



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 16, 1893.

NUMBER 7.

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, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

Now that Congress has gone beyond the Constitution on one point, for religion's sake, and has legislated to close the World's Fair on Sunday, it may, for the same reason, go beyond it on any or every point.

THE Congress of the United States had no right to put the Bible into its legislation and make it the basis of any legislative measure. The Constitution is the proper basis of congressional legislation, not the Bible. But the Constitution has been ignored and legislation had upon an assumed Biblical basis. To reach this the Constitution has been violated, the word of God has been blasphemed, and a statutory misinterpretation of a divine commandment has been had.

THE commandment says the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord; but in the face of this plain declaration the Senate of the United States has put its own interpretation upon that commandment, and has declared that the statement "the seventh day is the Sabbath" means "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Thus the Congress of the United States has taken the fourth commandment from the Bible and put it into its legislation, and has put its own interpretation upon the divine statute.

IF Congress can do this in one case, can interpret the Bible in one point, it can do it in any case; it can interpret the Bible on every point. When Congress went beyond the Constitution in this, as it did, it put itself and the Government in line with all the Church and State governments that have ever been, and assumed to itself to be the interpreter of the Bible for all the people in the land, and for all who come into the land. More than that, it not only assumed to itself the right and

the authority to interpret and enforce divine law as such, but in doing that it put the stamp of its legislative approval upon a given religious and doctrinal belief. It made an adherence to that belief and observance distinctively necessary to citizenship under this Government. It built a surer foundation for that line of judicial precedent in religious law for which there has never heretofore been any adequate basis.

THIS is not strictly an adequate basis, but it will no doubt be accepted as such, in connection with the Supreme Court decision that this is a "Christian Nation." It may be that the Supreme Court will be called upon during the coming year to state its position upon this definitely, and not in general terms. This may be brought about through the question of State rights, as to whether Congress has any jurisdiction within the municipality of Chicago by which it may enforce the Sunday-closing proviso, or lay any penalty for its non-observance. It may come through an appeal from the lower courts of some case brought under a religious statute or judicial precedent. However it may come it is not probable that the Supreme Court can long avoid the responsibility of defining directly the position which it has taken in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity of New York. When that point is reached the Supreme Court will face an awkward alternative. It will be necessary either to antagonize openly the First Amendment to the Constitution, and indirectly the Tenth Amendment by assuming for Congress powers which have not been granted to it; or the opinion of Justice Brewer that this is a "Christian Nation," and in which the entire bench concurred, will have to be overruled.

THE possibilities, rather even the probabilities, of the continuance of the Sunday-closing contest as regards the World's Fair,—and of appeal to the highest court of Sunday-law cases on their merits,—are fraught with much that is uncomfortable to the occupants of the Supreme Bench. Congress took the fatal step in haste last session. In shame at the position in which it finds itself and in fear of the Church party it refuses now to retrace its

steps, or even consider the propriety of so doing. When the Supreme Court is put in a similar position what will be its attitude? Will it refuse to review or antagonize the Brewer decision and allow this revolution to take its course?

The Tennessee Prosecutions for Sunday Labor.

THE past week has been an eventful one in the history of the "Adventist cases," as they are familiarly called in Paris, even the Attorney-General using that term when addressing the Court.

Prior to last summer, about five thousand dollars had been spent in this State in defending persons accused of nuisance by violation of the Sunday laws; but apparently nothing was accomplished; and in the cases of last summer, practically no defense was made. The defendants simply made a statement to the Court that they were conscientious in working on Sunday, believing that they had a constitutional and God-given right to do so. They were, however, convicted, and upon refusal to pay the fine and costs, amounting in each case to about twenty-five dollars, were imprisoned in the county jail and required to work upon the streets in the chain-gang with several negroes convicted for larceny and other offenses against the State.

The facts just stated, coming to the knowledge of Prof. Jas. T. Ringgold, a member of the Baltimore Bar and Professor of Law in the Baltimore University, that gentleman proposed to the National Religious Liberty Association, through whose publications he had learned the facts, that if he were permitted to do so, he would appear and defend the persecuted men in the present cases. His kind offer was accepted both by the association and by the several defendants, and in order to afford Professor Ringgold every facility possible, Mr. W. L. Carter, of the bar of this place, was employed to assist him in the defense.

At this stage of the proceedings, Ex-Senator Tolley, of this State, appeared upon the scene, having been attracted by the notoriety of the "Adventist cases," and by his interest in the principle involved. The ex-senator, who, by the way, is a Primitive Baptist, proposed that

his friend, Ex-Governor Porter, formerly judge of this judicial circuit and subsequently chief magistrate of the State, should also be brought into the case. Some doubt was expressed as to the possibility of securing the services of Judge Porter, but when asked if he would appear as counsel in behalf of the persecuted men, he not only consented, but, like Professor Ringgold, proposed to give his services freely because of his interest in the cases, his respect for the parties interested, and for the sake of the principle involved.

In an interview given to a reporter of the *Memphis Commercial*, and published in that paper on the 3rd inst., Governor Porter said:—

My consent to take part in defending these cases is not based upon any sympathy with the peculiar tenets of the denomination to which these defendants belong, but is simply due to my desire to vindicate the rights and liberties of all citizens in our State. I believe that the action of our courts with reference to this question of compulsory Sunday idleness has hitherto been in contravention of the principles of American liberty, as well as contrary to the expressed provision of the constitution of our State, according to my construction of it in regard to religious equality, and I am gratified to have the opportunity of doing what I can to reverse that action in the interest of humanity and of true liberty, as I understand it. I have always understood that these people are peaceable and law-abiding citizens, and I have yet to learn that the acts for which they are indicted have injured or discommoded their fellow-citizens in any way, or interfered in the slightest with any substantial rights of others. Regarding them as I do, as the representatives of a great principle, apart altogether from the religious aspects of their belief or their conduct, I have no hesitation in saying that I sincerely hope that they will successfully emerge from their present legal difficulty.

Upon examination, the attorneys found that several of the indictments were defective. These, six in number, were quashed by the court upon motion. This left but two cases for trial at this term; and, at this writing, only one of these has been disposed of, namely that of W. D. Dortch, described in the indictment as "Billy Dortch." This case was taken up on the third instant and resulted in a verdict of acquittal, without the jury leaving their seats.

It was proved in Mr. Dortch's case that he had worked on two separate and distinct Sundays. On one occasion he was seen, by two witnesses, working in his garden, and on another, he was seen, by one witness, "piling chunks" in a clearing on the back part of his farm. The Attorney-General made a desperate effort to prove that it was the custom of the defendant to work on Sunday, even going so far as to subpoena and attempt to put upon the stand, Mr. Dortch's own son, a boy of only ten years of age. But this, Judge Swiggart would not permit.

In his plea to the jury, the Attorney-General made an effort to appeal to their religious prejudices, but upon objection, the Judge instructed him to confine his remarks to the record. This left him with but little to say and not in first-class humor for saying it; nevertheless he continued for several minutes pleading for a verdict of conviction, which he insisted the jury must bring in or else violate their oath.

The charge of the Judge was very fair, and so was destructive to all the hopes of the prosecution; and at its conclusion the Attorney-General abandoned the case, saying that the State would consent to an acquittal, and so, with the consent of the jury, the Judge at once entered a verdict of not guilty, and the case was at an end.

The attorneys are very anxious to take

one case to the Supreme Court, feeling confident that a favorable termination can be reached there; and so have proposed to submit the remaining case upon a statement of facts, covering all the salient points at issue. It is probable, however, that the Attorney-General, who is more of a politician than a lawyer, will not agree to such a presentation as will get the facts fairly before the court of last resort, and that no appeal can be made to the Supreme Court at this time, as he has it in his power to refuse to try the remaining case at this term of court.

Public sentiment has changed a good deal in this county since the trials last summer. The attitude assumed toward "Adventist cases" by such men as Professor Ringgold, Ex-Senator Tolley, and Ex-Governor Porter has set people to thinking, and while bigotry and intolerance still live here they are becoming ashamed and are found hiding under various subterfuges.

Judge Swiggart has evidently grown tired of having his court turned into a religious inquisition, and while his view of the law and his understanding of the decision of the Supreme Court compel him to lend himself to some extent to persecution for conscience' sake, there is small room to doubt that he has no sympathy for the persecution and that he would be heartily glad to see the court of last resort reverse its own decision in the Parker case, thus leaving him free to order a discontinuance of the proceedings against the Adventists in his district. More details and farther interesting facts will be given in future letters.

Paris, Tenn.

C. P. B.

To Try the Case upon Its Merits.

A CORRESPONDENT for the *Memphis Commercial*, at the Seventh-day Adventist trials at Paris, Tenn., publishes an interview had previous to the calling of the cases, with Professor James T. Ringgold, who was there for the purpose of taking part in the defense. Mr. Ringgold is a member of the Baltimore Bar and lecturer in the Baltimore Law School. This is what Mr. Ringgold said:—

"I suppose you want me to tell you how I came to be here, and what I expect to do. I have taken considerable interest for a number of years in the Sunday law question, and through a work on that subject which I recently wrote, I became acquainted with the National Religious Liberty Association, which I found to be composed largely of 'Seventh-Day Adventists.' As the association and myself had a warm joint interest in the cause of religious liberty, we have ever since been in correspondence. When I learned of the proceedings against the Seventh-day Adventists in this county, which are similar to those to which our Hebrew fellow-citizens are occasionally subjected in Maryland, I at once wrote to the secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association, stating that if I could be of any service whatever in defending these men, it would give me pleasure to volunteer my time and labor in the good cause. My proposition was accepted, and that is how I happen to be on the ground. You will understand, therefore, that my concern in the matter is by no means that of mere counsel, but that of a citizen who believes that there is an issue at stake in all such

cases as these, irrespective altogether of their results, so far as the individuals are concerned. With this idea I have persuaded my friends to allow me to exhaust every legal resource in their favor, and have associated myself with W. L. Carter of your bar. I may add that the statement which has appeared in a number of papers to the effect that Hon. Robert G. Ingersoll and Hon. Don M. Dickinson have been retained for the defense in these cases is a mistake.

"Of course this is not the time to detail any of the points which Mr. Carter and I propose to argue, either before the court or the jury, but I have no objection to telling you that we rest our confidence of winning our cases largely upon an expression which was used by Judge Swiggart in a previous case of similar character. The learned judge is reported to have declared that he intended to have the laws 'strictly enforced.' This is just what we desire, and all that we desire. We shall make no captious objections at any stage, nor will we contend for delay for its own sake. We shall proceed on the assumption that in order that a criminal law shall be 'strictly enforced' it is necessary at every point that the strictness shall be exercised in favor of the accused and not against him. If we can show to the satisfaction of the learned judge that there is a reasonable doubt as to any one single proposition of law growing out of these cases we shall urge upon him that the strict enforcement of the law requires him to give us the benefit of that doubt just as much as its strict enforcement will require that the jury, if we ever get to the jury, shall give us the benefit of every reasonable doubt as to the facts. I may say that we are satisfied that we shall not get to the jury, if the learned judge will favor us with that strict construction of the law for which we shall contend. The reputation of Judge Swiggart is a sufficient guaranty that his rulings will be conscientious, and our endeavor will be to see that they cover every possible point, not only in order that we have the benefit of all the law that there is for us, but also in order that we may know precisely where we stand for the future. Our strength is that many of what we believe to be our strongest points do not appear to have been seriously argued or explicitly decided in previous cases, either by the learned judge of this circuit or the courts of last resort in Tennessee. In fact, it would be hard to find a case anywhere in which the merits of the Sunday law question have been thoroughly and exhaustively elucidated."

"I understand from what you tell me, Mr. Ringgold, that you are not, yourself, a member of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination?"

"No, I am not. I am a communicant in the Episcopal Church, but while my denomination has special religious services on Sunday, just as it has on Christmas day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, Ascension day, the forty days of Lent, and on many saints' days, I am not aware of anything in its doctrine or discipline which either requires or justifies the use of the police power of the State to compel any one, either within or outside of its pale, to observe a different line of conduct on Sunday, or on any other of the days which it especially honors, from the line of conduct which he observes on any other day. This being the case, I understand that I am as free to advocate the absolute

equality of all religions and of no religion before the civil law as is a Seventh-day Adventist. This is the cause in which I am so deeply interested, and this interest is the cause of my being in Paris at present. I want to say, also, that to my interest in the principle at stake there has of late been added a daily increasing personal interest in my clients. I have been, for some time past, studying the peculiar doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventists, as well as making acquaintances among them, and I do not hesitate to say that I regard them as the most remarkable and interesting set of people in the United States to-day. I have been fairly astounded by the combination which I find in them of intense zeal and absolute toleration. They have given the lie to the philosophy of all the ages, which has always been agreed upon the proposition that toleration can only co-exist with indifference. And they have done more than this. They have elevated toleration from a mild virtue of self-control to the position of a leading and fundamental Christian duty. Incredible as it may sound, they believe in and act upon the theory that there can be no true religion without the absolute divorcement of religious and civil influences. This is a doctrine which has never before been enunciated since it was first given to the world by the Founder of Christianity—that is to say, never officially enunciated by any organization of Christians, so far, at least, as I am aware.

“There is another thing about these people which connects them remarkably with the Christians of the first era and distinguishes them as sharply as anything well could do from the average Christian of these days. This is their willingness to suffer for opinion’s sake. Perhaps this contributes even more than their orderly, clean, and upright manner of life to make them valuable citizens just now. They are history makers, just as were the first Christian martyrs. It was by bringing out the rancor and cruelty of the Roman Government that the Christians destroyed pagan intolerance. It can only be through such men as these Seventh-day Adventists that the inhumanity, bigotry and unchristianity, which inspires all Sunday laws can be forced upon the attention of the people of the United States. I believe that these men will ultimately prove the instruments by which this survival of the union of Church and State will be rooted out of every American commonwealth, and I will further say that if this should prove to be the case, they will have done more for the service of humanity and for the glory and welfare of our country, than the greatest philanthropist, statesman or soldier that ever lived. I am far from attaining to their standard of life, and I do not profess to decide controverted points of doctrine between them and other denominations, but I am proud to be associated with them in the humblest capacity in the fulfillment of this which I believe to be their mission. Men are rarer than is generally supposed, and these are men, and I am glad to be among them.”

A Word to the General Assembly of Tennessee.

[This earnest and well-timed appeal to the General Assembly of Tennessee is reprinted from the *Sabbath Recorder*, where it is credited to the *Cottage Pulpit*, of Nashville, Tenn.]

The legislature of Tennessee will be in session here in our beautiful capitol

building when this number of the *Cottage Pulpit* reaches some of our more distant readers. As a whole month will intervene before we shall have another chance to speak to these honored representatives of the people of our State, and they will then be far along in their ninety-day’s biennial session, we want to ask a hearing of their clemency upon subjects in which, as a citizen, as a man, and as a servant of God, we feel a profound interest.

There are two questions, of a religious or semi-religious aspect, both of them, that ought to have attention before this august assembly of a State’s legislators. One is the lifting of Tennessee’s sovereign arm as an incorporated part of the American Nation in a withering rebuke of the Russian persecution of the Jews; and this can be done through proper instruction of our senators and request of our representatives in Congress. This is all we shall say now upon this question. The companion of this in our estimation, only as much more pressing as it is nearer home—at our own door, in fact—is the Sabbath question, as it will, or ought to, come before them in the case of the wicked persecution of certain harmless and useful men, women and children, citizens of Tennessee, resident in the county of Henry. It will be for this legislature and these honorable, and we hope God-fearing men, whom the favor and confidence of their fellow-citizens have sent here to legislate for the commonwealth, to say, whether they endorse that Henry County inquisition or not. It will be for them to purge the State’s escutcheon of the stain that these wicked persecutors of good citizens under a form of law have brought upon it, or, by failing to do so, deepen the spot of infamy until honest men traveling abroad will be ashamed to own that they belong to Tennessee.

It is to be hoped that there will not be wanting a wise and patriotic statesman in each branch of our legislature who will make it his especial care to prepare and bring forward a proper bill, providing for the repeal of all laws or parts of laws upon our statute-book under color of which any man’s religious belief can be made the occasion of his arrest, fine, or imprisonment, to gratify the religious prejudices and petty spite of that majority in a neighborhood or county to whom the said religious belief may chance to be objectionable. You owe it, gentlemen of the Tennessee General Assembly—let us say it in all earnestness and respect—you owe it to the Constitution of your country, and to the spirit of its framers, to the genius of this enlightened age, and to your solemn oaths as now entrusted with the power to make, amend, or annul the laws of your State (that, under the instrument of its own organic being, is required to be in accord with and under obedience to our great national Constitution, which as you all well know forbids the passage of any law that interferes with freedom of conscience in the practice of a man’s religion), you owe it to the truth of God and the voice of the very consciences that he has put within you, to do the thing suggested, and to act promptly and without delay. The eyes of men of correct principles, of proper sense of justice under American law, are upon you, to see what you are going to do about the business; for it is a matter in which every real Christian, every true patriot, every man in fact whose heart has not, from long

disuse of its better instincts, dwindled down to the dimensions of a peanut, is interested; for it is a matter patent to everybody that, under color of statutory law in Tennessee men have been, and are now being, deprived of their liberty because in the exercise of their religious convictions, they, after keeping the seventh day holy according to the law of God, work on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, without disturbing others, either individuals or congregations, in their Sunday-rest or their worship on that day.

You well know, gentlemen of the Legislature, that such a use of the law protecting worshipping assemblies as that made of it in these cases was never contemplated by its framers, or if by any jesuitical design so intended to be used against the few but good Christian people of the country who were then known as keepers of the seventh day Sabbath, the statute was void from the beginning as plainly at variance with the spirit and letter of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States on the subject of religious liberty.

Allow us to suggest that, inasmuch as malicious persecution is, if we mistake not, and ought to be, a felony in any and every properly regulated legal system, you would do yourselves honor if you would frame a statute fully covering the case of those wicked religious bigots of Henry County, who are said to boast that they will drive the keepers of the seventh-day Sabbath out of the country. If you could by some legal enactment stop the mouths of all such disturbers of the peace of their inoffensive neighbors who are in every respect better than their persecutors, but are greatly in the minority, you would be doing a good thing. Is not a man’s religious liberty dear to him; yea, as dear as his life? If, then, a threat against a man’s life is a punishable offense, should not the penal code take some cognizance of the other? If under ordinary circumstances a malicious persecutor is the meanest creature that a court of justice is ever called to deal with and punish, how the color of such a character darkens into midnight hues, when from the private individual it becomes, of course only in the name, a Methodist or Baptist, Presbyterian or Christian, or a combination of such, who, to show his zeal for his sect, puts his weak and unpopular brother of another sect “in durance vile,” simply because he hates him, and has the legal machinery of his country under his spiteful fingers, and can do it! Can’t you stop this thing, gentlemen of the legislature? Surely it is the province of the true gentleman wherever he is placed to be the protector of the weak, and the righter of the wronged.

It has been recommended that March 5, be set apart by all denominations as a day for considering in the Sunday-schools and pulpits, the question of Sunday closing.

The *Christian Patriot* heads its review of the lesson for the day thus:—

SUNDAY LAWS.

March 5, 1893.—Keeping the Sabbath.

LESSON—Nehemiah 13: 15-22.
GOLDEN TEXT—Exodus 20: 8. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

The lesson relates chiefly to the prohibition of Sabbath work by the civil authority, by law. Sunday, since the resurrection of Christ, is the Sabbath. The adult Bible class which can keep from considering Sunday laws while studying this lesson must have a queer teacher.

Certainly, and still queerer pupils!

Extract from Address of A. T. Jones
Before the House Committee on
World's Fair for Repeal of
Sunday Legislation.

THREE distinct considerations in the Constitution of the United States forbid Congress to touch this question. The first is well defined by George Bancroft in a letter which he wrote to Dr. Philip Schaff, August 30, 1887, which reads as follows:—

My Dear Dr. Schaff: I have yours of the 12th. By the Constitution no power is held by Congress except such as shall have been granted to it. Congress, therefore from the beginning, was as much without the power to make a law respecting the establishment of religion as it is now after the amendment has been passed. The power had not been granted, and therefore did not exist, for Congress has no powers except such as are granted; but a feeling has got abroad that there should have been a bill of Rights, and therefore to satisfy the craving, a series of articles were framed in the nature of a bill of Rights, not because such a declaration was needed, but because the people wished to see certain principles distinctly put forward as a part of the Constitution. The First Amendment, so far as it relates to an establishment of religion, was proposed without passion, accepted in the several States without passion, and so found its place as the opening words of the amendments in the quietest manner possible.

GEORGE BANCROFT.

This is shown by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution which says that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." As no power has been granted to Congress on the subject of religion, that is reserved to the States or to the people. That is where we ask that this should be left,—just where the Constitution has left it. It is a question reserved to the States. It is for the State of Illinois alone, so far as any State can have anything to say upon the subject, to say whether the Fair shall be opened or shut on Sunday. If the State of Illinois should not say anything on the subject, it is still left with the people. It is for the people, in their own capacity as such, to act as they please in the matter, without any interference or dictation by Congress.

Not only is that so on that point, but if the Constitution had not said a word on the subject of religion, there would have been no power in Congress to touch this question. But the people have spoken; the Constitution has spoken, and denied the right of the United States Government to touch the question, and has reserved that right to the States or to the people. Not only did it do that, but it went further, and actually prohibited the Government of the United States from touching the question. This lack of power would have been complete and total without the prohibition, because the powers not delegated are reserved. But they went further, and not only reserved this power, but expressly prohibited Congress from exercising it. It is trebly unconstitutional for Congress to touch the question. It was so at the beginning of the Government, and this is why we insist that this legislation shall be undone, and it be left where the Constitution has left it,—to the States or to the people.

Mr. Houk,—a member of the Committee,—The language of the Constitution, I believe, is that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.

Mr. Jones,—I was going to follow this question a little further, and notice that amendment. The amendment does not read as it is often misquoted, "Congress

shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion;" but "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." There are two meanings in this clause. When the Constitution was made, all that it said upon this subject was that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Some of the States had established religions at the time; I think all except Virginia. Virginia had released herself in a campaign directly touching this question. The first part of the clause was intended to prohibit Congress from making any law respecting any of those religions which were established already in those States, and the second part of the clause prohibits Congress from touching the subject of religion on its own part, in any way. In the State of Virginia, from 1776—with the exception of the interval when the war was the highest,—to December 26, 1787, there was a campaign conducted over the same question that is now involved in this legislation. The English Church was the established church in Virginia, and the Presbyterians, and Quakers, and the Baptists sent a memorial to the General Assembly of Virginia, asking that as the Colonies had declared themselves free and independent of British rule in civil things, so the State of Virginia should declare itself free from British rule in religious things, and that they should not be taxed to support a religion which they did not believe, nor even any religion which they did believe. And the English Church was disestablished. Then a movement was made to establish the Christian religion, and legislate in favor of the Christian religion, by passing a bill establishing a provision for teachers of that religion. Madison and Jefferson took the opposition to that bill, and by vigorous efforts, defeated it, and in its place secured the passage of a bill establishing religious freedom in Virginia, which is the model of all the State Constitutions from that day to this, on the subject of religion and the State.

Now then, that campaign in Virginia against the establishment of the Christian religion there, embodied the same principle that is involved in this legislation of to-day, and as that was distinctly shut out, so we ask that this shall be also, and Congress put the Government back to the place where it was before and where it belongs. Madison went right out of that campaign into the convention which formed the Constitution of the United States, and carried with him into that convention the principles which he had advocated in that campaign, and put those principles into the United States Constitution; and the intention of all was, and is, that Congress shall have nothing at all to do with the subject of religion or religious observances.

Washington in 1797, made a treaty with Tripoli, which explicitly declared that "the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." And when Congress has legislated upon this question with direct reference to the Christian religion, therein again it has gone contrary to the express intent of those who made the Constitution and established the supreme law, as expressed in their own words. And for this reason we ask that the thing shall be undone, and Congress put the Government right back where it was before that legis-

lation was established, and leave the question where it belongs.

The Constitution prohibits this legislation; and when the Constitution prohibits it, then ought not the legislation to be undone?

Extract from the Speech of Mayor
Washburne Before the House
Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN and Gentlemen of the Committee: I was but recently notified that I might be called upon to speak before this committee. The subject is one of such vast interest, touching as it does the welfare of nine-tenths of our population, I do not feel at liberty to decline to speak for want of proper preparation. The issue now raised, in order that it may be intelligently settled, must be clearly drawn and distinctly understood. It is not a question of abstract right or wrong, it is a question touching the absolute right of a vast majority of our entire population, now numbering over sixty millions of people, to enjoy the benefits of this great international Exposition.

It is also a question whether the Government of the United States will keep its faith with the nations of the world of all races and religions, which is contained in the invitation to join with us in this great international Exposition.

The preamble of the act of Congress passed April 25, 1890, creating the World's Columbian Exposition says: "Whereas such an exhibition should be of a national and international character so that not only the people of our Union and this continent, but those of all nations as well can participate, and should therefore have the sanction of the United States, therefore be it enacted, etc."

When your honorable body used the words, "the people of our Union," nothing less was meant, nor can these words be made to cover less than the entire people, and if it be our entire people for whom this exhibition has been created you must so legislate as to benefit a majority of those for whom you created this enterprise. You should not now legislate so as to deprive a majority of its benefits. If you legislate in favor of ten millions of those who protest against a Sunday opening, although they may be more numerous in this capital, and their voices may be the loudest in demands, you will not have complied with your obligations and the assurances you have held out, nor met the demands of the less noisy but more numerous fifty millions of people.

Moreover this Exhibition created by Congress is in the act of its creation declared to be of international character "so that not only the people of our Nation and this continent, but those of all nations as well can participate." This Exhibition is to be the work of all the peoples of every race and creed. The Mohammedan, and Hindoo, the people of China and Japan, all of whom know nothing of our Sabbath, the Jews who observe another day, the peoples of Europe who regard Sunday as a day of recreation, people without creed or religion as well as people of every creed and religion, will participate in this Exposition. To keep our faith with all these people, this Exposition must be managed and conducted in all respects as near as may be upon a common ground upon which all may come together.

It is not Christian nations or people that you have invited but all nations,

and it is because all the nations and peoples of the earth are asked to participate that you have declared that this Fair ought to have the sanction of the United States. I submit that good faith requires that the religious views, whether of a part or the whole of our people, in regard to Sunday observance or otherwise, should not be obtruded into the conduct of this Fair and upon the nations thus invited to participate by any act of our own national Government.

Another branch of this question touches possibly a constitutional principle. If the demand be that which is commonly accepted as the demand, that the World's Columbian Exposition shall be closed upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, in order to testify to the world that this Nation as a Government recognizes the Christian religion as the religion of the land, if this be the ground upon which the closing of this Exposition is demanded, it is not justified by the principles of our Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States framed by those whose wisdom has never yet been questioned, provided in Article 1, that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. The fathers of our Constitution appreciated too well the evils and abuses that might result from permitting the Congress of the United States to legislate at all upon matters of religion, or the observance thereof, or upon any question involving the religious beliefs of our people. They were descendants of a heroic people who had been persecuted and driven from the lands of their birth by such abuses of the functions of government. Our Constitution contemplates that so far as Federal legislation is concerned, religious beliefs and religious observances, as well with respect to days as to doctrines, shall be left untouched. You might as well impose upon the management of this Exposition the condition that a Jew, or a Hindoo, or Buddhist, or heathen, should be barred from its gates, as to say that the day of the week which is regarded as the Sabbath by a few of the people who are asked to participate should be observed. One is no less a violation of the spirit of the prohibition of the Constitution with respect to the powers of Congress than the other. If Congress is prohibited by the Constitution from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, if it could not properly impose conditions as to religious creeds or the observance of religious rites or ceremonies, it is, I submit, equally improper in any law to designate any day, season or time, and to compel its observance in obedience to any religion or creed. This would clearly establish a religion by Federal laws. And when you are asked to compel this Fair to close upon the first day of every week in order to recognize the Christian Sabbath, and in obedience to that religion, you are asked to do that which plainly violates the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. This would then be done in national obedience to, and national observance of, a religion. And if you can not close the Fair on Sunday on this ground, namely, as an act of national obedience to, and observance of, a religion which shall thus be recognized and followed in federal law making,—upon what grounds and for what reasons can you shut its gates in the face of fifty millions of our own people and of participating nations who do not know our Sunday,

who now demand that it shall be opened? I am only asking of you that the spirit of our Constitution—that the welfare and wishes of a large majority of our common people—that good faith to the nations of this world, be considered and observed.

A Candid Statement from the "Political Dissenter."

IN its issue of February 1, the *Political Dissenter* says this, editorially:—

The opponents of the act of Congress making the closing of the World's Fair on the Sabbath a condition of the national appropriation for its support, appeal to the Constitution of the United States against that enactment. And this appeal is likely to prove the most effectual method of defeating the operation of that law.

It is altogether probable, as we have noted elsewhere, that the Illinois legislature will put itself in direct opposition to Congress by enacting a bill authorizing the keeping of the Fair open on the Sabbath. The general ground for such a State enactment in antagonism to the act of Congress will be that by the very nature of our national Constitution Congress is forbidden to legislate on any subject touching religion. The fathers, it is maintained, framed for the Nation a fundamental law putting all religions on a level, so far as national action is concerned, and leaving the matter of religion entirely to the States. The act of Congress closing the World's Fair on the Sabbath will therefore be held to be unconstitutional, in that it legislates on a matter of religion at all, and specially in that it legislates on such a subject in respect to a Fair to be held within the territory of the State of Illinois.

This will at least afford opportunity for the legislature of Illinois to pass its own act authorizing the opening of the Fair on the Sabbath. The directors of the Fair will not be slow to avail themselves of such State authority, in the face of any national opposition. By shrewd legal tactics the Fair will be kept open every day of the week to the end; and whatever may be the final verdict in the courts, the State and the directors of the Fair will thus have won a complete victory over Congress and the American Nation.

Such a course is possible; and being possible, it is hardly to be doubted that it will be followed out. And for our own part, we believe that the Commonwealth of Illinois would be able to make out a strong case in its interpretation of the national Constitution, and of the powers of Congress under it. Congressional legislation on behalf of the Christian Sabbath, or any other Christian institution in the life of our Nation, has no adequate legal basis in our written Constitution. And sooner or later practical questions of this very nature will and must be raised as to its correct interpretation. The case in which the Supreme Court of the United States declared, as an *obiter dictum*, that this is a Christian Nation, did not raise this practical question as to the Constitution at all. But a case such as the Illinois legislature now has the opportunity to bring to an issue would touch this vital point.

And even suppose that the State legislature might be defeated in the end; it nevertheless has the power to win a present practical victory. And this arises from the religious defect of the Constitution. If the written Constitution of the United States contained to-day such an acknowledgment of Christ and his law for nations as would furnish an undeniable legal basis for the recent enactment of Congress closing the World's Fair on the Sabbath, the legislature of Illinois would never dream of setting itself in opposition to congressional action so indisputably constitutional as this Sabbath-closing law would in that case be. And this is just the practical value of the proposed amendment. Is not this present argument for it conclusive?

We shall still hope that if Illinois raises this issue, the Supreme Court of the Nation may decide that this is a Christian Nation, with an unwritten, vital, historical and providential Constitution that is distinctively and undeniably Christian, although much in our national life is out of harmony with it. Even in that case, the argument will remain in full force, that what is in the historical, vital, and unwritten Constitution, should be formulated in the written organic law.

This is a very shrewd forecast of the possible outcome of the Sunday closing contest as it relates to the World's Fair. It is also a candid statement of the unquestionable unconstitutionality of the Sunday closing proviso and all other legislation in behalf of religious institutions or ceremonies. At the same time it is an

unhesitating plea for a union of Church and State. If the *Dissenter* should retain the freedom and candor of expression which marks this editorial it will openly acknowledge very soon, the moment it perceives its wishes certain of being realized in either form, that what had all along been sought was the dominance of the State by the Church, and therefore a union of Church and State.

The Rights of Christians.

[The *Morning Times*, of Oakland, Cal., publishes, editorially, these just and well considered strictures upon the false Christianity so much in vogue. When the Church departs from the example and teachings of Christ, it is no longer Christian.]

WITH all deference to Christianity, and even to much which passes for Christianity and is not, we are compelled to note that there is coming to the front a dangerous sentiment which assumes that the rights of Christians as represented by the churches transcend the rights of other people. In other words, the churches, especially the ministry, are becoming unduly arrogant in their demands. The phrases, "This Christian people," "This Christian Nation," and others of like import, are paraded with an air that implies, "You stand aside, we are coming; we are entitled to first consideration."

This idea is emphasized by the assumption that to open a theater on Sunday night is an "insult" to a "Christian community," and ought not to be "tolerated." Toleration is the language of the autocrat, and implies the authority to coerce at will. Toleration has no place in the definition of the rights of a free people. In this (at least nominally) free country, there is no such doctrine as one class *tolerating* another. The theory of our Government is that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." There is no dictum as to how men shall pursue happiness. So far as the right to do so is concerned, one man has the same right to pursue happiness in the theater that another has to pursue it in the church. The theory of nearly all Christian sects is that man is a free moral agent.

The Christian Church never assumed the authority to tolerate or to coerce, until it had so far degenerated from primitive principles as to become a persecutor of opponents. And when Christian ministers talk about a Christian community, as Christians, tolerating or not tolerating in a municipal sense, they assume a prerogative that belongs to the citizen as a citizen, and not as a Christian. Christians are the last people in the world that ought, even if in a majority, to deprive others of their rights as citizens; for in so doing they admit the right of their opponent, if in the majority, to deprive Christians of their God-given rights. They ought to remember how their brethren have been made to suffer in many ages and in many localities by the spirit of disregard for the rights of others.

But such a spirit, though called Christian, is not Christian in a proper sense; and many, who are to-day pronounced infidels, are such only because they take for granted that all which passes in the name of Christ is Christian. A Christian is one who is like Christ. Now any one who will take the trouble to read the gospels will learn that Christ never asked the people

or the law-making power to put down any public enterprise that happened to be inimical to his work. He never resorted to anything like retaliation or coercion, no matter what hindrances came in his way. When he went to a place and could not carry on his work because of the unbelief and hostility of the people, he simply went away and left them to themselves.

Neither Christ nor his apostles ever sought either municipal or provincial or imperial enactments for the special benefit of their work; although wherever they went they found the conditions a hundred fold more unfavorable than in any part of California. They boldly proclaimed the gospel where it was treason to uphold any god but such as were recognized by a pagan government; but they asked no special favors, and asked no one to get out of their way. This is Christianity; to strive for the mastery by human right or power, by municipal ordinances or provincial laws, is common politics. If Christian churches would pursue their work in the same spirit as did He whom they profess to follow and proclaim, they would no doubt wield more Christian influence if not so much political power.

Are We "a Christian Nation?"

[This comment on the opinion from Justice Brewer that this is "a Christian Nation" is reprinted in the *Weekly Review* from the *St. Louis Republic*.

A CORRESPONDENT, commenting on the increasing tendency to make religious observance a matter of compulsion by the direct or indirect use of civil enactment, denies that the Supreme Court was sound either in the law or the evidence when it asserted this to be "a Christian Nation."

This, of course, was the language of the demagogue, the hypocrite, the Pharisee. We are not yet free from those who devour the substance of widows and, for a pretense, make long prayers; and whether these are in or out of office, they are the ones who are most urgent for compulsion as the handmaid of religion. These are the ones who always stand ready to appeal to Cæsar and to force him, even when he is unwilling, to crucify every Christ who is sent to them.

It was never intended that this should be "a Christian Nation." It was intended that Christians, Jews, heathens, and infidels should live together here in full enjoyment of entire liberty of conscience. It was never intended that any Jew or any heathen should be compelled to ask any Christian or any number of Christians for toleration in America. It was asserted, on the contrary, that liberty of conscience is a matter of every man's right, and not of the mere toleration of any government or any majority whatever.

To a certain class of persons it seems hopeless that the doctrines of Christianity should ever make their way by their own inherent force. Of these, the disciple who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant and then thrice denied his own Master was the type. They are continually attempting to draw the sword of the State to strike some one whom they regard as an enemy of religion; to cut off the power of some class in the community that they regard as inimical to Christianity. To them there is no meaning in the command, "Put up thy sword into the sheath;" and they can understand nothing of that self-sacrifice which, with power to call "le-

gions of angels," yet relies solely on the power of truth—on the compulsion that sooner or later truth, if there be no violence to convert it to error, must exert over reason.

This is not "a Christian Nation," and as long as Christianity is perverted into an excuse for using the force of the State it will be slow in becoming a Christian people.

The truest Christianity we have is religious liberty. If we maintain it we will finally work out the highest possible type of religion by reaching a clearer and fuller understanding of what Christianity really means. If we lose it we lose everything.

Does It Teach Apostolic Doctrines?

THE *Apostolic Guide*, that journal which advocates church unity, and at the same time persecution of those who refuse to keep Sunday, has this, under the heading, "Fighting the Sects:"

It is never in order to fight other churches. It is our duty to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

The evangelist must have love for truth and love for men in equal proportion. He must endeavor to persuade men of the truth of the gospel.

If the *Guide*, and all others who are clamoring for Sunday laws, would follow this principle, there would be many more Christians than there are, for this is the plan which Jesus and his disciples followed, and which they left for all other believers to follow. It is the Christian's duty to "persuade men of the truth of the gospel," and not compel them. Christ taught this, and, if we are Christians, we shall do the same, for we shall be Christ-like. Men would turn to the Lord if we went to them in this spirit, but it is impossible to make Christians by compulsion. They will pretend to be good, but the heart will be just as evil as ever. Is this the kind of Christians God requires? "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." It is heart-service that the Lord requires; the State would not make this kind of Christians, but only hypocrites.

But one would think to read the foregoing quotation from the *Guide* that it endeavored to make Christians in the way Christ taught, that is, by persuasion. Does it? Let us see:—

The State has the right to whatever is essential to existence. Moral teaching is essential to its existence. Hence, it has the right to moral teaching. No moral teaching can be secured without the observance of the Sabbath, or the Lord's day. Hence, the State has the right to enact and to enforce laws suspending all unnecessary work upon that day. Certainly no legislation can compel people to be pious. But by proper and wise legislation the State can make it easy for people to do right. It can remove the hindering causes that at present keep an army of men at work upon railways, in post-offices, in express offices and in divers kinds of work which can be postponed without serious injury to any one. No power save that which originates from the weekly observance of the Lord's day in Sunday-schools, in preaching and other religious training can pluck out immoral tendencies and supply the people with moral strength to resist temptation and equip themselves for the moral battles of life. The abolition of the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, will abolish moral instruction. The abolition of moral instruction will ruin the State. The issue, therefore, resolves itself into the balancing of the injury inflicted upon a few men who hold to the observance of the Sabbath against that inflicted upon the whole State. It is better for a few Adventists to suffer than for the whole State to break to pieces by the complete desecration of the day.

Is not the *Guide* somewhat inconsistent? It first says that Christians should persuade men to be religious, and should

do this by means of the Sunday-school, the pulpit, the observance of the Sabbath, and other religious training, and then argues that to make men religious the State has the right "to enact and enforce laws suspending all unnecessary work upon Sunday." It then says, "Certainly no legislation can compel people to be pious." What are Sunday laws for if they are not to make men religious? If they are not for this purpose, why does the Church interfere in such matters? What has it to do with civil affairs? Its business is to preach the gospel, and not to enforce civil law.

The *Guide* is trying to bring about church unity, but it can not do this until it is more consistent in its teachings; until it stops "fighting the sects." There can never be church union while one body of Christians is fighting another. It tends to destroy Christianity, and not to upbuild it. What has brought about the disunion that we see to-day? Nothing but a union of Church and State. There can never be church union while the State interferes with religious matters; because persecution of some of "the sects" is the inevitable result of a union of Church and State.

The *Guide* professes to be Christian and to teach apostolic doctrines. Is it Christian? Does it teach these doctrines? It owns that this persecution is wicked in these words:—

To "fight the sects" in a pugilistic spirit, with a pugnacious air . . . in the year 1892, is not only a manifestation of the "old Adam," but a lamentable anachronism of ignorance.

And yet it believes that for the good of the State those who believe and act contrary to its teaching should be punished. Is this consistent? This "fighting the sects" does not end with imprisonment, but death has been the penalty for keeping God's commandments, and is to be, if this persecution is allowed to go on. It was so in the Dark Ages, and always is the case when the State has the interpretation of the law of God.

It is not true that the State has a right to enforce moral teaching because it can not exist without it. It can exist without it, because religion and the State are entirely separate things. Irreligion does not necessarily harm men civilly, only morally, therefore the State has no right to interfere with it. The State can punish a man for getting drunk, because he is liable to harm his fellow-man; but if he is irreligious, he does his fellow-man no civil harm by being so. If a man has the love of God in his heart he will do good, no matter how much immorality he sees around him.

The *Guide* argues that if men do not keep Sunday, or keep some other day than Sunday, it is a degradation to society. This alone shows that there is no sacredness in Sunday, because if it were a sacred day those who observe it would keep it from love, and would not turn from it because others do. The non-observance of the Sabbath by others would have no effect upon them.

The *Guide* says: "It is undoubtedly true that the Adventist has the right to live." How long would they have this right if the State continued to interfere with their religion. Or, in other words, if religious bigots had their way, how long would it be before the Adventist would be shut from society altogether? How long before he would be told to stop preaching his heretical doctrine? Human

nature has not changed since the apostolic age, not even the *Apostolic Guide*. There is that same jealous spirit; that same wrong idea that the majority must rule in matters of religion; that same wrong idea that the State should enforce religion.

If the *Guide* is Christian, it ought to be able to see that these are erroneous ideas. Governments are instituted to protect the minority in their rights, but there would be no protection for them if the government were ruled by a majority of religionists. They would be compelled to believe as the majority believed, whether that belief was right or wrong, or else suffer the penalty.

Why is it we see so much infidelity in the world to-day? It is only because there is not Church unity; because Christians are not consistent; because one sect persecutes another. How can Christians be the means of converting an infidel when they do not follow the teachings of the Bible; when they say that the first day of the week is the Sabbath and the Bible teaches that the seventh day is; when they teach that the State should enforce religion, and the Bible teaches that it should not, but on the contrary, that they should be entirely separate. When Christians will live and teach consistently with the teachings of the Bible, then men will see that there is a power in the gospel; that Jesus Christ is able to save from sin. This alone will bring Church union.

But the *Guide* does not see this. The Bible and God are nothing; the State is everything, and from thence it seeks its power, and not from God. It does not care how a few good, honest, God-fearing men suffer so long as Sunday is exalted, for it says:—

The legislator must decide the abolition of the Sunday law and the consequent injury inflicted upon public morals, and the enactment and enforcement of Sunday law and the consequent injury inflicted upon a few Adventists. The good of the State is to be weighed against the good of a few men whose religion is a greater anachronism than the Blue Laws.

The legislator must decide who are Christians and who are not. The legislator must decide what is sin; not God. The Government must punish these "few Adventists" for this fearful sin of keeping the seventh-day Sabbath when by the law of the land the first day is made the Sabbath. Which is right, to obey the State, or God, in matters of religion? Let the Bible answer: "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men."

A. MALLETT.

Commingle of Church and State.

RELATIVE to the ruling of the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, dated November 11, 1892, in which the State's Sunday laws were upheld on the declaration that they were based on divine law, *Der Lutheraner* says under above heading:—

A State acts properly and in a way commendably when enacting Sunday laws, as Luther says, "for reasons of bodily necessity, taught and demanded by nature. And this in the interest of the great multitude, of man and maidservants, who ply their work and handicraft the whole week, so they too may retire a day for rest and recreation," and for the further purpose of protecting citizens that observe the Sunday, in the exercise of their religion. But, alas! this finds no expression in those laws. And now the Supreme Court of a State decrees with emphasis that its Sunday law is not merely a civil enactment, but a religious one! By no means, therefore, should we tire in our testimony against commingling of Church and State.

Der Lutheraner is the official organ of

the German Joint Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, representing upwards of twelve hundred ministers and sixteen hundred congregations.

A Peculiar Juxtaposition.

THE *Mail and Express*, of January 30, and 31, contains editorial texts and news items in such relation to each other as will appear to Seventh-day Adventists both suggestive and strikingly apt, though of course quite unintentional.

The scriptural text at the head of the editorial column of the issue of January 30, is:—

Deceit is in the heart of them that devise evil; but to the counselors of peace is joy.

In the news columns of the same issue is this:—

For violating Sunday laws,—Seventh-day Adventists on trial in Tennessee. Eleven Seventh-day Adventists were placed on trial in the Henry County criminal court at Paris this morning for violating the law of Tennessee by working on their farms on Sunday.

The day following the scriptural text is this:—

He shall not fail nor be discouraged till He have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law.

And the accompanying news item is as follows:—

Seventh-day Adventists meet. The Seventh-day Adventist Ministers' Institute is in session here. (Battle Creek, Mich.) Over four hundred ministers are here and about fifty are arriving daily. They represent nearly every portion of America, South Africa, England, Australia, and the Scandinavian countries. This Institute is preparatory to the thirtieth International Conference, which begins here February 17.

An application of these texts, to the incidents narrated under them, may be made by the denomination in question, which is not only striking but significant.

Certainly, deceit has shown itself to be in the heart of those who desire evil against the Seventh-day observers on trial in Tennessee, but in the heart of the persecuted, whose counsel to all men is peace, is joy. They know their God will not fail nor be discouraged, and that he is now sitting in judgment on the earth, while the isles which have waited for his law are receiving it; and that the convocation and conference noted is another assurance of this.

Individual Immortality Dependent upon Sunday-closing.

THE *Union Signal* of January 5, 1893, delivers itself of the following remarkable utterances, staking all, even the hope of heaven itself, upon the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, and the preservation of what it terms "our American Sabbath" by law:—

Open Fairs, museums, etc., on Sunday "for the laboring classes" mean inevitably in the end no Sabbath for the laborers or any one else. Unless we are prepared to accept this alternative of no Sabbath at all, we must never consent to an open Fair on Sunday.

To the Christian, the question is of far more serious import, for the annihilation of our day of rest is also the annihilation of our day of worship, and, to many, of almost the sole opportunity for religious development. It is a deadly blow at Christianity, and in Christianity center all the hopes of our Nation's life. . . . Our hope of immortality as a Nation, and our hope of immortality as individuals is the same.—*Union Signal*, January 5, 1893.

In other words, to sum the whole thing up, these Sunday-law fanatics hold that should they fail in compelling every body to keep Sunday they themselves could not

keep it, and would therefore stand no show of obtaining eternal life! What wild, what extravagant, what perverse ideas do they hold! The gospel of the Bible teaches that immortality is dependent upon individual acceptance of Christ, with nothing whatever said about keeping Sunday or the "American Sabbath." Surely the gospel of the Sunday-law people and the gospel of Jesus Christ are not the same.

W. A. COLCORD.

Let Us Do More.

IN referring to the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL the *Christian Statesman*, of December 24, says:—

As we have said before, twenty-six thousand Seventh-day Adventists circulate more millions of papers against the Sabbath than twenty-six million friends of the Sabbath circulate thousands in its behalf. The whole country ought to be sowed knee deep with Sabbath Reform literature, to refute the shallow sophistries of good men and bad as to Sunday opening of the World's Fair and other schemes of infidels and money grabbers thinly disguised as movements for the poor or for "pure religion." But who will provide funds for a part of them?

By "Sabbath" the *Statesman* means Sunday. By "Sabbath reform" is meant Sunday laws, to promote a stricter observance of the day. But Sunday is not "the Sabbath," and a reform can not take place on what never was. The only true Sabbath reform is a reform on the only true Sabbath, and that is the seventh day. See Ex. 20:8-10; Isa. 58:13. This reform God has predicted, and seventh-day keepers are now the only ones enlisted in the work for the Sabbath. Every paper, tract, and page circulated for Sunday and Sunday laws is against, not Seventh-day Adventists, but the Lord God of the Bible and his Sabbath. We are glad Adventists are doing so much; they ought to be doing ten times more. The truth and love of the Lord Jesus Christ and precious souls for whom he died, as well as the rapidly passing moments, demand a tenfold deeper consecration and zeal in God's work. But shall we suggest to the *Statesman* the cause of the apathy of friends of Sunday?—It is this: The majority of them down deep in their hearts believe neither in the day nor the methods to promote it.—*Signs of the Times*.

Responsible to God.

PERSONAL responsibility to God ought to be a principle which should enter into every transaction of life. That "every man must give account of himself to God" is a solemn truth of Scripture. We are therefore personally responsible to God. No society or organization or body politic of which we may be a part has any claim upon us which ought for a moment to transcend this obligation. In mere matters of opinion, where moral principles are not involved, in matters where our duties lie in the same lines and are based on the same principles as these organizations, it is good to have company, and in union there is strength. But where moral principle is involved, we should not follow a multitude to sin. Let personal responsibility to God rule. Acting as in his sight, for his sake who bought us, will but unite us in God's own better way with all the good in the universe. Although under the power of the enemy this may seem to leave us alone, leave it with God, and endure "as seeing Him who is invisible."—*Signs of the Times*.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 16, 1893.

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.

THE latest word from the "Adventist cases" at Paris, Tenn., is this: "The remaining case for possible trial at this term of court was continued yesterday on affidavit by the Attorney-General that the State could not safely go to trial because of the absence of important witnesses. It is almost certain that no conviction can ever be had in the case. The charge of the Judge in the Dortch case was such as to make it almost impossible to convict any one of Sunday work unless the work were done in an exceedingly open and public manner."

THE present status of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee is worthy of careful notice. These cases have attracted the attention of candid, clear-minded, and able, lawyers and legislators. These men, having a correct view of the purpose and intent of law and legislation, realize the error, the inequity, the inconsistency of existing law under which such persecutions can be had. To have called to the defense of truth, those who love truth, and right, and justice, for their own sake is much. But the greater thing yet remains for all,—to still stand for its defense in the coming day of its seeming defeat and ignominy.

PROSECUTIONS for working on Sunday are gradually becoming the recognized order of the day,—the arraignment of six men for violation of the Sunday law, on February 5, in this city, is recorded as follows:—

Louis Prague, of Prague Bros., shirt manufacturers, No. 474 Broadway, and Philip Krulewitch, a clothing manufacturer, No. 524 Broadway, were arraigned in the Tombs Police Court yesterday, charged with working on Sunday. Prague had thirty hands working and Krulewitch three. They swore that they observed Saturday as a holiday, and were discharged.

Three Sabbath-breakers were also arraigned in the Jefferson Market Police Court, viz.: Max Krouse, No. 20 Sixth Avenue; Joseph Leventhan, No. 64 Sixth Avenue, and Bernard Pellstickers, of No. 116 Sixth Avenue. The last named keeps a saloon and was charged with violating the excise law. The others are clothing dealers. Justice Koch held all in \$100 each for trial in the Court of Special Sessions.

Patrick Shea, of No. 511 Pearl Street, a foreman in the employ of F. M. Hausling, was in the Tombs Police Court yesterday, charged with violating the Sunday law in continuing the work of tearing down the buildings Nos. 64 to 68 Broadway. Shea was held in \$300 for examination by Justice Ryan.

Those who obtained their discharge by swearing that they were observers of the

seventh day were subjected to civil surveillance of their religion precisely the same in character, though not in kind, as they would have been forced to submit to in Russia. And as to those who were held, where is the distinction between the unwarrantable authority exercised over them here and similar arrests, for the sake of religion, in the dominion of the Czar?

COMMENTING on the growing tendency toward the strict enforcement of Sunday laws in this city the New York *Sun* says:

Many of the Jewish people living here, who keep their own Sabbath on the seventh day of the week, complain of the wrongfulness of enforcing the Sunday law against them, thus compelling them to refrain from business and labor during two days of every week or more than one-quarter of each month.

Two Jewish storekeepers have been arrested this week for selling goods on Sunday, and both of them were held in bail by the Justice of the Jefferson Market Court. Two Jewish manufacturers were also arrested this week for running their factories on Sunday, and both of them were discharged by the Justice of the Tombs Police Court. The respective Justices differed in their interpretation of the laws. It is evident from these facts that the Sunday laws are in an unsatisfactory state. In holding the two storekeepers on Monday, Justice Koch told them that he regretted the necessity of doing so. "No law," he said, "should exist which discriminates between people of different religions. You people keep your Sabbath, and a law obliging you to stop business on another day, and thus lose two days in the week, appears to me unjust."

In this city the Jews, who now number over one-sixth of the whole population, are desirous of securing a revision of the Sunday laws, and some of the leading men among them are preparing to seek relief from the State legislature.

The *Sun* has heretofore indicated the correct basis upon which relief should be had,—namely the entire repeal of all Sunday laws. But if this should be asked of the State legislature would the *Sun* now uphold this large proportion of the population in its just and wise request? Some late editorial utterances of the *Sun* go to show that it would not.

IN its issue of January 29, the New York *Sun* said in reference to the Sunday opening of the World's Fair:—

No, Congress must insist, whether in the interests of religion and reverence or in obedience to the custom and sentiment of the American people, that the Chicago Fair shall be closed on Sunday if it is to receive pecuniary aid and official recognition from the Government of the United States.

Close the Chicago Fair on Sunday! Close it tight!

The *Sun* said in an editorial paragraph, on October 7, 1892.

The Woman Suffragists have resolved in favor of opening the Chicago Fair on Sundays. The Fair grounds are already open to visitors, and the attendance is increasing. On a recent Sunday fifteen thousand persons passed through the turnstile. During the week the average daily attendance was three thousand. Most of the visitors to the park on Sunday are laboring men and their families. The worthy Col. Elliott F. Shepard is in Chicago working—yea striving with the brethren—to keep the Fair closed against the workingman. Colonel Shepard is a good man.

What becomes of the keen edge of the

Sun's irony in this paragraph when compared with its editorial shout in January—"Close the Chicago Fair on Sunday" against the workingmen! "Close it tight!"

The *Sun* once itemized its editorial views about the efforts of the Barbers' International Union to obtain Sunday laws, forbidding Sunday work in barber shops, thus:—

Why should the Barbers' International Union ask the State legislature to enact laws prohibiting all the barbers of the United States from plying their razors on Sunday? There is no law in any State requiring barbers to engage in Sunday shaving. Every barber in the country is at liberty to refuse to shave anybody, or trim anybody's beard, or cut anybody's locks on Sunday. Any barber has the right to close and bar his shop every Sunday of the year. The International Barbers' Union had better let the legislatures of the States attend to public affairs while its members regulate their own business.

This is sound doctrine. The *Sun* should have applied the same doctrine to legislation for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and, realizing the fact that there is no law in Illinois requiring exhibitors at the World's Fair to exhibit on Sunday, been willing that every exhibitor should exercise his individual right to close his exhibit every Sunday if he saw fit. Has the *Sun* forgotten to apply its own injunction and let Congress attend to public affairs, while the exhibitors at the World's Fair attend to their own business?

THE excitement on the question of Sunday closing of theaters in Denver seems to have been felt as far as Oakland, Cal., for:

The German-American Political Club held a meeting and adopted the following resolutions:—

"WHEREAS, A movement is under way, instigated by certain parties, having for its object the closing of the theaters of Oakland on Sundays, therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, as citizens of this great Republic, most energetically protest against what we conceive to be an infringement upon our rights and liberties; and, furthermore, that we consider the visiting of a decent theater on Sunday an innocent recreation after six days of labor and toil; and we further think such efforts are contrary to the Constitution of the United States, which does not recognize State religion, and consequently can not endorse a one-sided edict for the keeping of Sunday, which we consider a day of rest."

The question is not as to whether it is a proper or a profitable way to spend Sunday, or any other evening, at the theater. But it is a very important question by what right either the ministerial alliance or the city ordinances shall say that the Denverites, or the German-Americans of Oakland, may not go to the theater if they see fit on any evening they choose.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c.
"	25 to 99	" " " " " "	"	80c.
"	100 to 249	" " " " " "	"	75c.
"	250 to 499	" " " " " "	"	70c.
"	500 to 999	" " " " " "	"	65c.
"	1000 or more	" " " " " "	"	60c.
To foreign countries in Postal Union,				5 shillings.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
48 Bond Street, New York City.