that day at their usual vocations. The men who were arrested, fined and imprisoned in the cases noticed by the *Sun*, were found to have worked in fields remote from the highway on the first day of the week. The State's Attorney, who prosecuted them told the jury the defendants were good, orderly, thrifty citizens; that their records for morality were above reproach; that they had been guilty of no offense save the violation of a mouldy statute, which clearly meddles with citizens' religious convictions and practices; that they had only labored when they thought it their duty to labor, but that they had nevertheless violated the law; and on this admission of theirs he demanded their punishment. They were, as we have said, fined and flung into a dirty jail, the detention station of vile offenders, where they served out their sentence. One amiable old man, an Adventist, a farmer named King, for a like "offense," was fined, jailed, pursued and worried by the pious attorneys and immaculate courts of West Tennessee until he sickened and died; and his persecutors testified, with one voice, that Mr. King was a good man, and in all, save his working on Sunday, a law-abiding citizen of the most scrupulous kind. Ought not this absurd, injurious, disgraceful law to be repealed? We think it ought.

The Seventh-day Adventist is a considerable and growing religious denomination over the country. It has many intelligent and progressive adherents in this State, Hon. W. P. Tolley being of the number. It has built, and for many years conducted, a great school at Battle Creek, Mich., and owns and conducts at the same place one of the most successful sanitariums in the country, and one of the largest. It has two similar institutions in northwestern States. Its directing body desires to build institutions of this kind in the South. One of its prominent ministers and other members of the church, have hoped they might be justified in recommending to the church the founding of a college and sanitarium on Lookout Mountain, near this city; but the miserable persecution of their brethren in West Tennessee has given them pause. The State will probably lose this large investment, since its courts, in one grand division, and prosecuting officers, have displayed toward their fellow-citizens of Adventist faith the spirit that brought into being and kept alive the Spanish Inquisition.

We allow the railroads to haul tens of thousands of tons over the State on Sundays every year. Passenger trains run regularly on Sunday, so do our local trains of transport, and the latter do their best and most profitable day's work on Sunday. Hacks are busy on the first day of the week in all the towns. Our wives or servants do rather more cooking on that day than on any other. The newspapers find it the most profitable day of publication. All these are secular affairs; and yet we permit a lot of bigots to haul up and punish inoffensive Christians, because they feel they can not afford to be idle two days, and their conscience demands that they devote the seventh day to the worship of God.

Repeat this miserable relic of the Blue Laws, that we inherited from North Carolina, on whom it was imposed by bigots of the last century.

The *Chicago Herald* of Oct. 15, says:—

It seems as if a deep laid scheme were entered into to crush the Adventists.

Champions of Sunday Laws but Violators of Other Statutes.

PERHAPS there is no class of individuals who spend more of their energies dwelling upon the importance of obeying the laws than the representatives of the several organizations that have sprung into existence in the last few years for the purpose of enforcing Sunday laws. A favorite argument with these people is that these Sunday laws should be enforced because it is subversive of good government to allow statutes so plain as the Sunday laws in most of our States, to be trampled upon with impunity. They in-

sist that the people must be compelled to obey the laws, and rest on Sunday. Just how much this talk is actuated by the true principles of patriotism and a desire to observe laws that are generally admitted to be good, may be seen quite clearly by giving a little attention to some things that are now being done in Chicago by these Sunday closing advocates.

On Sunday afternoon, September 25, a mass-meeting was held in Chicago for the purpose of creating sentiment that would induce the merchants on the "West Side" to keep their stores closed on Sunday. The Chicago papers in reporting the meeting made the fact quite prominent that it is proposed to boycott all the merchants who would not close their places of business on the "American Sabbath." That the papers were not unjust in making these statements may be seen from the following preamble and resolution which was adopted at the meeting:—

WHEREAS, It is contrary to the laws of Illinois and against the express wish of the people of Chicago, propagated through the churches and labor organizations through the agency of the daily press, for the clothing stores to open their doors on the Sabbath day; and,

WHEREAS, The citizens of the West Side, in mass-meeting assembled, on this Sunday, September 25, do earnestly protest against the continuance of this evil; therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be the sense of this meeting that we, the purchasing public of this, the West Side, do agree not to purchase any goods sold by any store that may keep open its doors on the Sabbath.

This resolution in the most express terms declares a general boycott. They combine together "not to purchase any goods sold by any store that may keep open on the Sabbath. No matter what may be thought or believed in regard to the sanctity of Sunday, and whether or not it be a Christian institution, it must be admitted that the boycott is not a Christian method of compelling the merchants of Chicago to keep the day, in order to give some of their clerks an opportunity to obey it without losing their job. The individual who does not have enough faith in the principles of the Christian religion to lead him to observe the day without having it fixed so that he can do it without the risk of losing his job, has not learned the first principles of Christianity.

But notice that the first preamble to this resolution starts out with a tribute of respect to the laws of Illinois, of course reference being made to the laws in regard to Sunday. If these champions of law have read the statutes of Illinois very extensively, they have without doubt observed the following, taken from the "Revised Statutes of Illinois," Chicago Legal News Co., edition of 1887, edited by Harvey B. Hurd, page 438:—

If any two or more persons conspire or agree together, or the officers or executive committee of any society or organization or corporation, shall issue or utter any circular or edict as the action of or instruction to its members, or any other persons, societies, organizations or corporations, for the purpose of establishing a so-called boycott or BLACK LIST, or shall post or distribute any written or printed notice in any place with the fraudulent or malicious intent wrongfully and wickedly to injure the person, character, business, or employment, or property of another, or to obtain money or other property by false pretenses, or to any illegal act injurious to the public trade, health, morals, police, or administration of public justice, or to prevent competition in the letting of any contract by the State, or the authorities of any counties, city, town, or village, or to induce any person not to enter into such competition, or to commit any felony, they shall be deemed guilty of a conspiracy; and every such offender, whether as individuals or as the officers of any society or organization, and every person convicted of conspir-

acy at common law, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not exceeding five years, or fined not exceeding \$2,000, or both.

Now we submit the question in all candor, whether it is not just as wicked to trample under foot this law of Illinois against boycott, as it is to obliterate the Sunday statute; or will these Chicago people who are holding these mass-meetings in favor of the Sunday law insist that it is all right to trample under foot every other law of the State if need be, in their frantic zeal to enforce the observance of Sunday. And we would continually hold the matter up before all the people that such methods of procedure are anything else but Christian. No one should allow himself to be ensnared into such wickedness and folly.

A. O. TAIT.

Intolerance Becoming Apparent.

It is every day becoming more apparent that there exists in this country in the hearts of men, an intolerance which few supposed could co-exist with the culture, enlightenment, and Christian sentiment of our Republic. The surprise at the discovery of this intolerance is only equaled when the apologies of its defenders are examined, as the following correspondence will prove.

The correspondence resulted from a document sent out by the National Religious Liberty Association, narrating how three Seventh-day Adventist farmers of Henry County, Tenn., were imprisoned for forty-five days, and afterwards worked in the chain-gang on the highway, for the crime (?) of performing common labor on their own premises on Sunday, after observing the previous day as the Sabbath.

Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 4, 1892.

"MR. A. F. BALLENGER,
Chicago, Ill.

"Dear Sir: The observance of Sunday as a day of rest is required by our civil ordinances, enacted by our people in self government.

"Any one who can not keep our laws should be punished, or he should go to some other country where the laws suit him.

"The observance of Sunday as a day of rest from ordinary labor, does not exclude the enjoyment of rational and healthy recreation, and has nothing to do as a civil institution, with the worship of God. Any one is privileged to worship God in his own way, on Sunday or any other day of the week, or every day in the week.

"There is no persecution, nor any abridgment of religious liberty in our civil laws relating to the keeping of Sunday as a day of rest from the performance of common labor.

Yours truly,
D. W. MILLER,
Editor *Carriage World*."

"Chicago, Ill., Oct. 6, 1892.

"MR. D. W. MILLER,
Editor *Carriage World*,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

"Dear Sir: Your communication of the 4th inst. just received. It is a frank statement of your views of the justice of placing Christian farmers in the chain-gang, and working them on the streets as a punishment for performing farm labor on their own premises on Sunday, after having observed the previous day, as the fourth commandment enjoined.

"Your frankness is commendable, not-

withstanding your views are most tyrannical. Doubtless there are others who hold with you on the subject, but up to date, no one has had the courage to declare in favor of persecution as you have done. I take it for granted that you have no objection to my publishing your letter. It will be of great service to the cause of religious liberty, since it will awaken some to the fact that intolerance exists outside of Tennessee. One great trouble in enlisting broad minded public men in this question is that we are unable to convince them that the intolerant spirit, manifested in your letter, can be found outside a few benighted neighborhoods in the South.

"We do not question your sincerity in advocating punishment in the chain-gang, or banishment, for people who differ with you in religious practice, for Christ himself said to his disciples, 'The time cometh when whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service.' However, Judge Hammond, of the United States Circuit Court, though deciding against these persecuted Christians in Tennessee, says:—

"It is a somewhat humiliating spectacle to see the Sunday advocates trying to justify the continuance of Sunday legislation, and thereby reaping its advantages to them as sectarians, upon the argument that it is not in conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom. It surely is, and the economic value of a day of rest can not take that contention out of the category of being insincere as well as illogical.

"My belief in your sincerity leads me to attempt to enlighten you on this point, and for this purpose, I enclose a tract, entitled 'The Civil Sabbath.' Please give it a careful reading, and believe me,

Yours with respect,

A. F. BALLENGER."

"Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 8, 1892.

"MR. A. F. BALLENGER,

"Dear Sir: In response to your favor of October 6, I will say I have no objection to your publishing my reply to your former letter, but I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am in accord with your views as expressed in the Articles 1 and 2 of your Constitution and the Declaration of Principles, but I do not regard the breaking of our present laws, the proper way to bring about a reform in them. We have other, more peaceable and effective means of reforming our laws—if they are wrong. I said nothing about placing Christian farmers in the chain-gang, as you infer. But, inasmuch as there is nothing in our present laws prohibiting any one from worshipping God in his own way and time, and having a Sabbath every day in the week, if he wants it, I fail to see the justice of your argument on that point. I believe the seventh day to be the divinely appointed Sabbath, but in a religious sense, it is immaterial what day of the week you count from. It is only possible to have a general rest-day by common agreement and to insure such a day once in every seven, it was necessary to enact civil laws to insure its observance. This was not done solely on religious grounds or for religious purposes. Other purposes equally important, make a rest day once in seven a necessity.

"Having once agreed on a day, it is difficult to conceive of any good reason for changing it, and those people who can't abide by our laws, ought to go to some other country. We suggest the Desert of Sahara as a place favorable to the carrying out of their plans without interruption.

"The idea that liberty means the privilege of doing as you please without regard to others, is anarchistic. The obedience to the powers that be is just as divine in its essence as that in observance of the seventh day of rest. Quibbling about the calling of a day *seventh* or the *first* is childish at this period of the world's history.

"If imprisonment and the chain-gang is too severe a punishment in the judgment of Tennesseans for its citizens who break its Sunday laws, that is a matter which its citizens are competent to alter, but it would be easier to comply with the laws as they are.

Yours truly,

D. W. MILLER."

"Chicago, Ill., Oct. 17, 1892.

"MR. D. W. MILLER,

"Editor *Carriage World*,
"Cincinnati, Ohio.

"Dear Sir: Your favor of the 8th inst., written I take it, to prevent your former letter being 'misunderstood,' has been received, and its contents noted. If there was any danger of your position, as presented in your first letter, being misunderstood, that danger is wholly removed by your second communication. I fear, however, that you misunderstand your own position, for I can not conceive how you can understandingly hold the views your letters contain.

"With a view to converting you from the error of your way, I will state your position in its true light. This letter is inspired with a brother's interest in you, but I shall be frank, for I believe your case requires 'heroic treatment.'

"You believe (1) 'the seventh day to be the divinely appointed Sabbath'; and (2) that 'it is immaterial what day you count from' in ascertaining which day is the 'divinely appointed Sabbath.' You believe (3) that after you, with the majority, have done the counting, and 'divinely appointed' the first day to be the seventh day, that it is 'necessary to enact civil laws to insure its observance'; and (4) after you have 'divinely appointed' the first day to be the seventh day, and secured the enactment of a law enforcing your opinion, 'it is difficult to conceive of any good reason for changing it.' You further believe that 'those people who can not abide by our laws (laws made to enforce the observance of the seventh day on the first day) ought to go to some other country.' You suggest (5) the Desert of Sahara (not an oasis in that desert where human life might be preserved, but the uninhabitable waste of burning sand) as a place favorable to the carrying out of their plans without molestation.

"You believe (6) that when Christians refuse to accept your 'divinely appointed' count and prefer to obey the command of God, 'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work,' and patiently suffer the penalty of your law in the chain-gang, that their conduct is 'anarchistic.'

"You believe (7) that 'obedience to the powers that be (when you are in power and desire to enforce your views of the fourth commandment on others) is just as divine as the commandment requiring a 'seventh day of rest.' You do not believe with the Apostle Peter that 'We ought to obey God rather than men'; but on the contrary you believe (8) that we ought to obey men rather than God.

"You believe after your 'childish' 'quibbling' by which you come to the conclusion that the seventh day of the Bible, the almanac, and all history, is the first day of the Bible, the almanac, and all history, that (9) 'quibbling about calling a day the seventh, or the first, is childish at this period of the world's history.'

"You do not favor even the modification of the laws which place Tennessee Christians in jail and work them in the chain-gang for laboring on their farms six days according to the commandment; but believe (10) 'it would be easier to comply with the laws as they are.' You believe (11) in religious liberty(!)

"Hoping that this frank statement of your position may lead you to discover its mediæval tyranny, and as a result, effect your conversion, I am,

Yours for religious freedom,

A. F. BALLENGER."

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

A COMPLAINT against street pavers, in the city of Detroit, Mich., for working on Sunday in the neighborhood of a church has developed into an organized crusade against all Sunday labor. The opportunity has also been taken, in one pulpit, to antagonize that clause of the commandment which says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and also those who observe that day.

ACCORDING to the *Oxford Leader*, the Mayor of Oxford, Iowa, has just issued the following proclamation:—

Oxford, Iowa, Oct. 6, 1892.

To the business men of Oxford:

You are hereby requested to keep your public places of business closed on the Sabbath days, on and after the publication of this notice, or suffer the penalties of the law and ordinance of the incorporated town of Oxford.

A. J. DARNER, Mayor.

THE Marlowe Theater, at Englewood, the Chicago suburb, where the Sunday closing excitement raged so hotly some time ago, is again open on Sunday evenings, and unmolested. The managers of the theater give as their reason for opening Sunday nights, that the church people did not live up to their agreement to patronize the theater six nights in the week, and they were, therefore, not bound to keep their part of the contract to close Sunday nights. Now, perhaps, the Sunday closing faction of Englewood will deny that this agreement and alliance was ever made.

THE *Leader*, of Altus, Texas, referring to the Sunday laws of Tennessee under which the late prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists has been held, says:—

The same law encumbers the statute books of nearly every State in the Union, while the Constitution of each guarantees to every man the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Such prosecutions can only be classed as persecutions.

And they are persecutions, pure and simple—nothing more, nothing less.

THE *Centralia Enterprise*, of Centralia, Wis., commenting, editorially, upon the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, says:—

Wendell Phillips used to say that persecution is but a confession of lack of faith in one's own convictions. It really seems that way, when one sees a brutal majority enforce laws which, on their very face, violate the plainest dictates of right and reason.

It is true that religious laws do violate the plainest dictates of right and reason. The *Enterprise*

can see this to be a fact. Who can tell what blinds the mental vision of Sunday-law advocates and hardens their hearts, that they should be willing to do these things which are so clearly unjust and cruel?

THE French Senate has adopted a resolution, by a vote of four to one, which declares that Romanism is dangerous to social peace and the rights of the State. How long will it be before Congress or the Supreme Court will be asked to decide, by some such measure, that this is not only a "Christian Nation," but a "Protestant Christian Nation"? This time is likely to come soon. When it does come it will not result in a separation of Roman Catholicism from the State and the Government, but quite the contrary. It will result in a coalition of the three.

"National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution"

Is an excellent publication to loan or give to those who think that there is no danger in the National Reform movement. It is No. 26 of the *Sentinel Library* and costs one cent per copy; 50 cents per hundred.

"Union of Church and State,"

No. 31 of the *Sentinel Library*, shows just what may constitute a union of Church and State, and is just the thing for those who imagine that nothing of the kind is possible in this country. This tract should have a wide circulation. Its price is also one cent per copy; 50 cents per hundred.

"Why We Oppose Religious Legislation"

Is an excellent tract to put into the hands of your neighbors and friends to explain to them your attitude toward Sunday laws and kindred measures. It is No. 21 of the *Sentinel Library*, and will cost you only 3 cents per copy, or \$1.50 per hundred. A single copy might be loaned to, and be read by, several of your neighbors.

"A Civil Sabbath,"

No. 30 of the *Sentinel Library*, is just the thing to expose the fallacies of the so-called "civil Sabbath" argument. More people are astray on this question than on almost any other bearing upon religious legislation. The candid can be set straight on it at the cost of one cent each, for that is the price of this tract; or one tract might be loaned to several readers which would give still greater results at very small expense. This tract will also be furnished at 50 cents per hundred.

"In the Chain-gang."

READER, have you done anything to assist in circulating that excellent tract, "In the Chain-gang for Conscience' Sake," noticed in this paper three weeks ago? If not, be sure to send at once to the National Religious Liberty Association, Battle Creek, Mich., for a good supply, and then scatter them among your neighbors. This tract is a brief history of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee; it costs only fifty cents per hundred, and will surely be read by everyone who sees it.

Address all Orders to
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
12th & Castro Streets, | 43 Bond Street,
OAKLAND, CAL. | NEW YORK.

