



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, JULY 20, 1893.

NUMBER 29.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

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

WHERE are the Christians in the United States?

THIS is a pertinent question just now when those who not only profess to be Christians, but who profess to be the very representatives of Christianity itself, persist in the use of force, even to the employment of armed troops, to secure the recognition and observance of religious institutions.

OF course, the use of force, and armed force at that, has been involved in the Sunday-law movement from the beginning: and we have been telling the people so, all the time; but the people would not believe it. But now, when the Sunday managers have actually gone to the length of urgently and repeatedly calling for troops to secure and enforce Sunday observance at the World's Fair, is it not about time that the people began to believe that the terrible wickedness of a religious despotism is in this Sunday movement, which has so long been going on before their eyes?

TRUE, they did not get the troops—and they have not got the Fair shut either—but that is not to their credit. That they did not get the troops, did not take out of them the disposition to use the troops even now, if they could get them. Force is in the thing, in itself, and armed force is the straight sequence of any resort to any force at all. And the failure to get the troops that they so loudly called for, and especially their signal defeat in the courts, instead of taking out of them the disposition to use force to compel Sunday observance, will only increase their determination even to desperation, to secure their idolized Sunday at cost of any available or possible force.

THIS is demonstrated plainly enough by the fact that they called upon the United

States courts to decide the question of Sunday closing, and when the courts decided for Sunday opening, they at once announced a general and determined boycott of the Fair. They voluntarily submit their cause to the courts, and themselves take the initiative in calling upon the courts to decide their controversy; and then when the decision goes against them they refuse to submit to it. This demonstrates that they are determined to have their own way anyhow; and that the only thing that they called upon the courts for, was to have the courts to do their bidding only and to execute their arbitrary will upon the people, precisely as they wanted the troops called out to do their bidding and execute by the bayonet their arbitrary will upon the people. Their whole course of procedure is all of a piece.

BUT the particular thing about which we are inquiring just now and in this connection is, Where are the Christians in the United States to positively discountenance and protest against this worse than a travesty, this entire subversion, of the Christian name and profession? Nor is it enough to discountenance only the extreme measures to which those have gone who have called for armed troops. There is no merit whatever in protesting against the use of troops to secure Sunday observance, so long as any countenance is given to Sunday laws of which armed troops are only the consequence.

ONE religious paper—*The Northwestern Christian Advocate*—has characterized as "zebraic zeal" the action of the Sunday managers who have called for the troops. But this same *Advocate* has sanctioned and actively aided this same zeal in these same individuals in every step which they have taken up to this one. To secure the Act of Congress requiring the closing of the Fair, these same individuals used upon congressmen and senators threats of deprivation of office by loss of votes—the only force then at their command. And so far was the *Northwestern* or any other one of the family of *Advocates* from seeing in this, any manifestation of zebraic zeal, that they all actually took part in it. Yet this is the same zeal precisely that is now displayed by the same individuals, in

invoking the additional force which they had gained by getting Congress to surrender to them the national power under the threats of the only force that was formerly at their command.

OF course nobody can deny that it is "zebraic zeal" or worse. But the point is that there is no strength in any protest against this particular exhibition of it while taking an active part in all the manifestations of the same zeal up to this. Where is the difference between the zeal that would put bayonets into the people, and the zeal that puts people themselves into jail for from thirty to sixty-four days, when both are done, to make them recognize the righteousness of Sunday laws? As it is "zebraic zeal" that calls for troops to compel the World's Fair folks to recognize Sunday; then what kind of zeal is it that compels a woman to pay a fine or go to jail to make her recognize Sunday? And when people and papers sanction the zeal that fines and imprisons men and women for following their honest occupations on Sunday, then where is the virtue in calling in question the zeal that would, by armed troops, keep men and women from finding honest enjoyment at the World's Fair on Sunday?

THE truth is, that the zeal that calls for or sanctions the enactment of Sunday laws of any kind, is precisely the same zeal that calls for and sanctions their enforcement by troops. For the last is in the first. And if you are not prepared to go all the way then do not start on that road. There is no half-way place, nor any other stopping-place. And above all, there is no stopping-place when the men who have gone so far are the very ones who have led all the way hitherto. And the zeal which has brought them to this is the same zeal that has inspired them all the way along. And if you find that you cannot go with them the full length, then you are to renounce the whole thing and not go with them at all.

THERE is no other remedy. There is no other course that Christians, or anybody else, can take as to this matter now. The whole movement from beginning to end is antichristian, and this last step

demonstrates this before all people. And Christians must absolutely repudiate the whole thing or else be partaker of these evil deeds. For it is written, "Come out of her, *my people*, that ye be not partakers of her sins."

AND whoever is partaker of her sins, will be also partaker of her judgments and of her ruin. And her judgment hasteth greatly and her ruin is certain. "For her sins have reached unto heaven and God hath remembered her iniquities. . . . And she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

Or the early times of the Reformation the historian relates that "Our portion of the reform was to seek alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation." And this is precisely what this alliance will find now, and all who will escape this destruction and desolation must turn away from this evil combination in all its details and take the course of that other portion of the early Reformation and the right course of all true reform. "Another portion looking up to God was haughtily to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory."

JESUS CHRIST has spoken: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The Sunday-law managers called upon the courts to securely *close* the Fair on Sundays, and the courts have *opened* the gates. From this they ought to learn the lesson which the Scriptures everywhere teach, that when those who profess to trust God turn to the powers of earth they find just the opposite of what they expect—where they expect help they find hindrance; where they expect victory they find defeat; where they expect salvation they find destruction. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, *in whom is no help.*"

BUT will the Sunday managers learn the lesson? No, no, no. They have gone too far. They will not turn back. This failure will only make them more determined and more desperate until they indeed get full power to carry out, by force, their arbitrary will. And the fuller their apparent victory, the more terrible will be their sure defeat. And as they will not turn from their evil course, all who will be Christians must turn away from them. "We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed: forsake her, and let us go every one to his own country; for her judgment reacheth unto heaven and is lifted up even to the skies." "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." J.

Outside Its Sphere.

THE decision of the Federal Appellate Court in relation to the right of the United States to enforce the closing of the World's Fair on Sundays ought to serve as a reminder to Congress to confine itself to its legitimate province of legislation as defined by the Constitution of the United States. That instrument does not authorize the national Legislature to make Sunday laws to be enforced in the States outside of the Federal service. As a matter of course the weekly day of rest is observed by the

United States courts, the departments in Washington, the Federal offices throughout the country, and the army and navy. The Constitution also provides that Sunday shall not be included in the ten days within which the President may return measures passed by Congress without his approval, but beyond these matters the Sunday observance does not come within the sphere of the general Government. The attempt of Congress to do by indirection what under the provisions of the Constitution it could not do directly, apparently has failed. It is to be desired, but it can hardly be hoped, that no such attempt will ever be made again.—*Buffalo Courier.*

Another Sunday Case in Tennessee.

THE International Religious Liberty Association has determined to again test in the court of last resort in that State the practice which, for some years, has prevailed in Tennessee, of indicting for public nuisance Seventh-day Adventists, because they habitually labor on Sunday.

There is, as the SENTINEL has frequently explained, no statute in Tennessee authorizing any such proceeding; but the courts of that State have held that the common law covers the ground, and so have sustained such indictments where the evidence was sufficient to prove habitual Sunday labor.

The first attempt to maintain an action of this kind in Tennessee failed, the Supreme Court holding that while Sunday work was contrary to the statute, and, therefore, finable under the law forbidding secular labor on that day, it was not a nuisance, and was not subject to indictment as such. And the court further held, as have also like courts in other States, that statute law takes precedence of common law, and that where a statute exists on any subject, it and not the common law must govern.

The case referred to was that of a barber, not an Adventist, who kept open shop on Sunday. The date of the case we have not now at hand. But it stood alone for several years, until some changes occurred on the Supreme Bench of the State, when another case was brought in 1885; this time against W. H. Parker, a Seventh-day Adventist, residing at Springville, in Henry County, Tenn.

The indictment charged Parker with following his common vocation, that of blacksmith, publicly, upon Sunday, in the month of April, 1885, and upon other Sundays previous to that,—in fact, that it was his usual habit to work in his shop on the first day of the week; and to this accusation no demur was made. Upon trial in the Circuit Court of Henry County, Parker was convicted, and an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, where the judgment of the Circuit Court was affirmed, the Supreme Court holding that the repetition of the acts of Sunday labor constituted a nuisance, and thus became indictable.

It does not appear from the records of this case that either the court or the attorneys were aware of the previous decision in the barber's case. It seems to have been entirely overlooked, as no mention is made of it in the report of the case in 16 Lea, page 476. The defense relied upon seems to have been that the defendant kept another day, namely, Saturday, agreeably to the fourth commandment; and that nobody was disturbed by the work. The first of these was of course overruled, for

it is a well established principle of law, that "a man cannot escape punishment for the violation of a positive statute by setting up a religious obligation which he believes is upon him to violate it." The reason for this rule is thus stated by Prof. James T. Ringgold:—

We have no conceivable way of getting at a man's belief except through his own statement of it; this must be accepted as conclusive, and there can be no denial or impeachment of the evidence. Hence, if any other rule were adopted we should have this *reductio absurdum*, that all any man arraigned for crime would need to do would be to say that he religiously believed that it was his duty to commit the crime, and he must therefore be found not guilty.

The Tennessee court did not err in refusing to entertain the religious defense. But it seems equally clear that on the other point the court was guilty of an unjust and absurd ruling. In the opinion the court said:—

The statute makes it unlawful for any one of the enumerated classes to follow his ordinary secular vocation on the Sabbath day, because it is immoral and is of pernicious effect, and, though it may be conceded a single offense may be liable only to the penalty prescribed by the statute, yet a succession of such acts becomes a nuisance and is indictable; such a succession and repetition of the acts are shown in this case, as one witness says, that defendant did work at his trade, as blacksmith, in his shop near Springville, every Sunday, and others testify to similar acts on many Sundays, within twelve months before the finding of the indictment. Nor is it necessary to a conviction that the proof should show that any person was disturbed thereby. It is sufficient that the acts, which the law holds as illegal and forbidden, have been done in such public manner as to have been open to the observation of the public.

A nuisance that does not annoy is an absurdity. The definition of the term, is: "That which annoys or gives trouble and vexation; that which is offensive or noxious."

It is doubtless true that some people in the neighborhood of Springville were annoyed in a certain sense by the knowledge that Mr. Parker worked in his shop near that village on Sunday; but it was not in a sense that the law of Tennessee originally undertook to forbid. The annoyance would have been just the same had they known that he habitually worked in his cellar, or that he hoed in his garden behind a high board fence. It was the same kind of annoyance that the Protestant might experience in seeing his neighbor going to mass or to confession; or that the Episcopalians felt a century ago in Virginia at seeing Baptists immersing people; it was the annoyance of religious intolerance; and of such annoyance the State of Tennessee has no right, under her constitution, to take cognizance.

Section 3, Article I. of the Constitution of the State of Tennessee, provides "that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship." Sunday keeping is an essential part of the worship of a number of different sects; and when, by law, they are protected in that worship to the extent that nobody is permitted to work while they pray, or even while they rest, it is certain that a preference is given by law to their mode of worship. A law requiring everybody to pay some deference to Good Friday would be no more in the interests of Roman Catholicism than is the Sunday law in the interests of those sects that regard the day as sacred to rest and worship. Such laws are clearly forbidden by the Constitution of the State of Tennessee. Not only is it absurd to maintain that something is a nuisance which annoys no one, but it is equally absurd,

under the constitution of Tennessee, to maintain that the State has any right to take cognizance of annoyance to the religious feelings or prejudices of anybody, unless the annoyance were of such a character as to properly constitute a breach of the peace.

But even the law against breach of the peace is sometimes made to serve the interests of religious intolerance. From 1768 to 1775, Baptists were frequently arrested in Virginia, charged with "disturbing the peace." The disturbance consisted in holding religious services, baptizing by immersion, etc. Rude fellows of the baser sort would gather on these occasions, and being encouraged by the well-known prejudice against the Baptists, if not actually incited to disorder by members of other churches, would indulge in violent demonstrations, hooting and throwing sticks and stones. For this the poor Baptist ministers were arrested and punished on the charge of "disturbing the peace," while their tormenters, the real offenders against civil order, went scot-free. In the Tennessee nuisance case against Adventists the history of religious intolerance is simply repeating itself.

American colonial history is exceedingly fruitful in illustrations of how religious intolerance has sought to shield itself behind civil considerations, and justify persecutions on the ground of protecting public morals and preserving the peace and dignity of the State. In "The Emancipation of Massachusetts," Brooks Adams relates how the clergy of that Colony "used the cry of heresy to excite odium, just as they called their opponents Antinomians, or dangerous fanatics," to stir up the people against them. "Though the scheme was unprincipled," says Mr. Adams, "it met with complete success, and the Antinomians have come down to posterity branded as deadly enemies of Christ and the commonwealth; yet nothing is more certain than that they were not only good citizens, but substantially orthodox." Of course the motive of the clergy was wholly religious, yet they made it appear that while they were concerned for what they regarded as the true faith they were equally interested in the welfare of the Colony.

Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard College, did not believe in infant baptism, and for this he was indicted and convicted on the charge of *disturbing church ordinances*. The disturbance was as real as is the disturbance charged in Tennessee against the Seventh-day Adventists—it was all in the minds of those who, having control of legislation, were determined that the civil power should be used in support, to some extent at least, of their tenets. Dunster was driven out as an enemy of the commonwealth, and died in poverty and neglect.

In 1651, John Cotton denounced certain Baptists as "foul murderers" because they denied infant baptism. And in "The Emancipation of Massachusetts" page 116, we are told that under the Puritan Commonwealth, the moment a man "refused implicit obedience, or above all, if he withdrew from his congregation he was shown no mercy, because such acts tended to shake the temporal power." "Therefore," says the same writer, page 118, "though Winslow solemnly protested before the commissioners at London that Baptists who lived peaceably would be left unmolested, yet such of them as listened to 'foul mur-

therers' were denounced as dangerous fanatics who threatened to overthrow the government, and were hunted through the country like wolves."

Similar facts might be given at almost any length both in the history of the American Colonies and in that of England and other countries, but enough has been said to show that religious intolerance ever seeks to hide its hideous face behind some civil law, and to justify its crimes against humanity on the ground of public necessity; but nobody is deceived except the poor bigots themselves. Everybody else knows full well the real motive.

C. P. B.

Chicago Correspondence.

Sunday Opening of the World's Fair Still at Issue.

THE Wanamaker suit against the World's Fair Directors, to compel the Sunday closing of the World's Fair still remains undecided. It would seem, from the treatment which it is receiving at the hands of Judge Jenkins, that he is either very much averse to rendering a decision in the case or else considers it a frivolous suit. After the hearing had upon the matter before Judge Jenkins, the decision was withheld until after the return of the judge from a short Fourth of July vacation; but upon taking his seat upon the bench last Friday, he gave no attention to the matter and it was privately given out that no decision would be rendered in less than a week. There is no question of the frivolousness of this litigation as brought by Wanamaker & Brown. It contravenes completely, the previous contention of the Sunday closers and is, in all respects, clearly brought solely for the purpose of continuing the contest and multiplying litigation, if possible, to a wearisome degree with the expectation of creating by persistency a change of public opinion and feeling upon the Sunday opening question. In regard to this suit from a legal and business point of view the *Chicago Herald* says editorially:—

If such a case as this can be maintained there is an end to all directory rule of corporations. When stockholders appoint a board of directors to carry on the business of their company they must abide by the discretion of that board in the management of the company affairs, and if dissatisfied their only remedy is to change the board in the constituted way. Of course, if fraud appears, that is a different thing, and in such an event the courts might take cognizance of it, but where doing this or that particular thing is solely a matter of judgment, the stockholders are bound by the judgment of the directors. It would make a nice confusion of affairs if a disgruntled stockholder in a corporation could whenever he chose, haul his directors before the court for doing something that his judgment didn't approve. The directory of a bank might make a loan, and the directory of a railway might lower its rates, the directory of any sort of a corporation might expend money in improvements that in every instance might be injudicious, but could it be tolerated for a moment that this mere matter of discretion could, at the whim of a stockholder, be brought before the court? There would be no end of litigation if this were so.

Although this Wanamaker suit seems to have scarcely no standing in the court, yet the Sunday opening of the Fair throughout the entire period of the existence of the Fair is not yet by any means a fixed fact. It has been said in a previous Chicago letter to the SENTINEL that the decision of Judge Fuller and his associates, in the Court of Appeals, made it certain that the World's Fair would be open on all Sundays of its existence, hereafter, but further developments go to show that such is not, by any means, necessa-

rily true. The Sunday attendance has not been large and therefore as there is no evident financial gain to be had from Sunday opening, some of those who previously advocated it are beginning to change front and desire that the Fair be closed. This growing feeling is supplemented by the action of the National Commissioners who have taken up the Sunday closing matter again with considerable vim. Commissioners Hundley and Tousley have united in the presentation of a resolution reviewing the question of Sunday closing as it has been previously before the commission and the local board, and containing this paragraph:—

Resolved, That the rule now being enforced by the World's Columbian Exposition for the purpose of opening the gates of the Exposition on the Sabbath day is in violation of the rule jointly adopted and promulgated by said Exposition and said commission, and is being enforced without the consent or authority of the World's Columbian Commission.

This resolution is the subject of daily bitter debate at the meetings of the commission. What the result of the renewed agitation will be is very uncertain. In the meantime the natural, reasonable and proper solution of the question, presented at the Fair itself, seems to be ignored by all parties to the controversy. The exhibitors at the Fair follow their own personal choice, whether influenced by conscientious scruples or by motives of personal convenience; those who wish to close their exhibits on Sunday do so; and those who desire to hold them open do so; and those who wish to attend the Fair on Sundays may be found there to the number of fifty to seventy-five thousand each Sunday, and at the same time, those who for any reason whatever wish to remain away are not there and feel no necessary compulsion to be there. That such is the proper solution of such a question, without the intervention of Congress or the courts in any degree seems not to enter into the minds of any interested in the matter. But even if it did at this stage of the proceedings, it would be a futile second thought, for Congress and the courts have committed themselves to the attempt to enforce the Sunday closing and their procedure is upon record irrevocably. The legal and legislative propriety of such a course has been established in such terms that it cannot be hoped that it will ever be repealed or overruled.

The Baptist and Methodist meetings are still weekly arenas of debate in condemnation of the Directory of the Fair and its Sunday opening measure. The Baptist ministers' last move was to appoint a committee to interview the members of the local board and attempt to secure Sunday closing by one means or another. It is not at all impossible that the storm which swept over the city last Sunday evening doing some slight damage to the buildings and the terrible loss of life at the burning of the cold storage building the next day, will be turned to account as evidences of divine displeasure at Sunday opening. It is well known that a visitation of the Fair by such calamities has been made a subject of prayer and these calamities may very naturally be considered in answer to these petitions.

W. H. M.

Chicago, July 10.

THE Christian can go to prison or to death, but he can not disobey God even at the behest of the greatest of civil powers. His invariable answer must be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

National Reform in the South.

The Soldier, a paper published at Columbia, S. C., in the interests of the Sunday Sabbath, has, in its issue of June 15, about as much bald-faced Sunday sophistry and so-called National Reform as is ever seen in one paper.

The Rev. Geo. S. Mott, vice-president of the American Sabbath Union, has a long article entitled, "Saturday or Sunday, Which?" in which he takes up the question of Sabbath observance as it is held by the Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists.

He says that while they "hold most of the doctrines designated as evangelical, and are a wealthy class of citizens," yet they "have placed themselves in antagonism to the movements for preserving the safeguards which now protect Sunday. And this opposition on the part of the leaders has assumed a violence that partakes of rancor, and a pride of opinion that will be satisfied with nothing short of the obliteration of Sunday from the creed of Christendom." "They confront and oppose the friends of Sunday by the press and before legislatures." "They hold that while the seventh day is the only Bible Sabbath, every one should be left perfectly free, so far as civil law is concerned, to observe any day, or no day at all, according to his own pleasure, or his own sense of duty to God. On this point their influence and arguments are necessarily on the side of those who would remove the safeguards which protect the civil side of Sunday."

Now, put this with what we find in the same paper from the editor on the purely "civil side" of Sunday: "Seventh-day Sabbatarians are trying to break down our established day of rest and worship. Should they succeed in this, we would have no rest day. To destroy the one now existing would leave us Sabbathless, for they could establish no other." And then on the same page he asks the mournful question: "If we give up our Sabbaths [civil Sundays] how shall we reach the people with the gospel?" But what about these Sabbatarians? do they never reach any body with the gospel? It would seem so from this; yet "they hold most of the doctrines designated as evangelical."

Well, if they hold "most of the doctrines designated as evangelical" by these other churches, what is that which they do not hold? It must be the "civil Sunday," and as they have not this, they have not the *gospel!* Then what is that "gospel" by which these self-styled reformers mean to reach the people? It certainly can be none other than this civil Sunday.

And how do they intend to "carry" this "gospel" to the people? by going out into the world as sheep among wolves? No; for in speaking of the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday, *The Soldier* says: "We do not propose now to be defeated by a mercenary and godless board of local managers, who thus defy God and man;" and then, after calling the Local Directory of the World's Fair "incorrigibly wicked" and "past hope" and "not only Sabbath breakers but swindlers and liars," and "virtually stealing the appropriation," the editor quotes from the *Alabama Christian Advocate* the following:—

The fact is the religious sentiment of this Christian country has suffered enough at the foul hands and putrid breath of the hoodlums,

gamblers, and scoffing infidels of the land. Is it possible that the executive head of this great Nation—the President—whose duty it is to see that the laws are enforced, will stand idly by, fold his hands; and see a Chicago rabble tread under foot a law of Congress? . . . Must the great principles of American liberty be prostituted to baseness and corruption in order to foster the interests of a godless and shameless crew of shysters and charlatans? God forbid! Let the moral and religious forces of the country [the President and the militia] be marshaled against this iniquitous plot and nefarious scheme of bad men.

I need add no comment to these words; any one can see that such language comes not from Him who said, "If any man hear my words and believe not I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world but to save the world." And, "Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

What will become of "dissenters" when such men as these get control of the civil power? Surely the rack and thumbscrew can not be far distant.

J. O. JOHNSTON.

Persecuting Sabbath-Keepers at Ford's Store, Maryland.

On Monday, June 26, 1893, Mr. Samuel Marvell served warrants of arrest upon Mr. Geo. W. Marvell and Mr. Atwood Bryan, charging them with Sabbath breaking, and notified them to appear on Wednesday, June 28, for trial. At one o'clock we were present. (The writer representing Atwood Bryan, who was not present.) The justice read the charge against Mr. Geo. W. Marvell. Seeing that the warrants were not properly drawn, we asked for them, so we could see exactly the trouble. Very reluctantly they were produced, and after going through them, we asked that the cases be postponed, on the ground that we had not counsel. The justice then asked the constable if the hour we suggested suited him. We told the justice that we thought that as Mr. Marvell was constable, and that it was his duty to be present at the time mentioned, that it suited us, as our counsel, no doubt, would come on Monday evening's steamer, defend the case, and return in the morning. So the justice postponed the case to suit our convenience. When that decision was made the spirit of the dragon began to rise. We left as our business had been attended to. But the people worried the justice so that he ran 300 or 400 yards to catch us, and said that the people back there had said he had done wrong; that they had come there as witnesses on the case, and wanted it to go on. We told him that it would be better for him not to listen to the witnesses and opposers, that his instructions should come from Mr. P. B. Hopper, the State Attorney. We also said that if Mr. Hopper had been present, that without a doubt both cases would have been discharged, as we were not brought before him with any charges whatsoever. So we declined to go back until the appointed hour on Monday, July 3, at 7.30 o'clock.

At the appointed time the prisoners Mr. Geo. W. Marvell and Mr. Atwood Bryan, with their counsel, J. T. Ringgold, were present. The hall was crowded on the inside, a number of ladies being present, and some ladies who are opposed to us were on the outside. They came to see our brethren go to jail, but were ashamed to let any one see that they were so much interested. We estimate the attendance at from 175 to 200.

Before the witnesses were put upon the stand, Mr. Ringgold argued that Mr. Geo. W. Marvell was not there upon any charge whatever, as the writ did not charge him with any crime. The justice could not see the point, or did not want to see it, and would not dismiss the case, but held it under advisement. He said he thought it would take him another week to decide whether the accused was legally before him or not.

Mr. Atwood Bryan's case was then taken up. The warrant charged Mr. Bryan with Sabbath-breaking. Such a thing or crime, Mr. Ringgold says, is unknown to the Maryland law, and that the warrant was not such as to bring the man before him. But the justice claimed that the warrant was only a summons, and that the charge was on his docket for manual labor, and that he should try the case if we were ready. Of course, we were ready, and the trial proceeded with Wm. Lloyd Ford as first witness for the State:

Justice.—Tell the court what you know about Mr. Bryan working on Sunday.

[Mr. Ringgold objected to that as the charge was made for breaking the Sabbath.]

Justice.—Tell the court what you know about Mr. Bryan's working.

Witness.—I saw Mr. Bryan between 9 and 10 o'clock on Sunday doing manual labor.

[The justice asked no more questions and the defense took the witness.]

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Ford, will you swear that you saw Mr. Bryan on the Sabbath day doing manual labor?

Witness.—I saw him working on the Christian Sabbath.

Mr. Ringgold.—Never mind the Christian Sabbath. Mr. Bryan is not charged with breaking the Christian Sabbath; he is charged with breaking the Sabbath.

Witness.—Sunday is my Sabbath.

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Witness, will you show me in this warrant where Ford's Sabbath is?

Witness.—I will not answer.

[At that time the dragon spirit began to rise, and the opposers who could not get in commenced to shout at the counsel, and another on the inside told witness not to answer the question.]

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Justice, if this is not stopped I want warrants for the arrest of these men for contempt of court.

[When they saw that our counsel would have no foolishness, they quieted down like lambs.]

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Witness, will you swear positively that Mr. Bryan did work upon the Sabbath?

Witness.—I will.

Mr. Ringgold.—Where were you standing when you saw him, and what was prisoner doing?

Witness.—I was at Mr. Taylor's, and I saw some one raising something up and down as if digging.

Mr. Ringgold.—Can you swear what he was raising up and down?

Witness.—I cannot.

Mr. Ringgold.—How far were you off?

Witness.—Three hundred yards (about).

Mr. Ringgold.—Do you know if he was doing manual labor or work of necessity?

Witness.—I do not; but I came within one hundred yards of him and saw him pick up his ax and cut some wood. Then he picked up something like a shovel and was shoveling something.

Mr. Ringgold.—Can you swear what Mr. Bryan was doing was not a work of necessity?

Witness.—I cannot.

Mr. Wm. Taylor was the next witness called. He gave the same testimony as his fellow-detective missionary or missionary detective, excepting he could swear at three hundred yards that Mr. Bryan was using a hoe. He has to wear glasses to read.

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Taylor, why did you have Mr. Bryan arrested?

Witness.—I love Mr. Bryan. I love everybody, and I did it so he would do right and go to heaven.

Mr. Ringgold.—So you thought that a fine of \$5.00 or thirty days in jail would send him to heaven, did you? [Witness would not answer.]

Mr. Ringgold.—Will you swear that the work Mr. Bryan was doing was not a work of necessity?

Witness.—No, sir.

Mr. Ringgold.—Will you swear that Mr. Bryan was breaking the Sabbath?

Witness.—No, sir.

Mr. Ringgold.—Do you know if Mr. Bryan was

digging potatoes for dinner, and cutting wood to cook them with or not?

Witness.—I do not.

Mr. Ringgold.—Mr. Taylor, did you not swear out this warrant? (Showing the warrant.)

Witness.—I did not swear to any such warrant as that one.

This closed the testimony for the State, and as we did not want any witnesses, the case was left to the justice. As seen, there was no evidence whatever to prove that Mr. Bryan was doing other work than work of necessity or charity. But the justice's verdict was *guilty*. It is a common practice here to dig potatoes or such vegetables as grow in our gardens on Sunday, and never before has any one been arrested for doing such work on Sunday.

The people who are doing this have our earnest prayers, for they know not what they do. John 15, 2:3, says, that "They shall put you out of the synagogues, yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God's service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father nor me." It can be seen that they believe that they are doing God's service, when persecuting us for our faith, because they have not been to the Father or Christ. God has given us sufficient grace to bear up under it, and when worse comes (which will) we shall ask our Saviour for more grace, and he will give it according to his promise.

We ask every one to pray for these poor blind people who know not what they are doing. Ask God to open up their minds and hearts to the truth of the word of God before it is eternally too late.

CHAS. O. FORD.

"Jeroboam Has Followers Yet."

THE above quotation is the closing sentence in an article entitled, "Seventh-Day Adventism," and signed "Truth," published in the *Kent News*, of Chestertown, Md., July 1, 1893. In order that all may see the "truth" in that statement we will look at the history of Jeroboam and compare it with his "followers." Yet Jeroboam was chosen to reign over ten tribes of Isaael. After a period of prosperity he began to fear the people under his charge would revolt, "Whereupon the king took counsel and made two calves of gold and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." Having substituted false gods in place of the true the king next appointed a feast day in their honor and for their worship. "And Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah. . . . So he offered upon the altar which he had made in Bethel the fifteenth day of the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised of his own heart." 1 Kings 12:28, 33.

It will be observed that the Lord had appointed a feast on the fifteenth day of the *seventh* month, but the king Jeroboam, had appointed his feast day on the fifteenth of the *eighth* month. No doubt he "devised of his own heart" that the particular day God had commanded was not so worthy of regard as the one ordained by himself to commemorate the deliverance of the people from Jewish customs into the fuller liberty he had inaugurated. One thing however troubled him; there were men that would not join

in this idolatry, for we read: "And behold there came a man of God out of Judah by the word of the Lord unto Bethel; and Jeroboam stood by the altar to burn incense. And he cried against the altar in the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord; behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee."

This was more than the king could endure. Here was a man preaching against the religious laws of the land and refusing to obey the king and magistrates in that respect. The peace and dignity of the nation demanded prompt action, so, "It came to pass, when king Jeroboam heard the saying of the man of God, which had cried against the altar in Bethel, that he put forth his hand from the altar, saying, Lay hold on him." Jeroboam had the law on his side, and he did not propose to have his holy days denounced, so he gave orders for the prophet to be arrested. Perhaps he reasoned that this was not persecution, it was only enforcing the law.

Now let us apply these principles in the career of Jeroboam, to the two classes mentioned by "Truth" and see where "Jeroboam's followers" are found. Evidently the writer of the article mentioned, intended the sentence to apply to Seventh-day Adventists, whom he accuses of doing a "nefarious work." Is it the case that Seventh-day Adventists have gained control of the civil power and are now using it for the arrest of those who differ with them in religious faith and practice? Such a thing has never been known, and they repudiate any desire for such authority. They are not followers of Jeroboam in that respect. How is it in reference to the holy-days commanded by the Lord, have they substituted some other days? Their very name signifies that they observe for the Sabbath the very day of the week commanded by the law of God. In fact "Truth" acknowledges that therein lies their chief offense; he says:—

Their mischief comes of their teaching in reference to the Sabbath day. They seek to show the unwary that unless we keep the *seventh* day instead of the first, they violate the law, and in so doing they are an unpardoned sinner before God, no matter how strictly they may keep the other provisions of the sacred Scriptures."

Certainly then they are not the followers of Jeroboam in this particular. We are compelled, therefore, to see if the application will fit any better when used to describe "Truth" and his fellow-men. The first thing that meets our view is that "Truth" desires the first day of the week to be kept holy instead of the seventh—"devised of his own heart"—that this day is more fitting for Christians than the one sanctified by the Lord. It certainly looks as though Jeroboam had many followers, and "Truth" may be hit by his own boomerang. Again it will be noticed that "Truth" and his followers have secured the aid of civil laws to enforce their so-called holy-day, thus proving their kinship with Jeroboam. Another feature of resemblance is that they are greatly disturbed because some prophet of the Lord speaks against their man-made institutions. Then "Truth" after severe censure for such "nefarious work," says:—

And if such teachings are not stopped matters will grow worse. How long our rulers mean to endure all this, and how long our tax-payers are

willing to pay the constantly increasing cost of court expenses these men are imposing on the people, remain to be seen."

And then the next sentence is "Jeroboam has followers yet." Whatever he meant, the only correct idea to be drawn from his words and its illustration is, that just as Jeroboam stretched out his hand and said, "Lay hold on him," so "our rulers" are to say, Lay hold on the men that speak against our Sunday laws; and "Truth" wants to know how much longer they will wait before measures to stop such teaching shall be made.

Verily Jeroboam has many followers, and "Truth" is one of them. It may, therefore, be well for us to see the result of the king's effort. "And his hand, which he put against him dried up, so that he could not pull it in again to him." So our modern Jeroboams by invoking the sword are quite likely to perish with the same weapon. When they have stretched out their hand against Adventists they may not be able to pleasure to pull it in again. Then the king asked the man of God to entreat for him that his hand might be restored and it was done. But, alas! when his followers shall find themselves overtaken by the righteous judgments of God, and shall wander from sea to sea seeking some man of God to give them the word of the Lord, it will then be too late. Oh! that the followers of Jeroboam might now listen to those who plead for Jehovah and his word.

H. E. ROBINSON.

Church and State in North Carolina.*

THERE is no question of deeper interest to the provinces of the Canadian Dominion or to any country which at present lies outside the boundaries of the United States, than the inquiry, What would be the rights of such province or country with respect to provisions concerning religion within its territory? So far as the Federal Government is concerned, that, as we know, is debarred from touching the matter, by the First Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. That limitation on the powers of Congress is largely due to the course taken by North Carolina, which, as is well known, refused to adopt the Constitution, unless supplemented by amendments of which this was the chief. The fact shows that North Carolina was determined to reserve to itself as a State, the exclusive right of regulating religion; and, for that reason, the record of the relations of Church and State in that commonwealth is peculiarly instructive. The subject has recently been discussed at length and with singular lucidity by Prof. Stephen B. Weeks in a contribution to the series of the Johns Hopkins studies in historical and political science.

In North Carolina, as in Virginia, the Church of England was by law established up to the outbreak of the Revolution, and the abolition of it was one of the first steps taken in each State by the Convention called to frame a Constitution. That a majority of the inhabitants of North Carolina were Dissenters through the greater part of the colonial epoch is proved by the extreme difficulty, not to say impossibility, of levying tithes and providing other resources for the mainte-

* For editorial comment see last page of this paper.

nance of the Anglican clergy. Nevertheless, although the payment of tithes could be evaded, there were other hardships and disabilities which Dissenters, including Presbyterians, as well as Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites, Dunkards, Unitarians and Catholics could not avoid. All these nonconformists suffered from the muster law, by which a distinction was made in favor of the clergymen of the Church of England and against dissenting ministers. Then, again, although Scotland was supposed to enjoy equal rights with England in the colonies, even Presbyterian ministers were not allowed to perform the marriage ceremony till 1766; and, when they did perform it, the fee went to the local minister of the Church of England. To other dissenters, Quakers excepted, this right was not conceded before 1776. Worst of all was the enforcement in North Carolina of the Schism act, repealed in England in 1718, which prohibited any one from keeping a school in the provinces unless he had obtained a certificate from the Anglican authorities. There is not a doubt that the enforcement of this act up to the period of the revolutionary war, through the widespread ignorance which it engendered, is directly responsible for the large percentage of illiteracy, and for the backwardness of intellectual activity characteristic of the State to-day.

If the Revolution really began in North Carolina, as the natives of that State contend, it was because the people were even more inflamed by a desire for religious freedom than by the wish for political independence. The Bill of Rights and State Constitution, adopted by the Provincial Congress at Halifax in December, 1776, asserted the natural and inalienable right of men to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. It was further laid down that there should be no establishment of any one religious church or denomination in the State of North Carolina in preference to any other. Neither should any person, on any pretense, be compelled to attend any place of worship contrary to his own faith or judgment, or be obliged to pay for the purchase of any glebe or the building of any house of worship, or the maintenance of any minister, contrary to what he believed right, or had voluntarily and personally engaged to perform. On the contrary, all persons should be at liberty to exercise their own mode of worship. These declarations involved the downfall of the Established Church. It only remained for the laws of the new State to be brought into conformity with the new Constitution. Marriage was put on a proper footing in 1778, by a law giving the privilege of performing the ceremony to all ministers alike. Next, the terms of the affirmation for Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites, and Dunkards were fixed. The restriction of school teaching to men fortified with the certificate of the Anglican authorities, of course, disappeared, and the law respecting the care of the orphan children of Quakers was repealed.

It is evident that North Carolina, from the moment that it declared itself an independent State, asserted an exclusive and unchallenged authority over religious matters. It could, had it so chosen, have retained the establishment and endowment of the Anglican or Episcopal Church. It might have established the Presbyterian Church, as it was then, and is still, established in Scotland. It might have given

Calvinists of the Congregational type the same privileges which they enjoyed at the time in the Colony of Massachusetts. It might, had a majority of the colonists been Catholics, have made Catholicism the religion of the State. It did none of these things; but, in its fundamental organic law, it made, as we have seen, a close approach to universal toleration. Nevertheless, there was one provision, which, in process of time seemed to require amendment. The thirty-second section of the State Constitution of 1776 read as follows: "No person who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testament, or shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within the State." As time went on, there were various interpretations of this section. One theory held that it clearly excluded atheists and such deists as made a parade of their infidelity by proclaiming the Scriptures to be false. Others thought that it disqualified Jews also, on the ground that the latter must necessarily deny the divine authority of the New Testament. Still others maintained that Quakers, Mennonites, and Dunkards were disqualified, because their belief that arms cannot lawfully be used in defense of one's native country is subversive of its freedom and repugnant to its safety. Many lawyers declared, and their views seem to have been followed in practice, that the clause in question excluded nobody; that for want of a specified tribunal to expound and enforce it, the provision was a dead letter.

There is no doubt that the clause had been aimed at Roman Catholics. But it had never been interpreted against them. Thomas Burke, who publicly professed the Catholic faith, was a member of the Continental Congress from South Carolina, and, in 1781, was elected Governor of the State. There was no State office, from that of Governor down to that of constable, which had not, at one time or another, been filled by a Catholic. Perhaps the most distinguished of these was William Gaston, who had been successively a member of the State Senate, a representative in Congress, and a Justice of the State Supreme Court. No complaint was made when Judge Gaston assumed his seat upon the bench; nevertheless, it was thought best to amend the section in question when the matter came up in the Constitutional Convention of 1835. In the Constitution of North Carolina, framed and adopted then, the word "Christian" was substituted for "Protestant"; and thus, in the words uttered by Judge Gaston at the time, was the carcass of the last remnant of religious persecution interred, lest its pestilential effluvia should poison the atmosphere of freedom.—*N. Y. Sun, June 16.*

WHEN a religious organization resorts to the law to compel recognition of its tenets or customs, it proves its spiritual power to be at a low ebb. When it must have the aid of the State in the way of laws exempting its property from taxation soldiers and police to enforce its Sabbath regulations, grants of public money to support its institutions, and the like, there certainly is a screw loose in its spirituality somewhere. Some religious leaders are too eager to throw aside the sword of

the Lord and of Gideon and seize upon the weapons which man hath fashioned by his own cunning.—*Independent Herald, Bertrand, Nebr.*

Is It Selfishness?

THERE are many selfish people in the world, but they can never see themselves that they are selfish. They think that everyone else is selfish and is trying to deprive them of their rights, but they cannot see that by their actions they are continually depriving others of their inalienable rights.

How is it with the Sunday-law advocate? He complains that because the World's Fair is open on Sunday the rights of the "Christian people" of the country are infringed. He virtually says: "We, the Christian people of the land, have asked that the Fair be closed on Sunday, and our request should be granted; not only so, but every person should be compelled to keep the day we regard as sacred." It matters not to him how much his fellow-man's rights are infringed so long as his are not. There are thousands who do not believe in the sacredness of Sunday, but that makes no difference to the Sunday-law advocate. In his eyes the "insignificant minority" have no rights that should be respected. Is there any selfishness in this? Is there any Christianity?

Christians should be freest of all people, for the Author of Christianity says: "Whom the Son makes free is free indeed;" but is a man free when his conscience is tied by a certain set calling themselves Christians? He is not; he is a slave, and that of the worst kind; for if he persists in being loyal to God, then he must suffer the penalty. He is called a law-breaker; he is put into prison; and if he still persists in being free in matters of religion, then stronger measures must be taken. The Sunday-law advocate has gone even so far as to threaten the use of the sword and the bullet if he does not have his way. But Christ said, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." But to them that are persecuted for His sake He says: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven."

EAGLE BRAND

THE

BEST ROOFING

Is unequaled for House, Barn, Factory, or Out-Buildings, and costs half the price of shingles, tin or iron. It is ready for use, and easily applied by any one. Send stamp for samples, and state size of roof. Address,

EXCELSIOR PAINT AND ROOFING CO.,
DEPT., 9, 155 DUANE STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

"EVERYBODY'S LAW BOOK"

Is the title of the new 768 page work prepared by J. Alexander Koonce, L. L. B., member of the New York Bar.

It Enables Every Man and Woman to be Their Own Lawyer.

It teaches what are your rights and how to maintain them. When to begin a law suit and when to shun one. It contains the useful information every business man needs in every State in the Union. It contains business forms of every variety useful to the lawyer as well as to all who have legal business to transact.

Inclose two dollars for a copy, or inclose two cent postage stamp for a table of contents and terms to agents. Address,

Benj. W. Hitchcock, Publisher,
885 Sixth Avenue, New York.

THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM HEALTH FOODS.

For more than sixteen years the Battle Creek Sanitarium has maintained a Health Food Department, at first for the benefit of its patients and patrons, later, and for more than a dozen years, with increased facilities, to supply the general public. Within the last year **More than 150 Tons** of the following named foods have been manufactured and sold:—

- Oatmeal Biscuit, Rye Wafers,
- Medium Oatmeal Crackers,
- Fruit Crackers, Carbon Crackers,
- Plain Oatmeal Crackers,
- No. 1 Graham Crackers, Avenola,
- No. 2 Graham Crackers, Granola,
- Plain Graham Crackers (Dyspeptic),
- Wheat Granola, White Crackers,
- Whole Wheat Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 1, Gluten Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 2, Infants' Food.

Granola, The Gem of Health Foods.

Our Granola, which has now been manufactured by us for nearly seventeen years, is unquestionably the finest health food ever devised, and is greatly superior to any of the numerous imitations to which its success has given rise.

TO THE PUBLIC: This certifies that the Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods, manufactured by the Sanitarium under the name of the Sanitarium Food Company, are made under my direction and supervision, and that Granola and the other special foods manufactured by this company, are not made or sold by any other firm or person except their duly authorized agents.

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Our goods are shipped to every part of the world—to Australia, New Zealand, India, Persia, and other foreign countries, as well as to all parts of the United States; and in every instance they have demonstrated their wonderful keeping properties. The following are a few of the hundreds of testimonials received from persons who have for years made use of our foods.

I have for three years used the "Health Foods" in my family, and can heartily recommend them, both for purity and health-giving properties.

MICHIGAN.
C. F. PORTER, D. D. S.

Your "Health Foods" are the wonder of the nineteenth century. I have used Granola but a short time, but have already experienced relief from indigestion and acid, or flatulent dyspepsia. I also find the Zwiebach nourishing and toothsome.

INDIANA.
D. M. KAUFFMAN.

I have personally tested your excellent food known as Granola. It is highly pleasing to the taste, easy of digestion, and the most nutritive cereal production with which I am acquainted.

NEW YORK.
DR. R. W. BULA.

Your Granola is the best selling invalid food I have ever handled. I have already sold nearly two thousand pounds.

CONNECTICUT.
A. J. BROUGHTON.

We have used your "Health Foods" in our family for three years, and can not get along without them. Having been troubled with dyspepsia and chronic inflammation of the stomach, I find that your Granola, Avenola, Wheatena, and Gluten are the only foods that I can eat with safety.

OHIO.
WM. M. MERWIN.

Our baby is a testimonial to Sanitarium food. She is ten months old, weighs twenty-eight pounds, and is as ruddy and healthy a specimen as can be seen. She has actually gained flesh while cutting her last two teeth. Her flesh is firm and sound, and she is very strong.

MINNESOTA.
FRED. L. ROSEMOND.

We have twins, and the little fellows are thriving nicely. The food agrees with them perfectly, and I have recommended it to many who are bringing up babies "by hand."

D. W. McCOURT.

We are constantly improving our foods, and adding to our list as the result of experimental researches conducted in the Sanitarium Laboratory of Hygiene and our Experimental Kitchen. For the latest descriptive circular and price list, address,

SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE MORMON QUESTION.

Is the Prohibition of Polygamy Religious Legislation? This tract is a dispassionate arraignment of polygamy as an invasion of natural rights, and a logical defense of the right of every man to keep any day or no day as a season of rest and worship. 20 pages. Price 2½ cts.

Address—PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 Bond Street, New York City.

AMERICAN WATCH AND CHAIN.

PRICE, \$1.50.

DUST-PROOF GOLD-PLATED CASE.

American Lever Movement, Patent Escapement and Regulator, Patent Winding and Setting Attachment Requiring no Key, 240 Beats to Minute; Hour, Minute, and Second Hands.

THE CHEAPEST GENUINE AMERICAN WATCH EVER SOLD.

Timed, Tested, and Regulated. **EVERY WATCH GUARANTEED.**

The case is strong and tight, of solid composition metal used the world over as a substitute for gold, with an **Elegant Gold-plated Chain and Charm**. Packed in a neat box and mailed to any address for \$1.50 each; 3 for \$4.00 by express; one dozen for \$15.00 by express.

FULLY GUARANTEED TO KEEP ACCURATE TIME.

It is fully as durable as the most expensive watch, and with fair usage will keep good time for **TEN YEARS**. This watch is being manufactured in lots of 100,000 at the rate of 1,000 PER DAY by the largest watch manufacturing concern in the world. This constitutes the sole reason for its low price. It is a practical illustration of what may be done in this country by machinery and skilled operators when an article can be sold in large quantities. Its parts are not made by hand by "Pauper European labor" as are most of the cheap watches now sold, which never run long and can never be repaired. Automatic machinery does everything in this watch, and every part is as true as a die can make it. The movement is the same as in all American watches, and is readily understood and repaired by any jeweler. **Every Watch Timed, Tested, and Regulated before leaving our hands, and carefully packed with chain.**

A Few Testimonials for You to Read. We Have Them From Every State.

WEBB CITY, Mo., Jan. 9, 1893.
GENTLEMEN: I am much pleased with the Watch you sent me, and I will say it keeps right up on time. It has not varied any as yet.
Most truly yours,
DR. ANDERSON.

CATO, Mass., Jan. 6, 1893.
GENTLEMEN: I take pleasure in saying the Watch you sent me gave perfect satisfaction. It is a good time-keeper and all you recommend it to be. You will be favored with an order from me soon.
Yours truly,
W. G. DONNELL.

CALDWELL, KANS., Jan. 3, 1893.
SIRS: I received your Watch and found it to be as represented in the *Twentieth Century* advertisement. It would be hard to improve on its time-keeping qualities.
Yours truly,
MOSES HINCHCLIFFE.

Forte Wayne, Ind.
R. H. Ingersoll & Bro., Room 44, 65 Cortlandt St., New York—*Kind Sirs*: It is a standing rule of mine when I see an admirable trait in any character, or a marked excellence in anything, to express appreciation either in public or in private. Taffy is better than *epitaffy*. Post-mortem praises do the dead no good. The corpse smells no flowers on its casket. Hence I want to say that I am delighted with your Watch—a little gem. I keep it on my typewriter desk during week-days, right before my eyes, and it keeps *splendid* time; I then use it on my pulpit Lord's days.
Faithfully yours,
REV. STEPHEN A. NORRIS.



R. H. INGERSOLL & BRO., Sole Mfrs., Room 44, 65 Cortlandt St., New York.



NEW YORK, JULY 20, 1893.

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.

A Word of Explanation.

WE are asked to explain the statement made two weeks ago in these columns to the effect that the Sunday closing proviso in the World's Fair bill "is in no sense law." The phrase used did not express clearly the thought in the writer's mind. The act in question did not require the closing of the Fair on Sunday, but did propose to secure such closing by making it the condition of a gift. This was as far as Congress could go, for in no other way could Congress control the actions of a State corporation operating within the boundaries of a sovereign State. The act of Congress did however bind the Government, the legislative, judicial, and executive; and did just as fully commit the Government to the championship of Sunday as though in its terms it had been mandatory. The proviso is law, in just the sense that every other act appropriating money is law, when passed by both houses of Congress and signed by the President. This view of the matter is in perfect keeping both with all that the SENTINEL has ever said on the subject and with the legal decisions that have been had, excepting that of Judges Woods and Jenkins, which was overruled.

WE print on page 228 of this paper under the heading, "Persecuting Sabbath Keepers at Ford's Store, Md.," an account of the trial of one Adventist before a Justice of the Peace at that place, and the postponement of another case, that of Mr. G. W. Marvell.

MR. MARVELL was arrested with only the pretense of a warrant. The paper which purported to be a warrant was not a warrant in any sense. Therefore, after taking the matter under advisement for one week, as related in the account given on page 228 by Mr. Ford, the justice issued a warrant and upon that Mr. Marvell was again taken into custody.

This case was tried on the morning of the 11th inst., and though there was no evidence to justify such a conclusion, Mr. Marvell was found guilty. The case was appealed. The fact is that it requires no evidence to convict an Adventist in Maryland of Sunday work. The charge is sufficient, and unless the accused can prove that he did not work, his conviction is a foregone conclusion.

In Mr. Marvell's case the constable who

made the charge against him, and who arrested him, and who will get the fees, came to him the evening before the trial and said that he did not actually see him doing any work, and that if he would swear that he was not working that would settle it. This Mr. Marvell declined to do, and the next morning he was promptly convicted.

Now the *Mail and Express* says that "Attorney-General Rosendale has sent a written opinion to President Huntington of the State Commissioners of Fisheries, to the effect that Sunday fishing does not come within the scope or meaning of the law for the protection and preservation of fish and game. He further declares that the provisions of the Penal Code, Section 265, as to fishing on the first day of the week, is an act for the observance of Sunday, but that the fish and game protectors have no statutory duty and possess no powers in respect thereto "more than any other citizen."

RHEA COUNTY, Tennessee, is about to proceed against those who do not square their lives by the established religion of the State, and keep the venerable day of the sun, the legal Sabbath of the State of Tennessee. In his charge to the Grand Jury at Dayton on the 3rd inst., Judge Traynor referred to the Seventh-day Adventists, ridiculed their observance of Saturday, and said that the Mormons might as well contend for the privilege of practicing polygamy. The Adventists have an academy at Graysville, in Rhea County, and as everywhere else their reputation for fair dealing, and exemplary lives is excellent. The only charge against them is concerning the law of their God. What the outcome of the judge's charge will be remains to be seen.

THE *Sun*, in some respects the best of the New York dailies, is very anxious for the annexation of Canada, or, as some prefer to call it, for political union of the Dominion with the United States. Three considerations are in Canada urged against political union with the States: (1) Loyalty to the British Crown; (2) Loss of national identity; (3) The provision of the Federal Constitution prohibiting any union of Church and State.

It is of course the Roman Catholics who object to political union with the United States on the ground last stated, namely because Congress is by the Constitution prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. And this objection the *Sun* undertakes to remove, not by showing the Romanists the iniquity of Church and State union, and the justice of religious liberty, but by assuring the papists of Quebec that their province could become a member of the American Union and still retain its eccle-

siastical establishment. This is perhaps technically true, but it would not be true if the courts were to give to the First and Fourteenth Amendments the broad application of which they are capable. But whether true or not, it is a shame that a leading American newspaper should be willing to thus sell the American birth-right for a mess of popish pottage.

THE account which the *Sun* gives of the evolution of religious toleration in North Carolina is interesting; but it is a mistake to suppose that by substituting the word "Christian" for "Protestant" in the constitution of that State, "was the carcass of the last remnant of religious persecution interred," even if Judge Gaston did say so. Jews and atheists are still under the same disability that Catholics were formerly, and the "pestilential effluvia" of persecution is just as likely to "poison the atmosphere of freedom" in that State to-day as it was before the constitution was amended by striking out the word "Protestant." But the *Sun's* is the popish view of religious liberty, which Cardinal Gibbons has defined as "freedom to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience,"—the Catholic Church, of course, to determine what is a "right" conscience.

THE Adventists are building a very nice little church at Ford's Store, Md., and some of the zealous Sunday keepers threaten to burn it down. One lady who makes a high profession in another church said she would furnish all the oil necessary to make sure work of it, or words to that effect. It is marvelous what some people will do in the interests of Christianity (?) and law (?).

SUNDAY closing seems about to be realized owing to lack of patronage of the Fair on that day. Closed buildings, covered exhibits, and the religious boycott, are strong arguments. Doubtless the churches will know how to use such weapons in the future even more effectively than in the case of the Fair.

APROPOS of the advertisement on another page is the following note, which speaks for itself:—

"Box 107, Willow Lake, S. D.,
May 22nd, 1893.

"Editors AMERICAN SENTINEL: I sent for one of those cheap watches on the strength of your advertisement, and it is 'O. K.' Thanks for advertising it. It is not a fraud, 'evident' nor otherwise. Those 'unfriendly' critics were too fast. 'Slow to speak' is a safe motto.

"Yours for the right,
"WM. JOHNSTON."

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.