

AMERICAN SENTINEL

"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."

VOLUME 10.

NEW YORK, MAY 30, 1895.

NUMBER 22.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
 No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
 Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
 CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }
 LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

THE GEORGIA COURTS AND THE SUNDAY LAW.

AN interesting question, though by no means a new one, has been raised by the case of J. Q. Allison, at Douglasville, Ga., an account of which is given elsewhere in this paper.

Mr. Allison produced a Bible in court and proposed to show from it his authority for holding that the seventh day is the Sabbath. But he was stopped by the judge, who told him: "That won't do in this court." "We allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law."

Mr. Allison then read from Section 6, Article 1, of the constitution of Georgia, which is as follows:—

Perfect freedom of religious sentiment shall be, and the same is hereby secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property, or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the people.

Mr. Allison was interrupted by the court before he had finished reading this section, and was informed that the only question be-

fore the court was, whether he had worked on the first day of the week or not, at the time charged in the indictment. And in this connection the judge said:—

I would not interfere with you in any way in the enjoyment of your religion; this is simply a law of the State, and we are bound thereby. The State could say that you should keep Wednesday or Thursday or every other Thursday, that it would be a crime to work on every other Wednesday or every other Thursday, and we would be bound to obey that law.

This statement by the judge would be true if the law were indeed a merely civil regulation based upon civil reasons; but according to decisions of the Supreme Court of Georgia,

solutely no other basis except the supposed sacred character of the day. No other reason could possibly exist for forbidding a man to plow in his own field on Sunday; and Judge Janes can ascertain for himself that this is the ground upon which the Supreme Court of Georgia has sustained the Sunday law.

In 1852 Judge Lumpkin, of Georgia, said: "All agree that to the well-being of society stated intervals of rest are absolutely necessary. We should not tempt mankind, therefore, to yield obedience to municipal arrangements which overlook and disregard the moral law of the great Jehovah, who, from the smoking top of Mount Sinai, proclaimed to all the world, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; in it thou shalt not do any work.'"¹

This is a direct acknowledgment of the religious character of Sunday, and likewise of the laws which sustain it, and the same could never be true of Wednesday or Thursday, for nobody claims that the fourth commandment has any reference to those days. Again, as recently as 1871, Judge Lochrane said that he felt sustained in presuming the law of Kansas to be the same as that of his own State (Georgia) in this

regard, because the contrary view would suppose the people of Kansas to have annulled the Decalogue and to have permitted by law the disregard of Christian obligation; and not only to have forgotten, but violated the injunction, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy; in it thou shalt do no manner of work."²



Civil Officers Leading Jerome to Martyrdom for Heresy—"A Crime Against the State."

"It must be remembered that in those days, heresy, especially if outspoken, was regarded not only as an offense against religion, but also as a crime against the State, and was punished accordingly."
 —Cardinal Gibbons.

his statement is not true. The Supreme Court of that State has sustained Sunday laws upon distinctively religious grounds. And the reasons given could not by any possibility apply to Wednesday or Thursday or to every other Wednesday or Thursday. Moreover, the judge cannot find in American law anywhere an enforced civil holiday. The prohibition of secular labor and business on Sunday has ab-

¹ Neal vs. Crew, 12 Ga., 93. ² Hill vs. Wilker, 41 Ga., 449.

Again, in the same year (1871) it was held by the same court³ that the power to enact a Sunday law was collected from the general powers delegated to maintain good order, but added: "The power is a very high prerogative, and is supported by the principle involved in the preservation of morals and the duties of citizens upon the Lord's day." In 49 Ga., 436, *Bass vs. Irvin*, it is said that "the code denominates it [the first day of the week] the Lord's day, and as the Lord's day, all courts and magistrates are to consider it."

It is quite evident from these authorities that while the Sunday law of Georgia is a "civil" law in the sense that it has a place upon the statute books of the State and is enforced by the civil courts, it is no more civil than would be any other law requiring the observance of any other religious institution. The terms "Lord's day," and "Sabbath" occur no less than eight times in the several sections of the Georgia code referring to Sunday, while in Section 4582 it is provided that "all moneys arising from fines for offenses, the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day, shall be paid to the ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed for the purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath-schools in the county." This language is conclusive as to the character and intent of the law; it has no other purpose than to honor Sunday as a religious institution.

It will be observed that under this Sunday law there are certain offenses, "the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day." The gist of these offenses is not that they invade the rights of other people, or even that they injure the person himself who commits them, nor that they are licentious nor that they disturb the public peace, but that they are violations of "the Sabbath." And yet the courts of the State refuse to allow one accused of Sabbath-breaking to show from the Bible which day is the Sabbath, telling him that "that [the Bible] won't do in this court;" "we allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law." And so, and in exactly the same sense, would be a law requiring all parents to have their children sprinkled, as was once the case in Massachusetts, and that too, for the protection of morals.

Religious persecution has always been defended on exactly the same grounds. Robert Baird, the church historian, says:—

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banished "Antinomians" and "Anabaptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—"Religion in America," p. 94.

It is in precisely this way that Cardinal Gibbons defends the Inquisition. He says:—

The Spanish Inquisition was erected by King Ferdinand, less from motives of religious zeal than from human policy. . . . It must be remembered that in those days, heresy, especially if outspoken, was regarded not only as an offense against religion, but also as a crime against the State, and was punished accordingly.—"Faith of Our Fathers," pp. 292, 293.

It is the same to-day and among so-called Protestants. Rev. Robert Patterson, D. D., says in defense of Sunday laws:—

It is the right of the State to protect by law such a fundamental support of government. This attack on

the Sabbath is treason against the very foundations of government. As such, let it be resisted by every American citizen. The American Sabbath is essential to American liberty, to our Republic and to God's religion.—"The American Sabbath," by the Rev. Robert Patterson, D. D.; Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.

This is only putting into slightly different phrase the papal "argument" in justification of the Inquisition. It is neither better nor worse in the one case than in the other. In the days of the Inquisition the Roman Catholic faith was regarded as the bulwark of social order, and therefore to be protected by civil law; now, the Sunday institution is declared by professed Protestants to be essential to good government, and so to be jealously guarded by the State. In these Sunday-law prosecutions, history is simply repeating itself.

Jerome, the subject of our illustration, was not burned at the stake by the Roman Catholic Church any more than are Seventh-day Adventists in Georgia and Tennessee imprisoned and sent to the chain-gang by the so-called Protestant churches whose influence created and sustains the Sunday laws. The Roman Catholic Church simply declared Jerome a heretic, and as such he was regarded as an enemy of the State; and our illustration shows him being led to the stake, not by ecclesiastics, not by officers of the church, but by the civil authorities—officers of the State—just as Adventists are to-day imprisoned and driven in chain-gangs by authority of the State, but none the less in obedience to the behest of professed Protestants. The religious sentiment of the community was then crystalized into civil law precisely as it is to-day, and that not for the protection of civil rights, but for the enforcement of religious dogma.

It was not pretended in this Allison case that anybody was interfered with in the least degree. There was no disturbance, no infringing upon the rights of others. The gist of Mr. Allison's offense was that he worked on Sunday, the day which the State of Georgia has declared is the "Sabbath," "the Lord's day," and which it has decreed must be kept "holy." There is absolutely no civil element in it except the fact that the day is entrenched in the civil law. A law requiring everybody to be baptized and to join a church would be civil in just the same sense as is this law requiring the observance of Sunday in the State of Georgia; and such a law would be no more in conflict with the constitution of that State than is the Sunday law.

The assertion that Mr. Allison or anybody else is left perfectly free in religious matters under a Sunday law is false. How free would the Sunday-keepers of Georgia consider themselves if they were taxed one-sixth of their time for the benefit of Mr. Allison's religion?

Moreover, the fact that Mr. Allison is in the minority does not alter the case one iota. Judge Parks, of Tennessee, has well said: "If there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest belief, but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors."

This is the touchstone to which all such laws and all such questions ought to be brought, namely, the equal rights of others. Does one man, by working on Sunday, thereby infringe the equal right of another man to rest or to worship? If not—and he certainly does not—any law forbidding such work is simply an expression of intolerance and despotism, none the less intolerable, because instead of being the intolerance and despotism of one it is the intolerance and despotism of the majority.

TRIAL OF J. Q. ALLISON.

THIS trial, referred to in these columns last week, took place in the Superior Court at Douglasville, Ga., May 15, before Hon. C. G. Janes, Presiding Judge. W. T. Roberts, Solicitor General, appeared for the State. Mr. Allison conducted his own case. Two witnesses were sworn for the State, both of whom testified that they lived near Mr. Allison, and that they had seen him plowing in his field on Sunday, the 21st day of April, as charged in the indictment.

Mr. Allison did not deny doing the work, but offered to show that it was not of a nature to disturb anybody, and that in fact nobody was disturbed thereby. Both the witnesses testified on direct examination that they would not have seen Mr. Allison at work had they not gone to the place where he was, on purpose to see him.

Mr. Allison attempted to cross-examine the second witness, as follows:—

Q. How near is your place to mine? where does your land come up to it; your field?

A. I suppose it is a hundred yards, or something like that.

Q. You worked there on the seventh day?

A. Yes, sir, I worked on Saturday.

Mr. Allison. I want to prove whether I disturbed him, or whether I had complained about his disturbing me.

The Court. Never mind about that; that has nothing to do with this case. The only question in the world is whether you worked on the first day of the week; that is the only question in the case; I mean, worked in your ordinary employment.

The solicitor general then asked the witness two questions to establish the fact that Mr. Allison was working at his usual employment; after which the judge asked Mr. Allison if he had any statement to make. From this point onward we copy verbatim from the notes of the official stenographer:—

The Court. What statement do you want to make?

Mr. Allison. I want to show where I get the authority that the seventh day is the Sabbath. (The defendant had produced his Bible, as if to read.)

The Court. That won't do in this court.

Mr. Allison. I am not allowed to give the reasons?

The Court. No, sir; we allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law.

Mr. Allison. Will you allow me to read a piece from the constitution of Georgia?

The Court. If it applies to this case—any law of the State—if you want to read it.

Mr. Allison. (Reading from the code.) "Freedom of Conscience.—All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should in any case control or interfere with such right of conscience. Religious Opinions.—No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property."

The Court. If you want to make any statement about the facts of this case, you can do so;—you have no lawyer to represent you;—if you do not want to, you need not do so, as to whether you did this work on this day.

Mr. Allison. I work on the first day of the week, and rest the seventh day. I keep it. I do nothing but feed my mules and water them, and some such things. We don't even do our cooking on the seventh day; we try to keep that holy. God has said we shall work six days, and rest the seventh. I rest the seventh, according to the commandment. I know that is the right day to keep, and I try to keep it.

The Court. You want to make any statement as to whether you did this work as charged against you?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir, I do; I said I worked on the first day of the week; I do that.

The Court. I mean in this case, whether you did the work that the State has charged you with, and as sworn to by the witnesses?

Mr. Allison. Yes, I don't deny that; I don't deny working on the first day of the week, but I deny working on the Sabbath, that is, the Lord's day.

The Court. You don't deny doing the work that the witnesses swore to?

Mr. Allison. No, sir,

³ Karwisch's case, 44 Ga., 204.

The Court. You mean to swear that you did do it?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir; I did the work.

The Court. That these witnesses said you did?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir; but I claim that I have a right, under the Constitution and under the laws of God, that I have a right to work or not work and keep the day that he wants me to keep; that is the way I do. I claim I could not work on the seventh day, and then go right on and keep the first day of the week without displeasing God.

The Court. There is nothing in that. I have as much respect for your religion as anybody in any church in the country, or good men in the country. I would not interfere with you in any way in the enjoyment of your religion; this is simply a law of the State, and we are bound thereby. The State could say that you should keep Wednesday or Thursday, that it would be a crime to work on every other Wednesday or every other Thursday, and you would be bound to obey that law. I have a perfect respect for every man's religion, and I think every man has a right to his religion, whether he is a Mohammedan, or Jew, or Christian, or a Buddhist, and whether he believes in the seventh day, or the first day, or any other day.

Mr. Allison. Don't you think I would be worshipping some other god, if I was to obey the law in this matter believing as I do? Why God would not protect me, I would be worshipping another god.

The Court. Probably I would not be competent to argue this question with you, when you come to the Bible. This is an act of the State, and if you live in the State of Georgia, you must obey its laws.

Mr. Allison. Don't you remember where you read about Daniel? They made a law special for Daniel, and they cast him into the lions' den, and he broke the law, and God protected him in it.

The Court. I believe I have heard something about that, but the day of miracles is past. I am here simply to enforce the laws, and no matter what a man's religious opinions are, if the laws of the State are that he shall not work on a certain day, and he continues to work on that day, I am bound to enforce the law; I am simply bound to do that; that is my duty; that is my oath. I state to you that you are guilty, according to your own statement, of the violation of the law, and you cannot live in the State of Georgia and do that. The trouble is this, that if you are allowed to do this—I understand you are a good man, your neighbors say you are, there is nothing in the world against you—but if you are allowed to do this, bad men would claim the same privilege, and desecrate what the great majority of people consider the Sabbath; but outside of any reason for it, that is the law.

As appears from the record, the verdict of guilty was entered without the jury leaving their seats. The court then took a recess until afternoon; and, upon reassembling, the judge proceeded to pass sentence upon Mr. Allison, prefacing it with the advice that if the defendant's religion prevented him from obeying the Sunday laws of Georgia, he would better move out of the State and go where he would be allowed to live out his religion. He said if Mr. Allison persisted in working on Sunday, and came up before him again, he would put him where it would be a long time before he could get out of the State. Then, repeating what he said about Mr. Allison's being a good man and a good citizen, and there being nothing in the world against him, he said: "I will let you off easy this time with the costs, \$22.05, or in default thereof, twelve full months in the chain-gang."

For some discussion of the principles involved in this case, see article on first page of this paper.

THE BOYS' BRIGADE.

ONE of the founders of the "Boys' Brigade" movement, describing the origin of the movement in a recent number of the *Independent*, says:—

All healthy boys have a love of soldiering born in them.

This intended defense of the military spirit that is permeating the churches, is the strongest condemnation of it. It is very true that boys are born with a love for war, but it is also true that these boys must be "born

again" before they can enter the kingdom of heaven. John 3:3. And to the Church was committed the teaching of this vital truth; but instead of condemning the fruits of the natural heart, among which are "emulation, wrath, strife," the concomitants of war, and teaching that all these belong to the natural heart, to escape which all must be born again, the Church is fostering the natural heart and stamping it with the approval of the Christian Church. The excuse is made that this natural desire of the carnal heart is taken advantage of to get the ear of the boy to teach him that he must be born again. But to do this is to "do evil that good may come," a proposition condemned by the Scriptures. Rom. 3:8. With the one hand the Church is building what with the other it professes to destroy. "Ye cannot serve two masters."

FOUND AT LAST AND LAST FOUND IN TENNESSEE.

SOME divine authority for Sunday observance has been a want of many centuries, and many have been the efforts to supply it. Scripture has been wrested, history has been falsified and perverted, letters have been forged and tomes have been written, but all to no purpose; the fact still remained that Sunday was, as Neander says, "always only a human ordinance;" but now the lack has been supplied(?) and that in the very place where most needed, namely, in Tennessee, as is witnessed by the following from the *Memphis Weekly Commercial*:—

MILAN, Tenn., May 28.—Mr. J. A. Warner, of this city, has in his possession a wonderful letter, which is probably one of the oldest specimens in existence. It has been in the Warner family 173 years. It is written on material resembling parchment, and yellow with the age of two centuries. The copy and letter are presented as follows:—

COPY OF A LETTER

"Written by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and found eighteen miles from Iconium twenty-five years after our blessed Saviour's crucifixion and transmitted from the holy city by a converted Jew, and faithfully translated from the original Hebrew copy now in possession of Lady Cubass.

"This letter was found under a stone, both round and large, at the foot of the cross eighteen miles from Iconium near a village called Mesopotamia. Upon this stone was written and engraved: 'Blessed be he that shall turn me over.' All that saw it prayed to God earnestly and desired that he would make known unto them the meaning of this writing, that they might not in vain turn it over. In the meantime a little child of about six or seven years of age turned it over to the admiration of all present, and under the stone was written the command of Jesus Christ in a letter published by the angel Gabriel ninety-eight years after the death of our Blessed Saviour and carried by a person belonging to Lady Cubass, and made public in the city of Iconium."

THE LETTER.

"Glory to God on high and on earth good will to all men, whosoever worketh on the Sabbath day shall be cursed. I command you to go to church and to keep the Lord's day holy without doing any manner of work. You shall not idle or mis-spend your time in decking yourselves in superfluous and costly apparel and vain dressing, for I have ordained a day to be kept holy that your sins may be forgiven; you shall not break My commandments, but observe and keep them written with My own hand. You shall not only go to church yourself, but your man servant and your maid servant, to observe My word and learn My commandments. You shall finish your labor every Saturday at six o'clock in the afternoon, from that time the preparation of the Sabbath begins.

"I advise you to fast five days in the year, beginning with Good Friday, and so continue the four first

¹ Neander's Church History, translated by E. J. Rose, p. 186.

² We take this article from the *Herald*, of Roseland, La., March 23, 1895, which paper credits it to the *Weekly Commercial*, of Memphis, but does not give the date of the paper from which it took it. The date given in the date line, May 28, causes us to think, however, that it appeared in the *Commercial* last year. The pressing need of some authority for Sunday other than the law of the State has been increasingly felt in Tennessee for several years.

days following, in remembrance of the five bloody wounds received for mankind.

"You shall diligently and peacefully labor in your respective vocation wherein it has pleased Almighty God to place you.

"You shall love one another with brotherly love and cause them that are not baptized to come to church and receive the holy sacrament, and be made members thereof; and in so doing I will give many blessings, and comfort you in great temptation, and surely he that doeth to the contrary shall be cursed and unprofitable. I will also send hardships of heart upon them, but especially upon impenitent sinners and hardened unbelievers.

"He that giveth not to the poor shall be unprofitable.

Remember to keep the Sabbath day, for the seventh day I have kept to Myself, and he that hath a copy of this letter and keepeth it without publishing it to others, shall not prosper, and he that publish it to others shall be blessed of Me, and if their sins be in numbers as the stars in the firmament and believe in this they shall be pardoned, and if they believe not in this writing and keep not My commandments I will send My plague upon them and their children and their cattle, and whosoever shall have a copy of this letter and keep it in the house nothing shall do them any damage, neither pestilence, lightning or thunder shall hurt them, and if a woman be with child and in labor and she firmly puts her trust in Me, she shall be delivered of her birth; you shall hear no more of Me, but of the blessed spirit, until the day of judgment."

"JESU HOMINUM SALVATOR."

—*Memphis Weekly Commercial.*

This is not the first time that documents of this kind have been discovered(?) in remarkable ways; and that they have a common origin is evident from their marked similarity; and yet they are not free from contradictions, which circumstance however is never taken seriously by the slave of tradition.

As related by J. N. Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," pp. 287-390, there visited England in the year 1200 A. D., one Eustace, the abbot of Flaye in Normandy, and the burden of his preaching seems to have been Sunday observance. "At London also, and many other places throughout England," remarks Hoveden,³ "he effected by his preaching that from that time forward people did not dare to hold market of things exposed for sale on the Lord's day" [Sunday].

The abbot met much opposition, however, even from the clergy, and some were so inconsiderate as to demand of the zealous preacher that he cite some divine authority for the observance upon which he so strenuously insisted. The result was that he for a time abandoned the field and "returned," says Hoveden, "to Normandy, unto his place whence he came."

But the Sunday-breakers were to enjoy only a short respite. The following year, as the same author relates,⁴ the abbot returned with the authority demanded in the shape of the following document:—

THE HOLY COMMANDMENT AS TO THE LORD'S DAY.

Which came from heaven to Jerusalem, and was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, in Golgotha, where Christ was crucified for the sins of the world. The Lord sent down this epistle, which was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, and after looking upon which three days and three nights, some men fell upon the earth, imploring mercy of God. And after the third hour, the patriarch arose, and Acharias, the archbishop, and they opened the scroll, and received the holy epistle from God. And when they had taken the same, they found this writing therein:—

"I am the Lord who commanded you to observe the holy day of the Lord, and ye have not kept it, and have not repented of your sins, as I have said in my gospel, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' Whereas, I caused to be preached unto you repentance and amendment of life, you did not believe me, I have sent against you the pagans, who have shed your blood on the earth; and yet you have not believed; and because you did not keep the Lord's day holy, for a few days you suffered hunger, but soon I gave you fullness, and after that you did still worse again. Once more, it is my will, that no one, from the ninth hour on Saturday until sunrise on Monday, shall do any work except that which is good.

³ Roger de Hoveden's Annals, Bohn's Ed., Vol. 2, p. 487.

⁴ Hoveden, Vol. 2, pp. 526-528.

"And if any person shall do so, he shall with penance make amends for the same. And if you do not pay obedience to this command, verily I say unto you, and I swear unto you, by my seat, and by my throne, and by the cherubim who watch my holy seat, that I will give you my commands by no other epistle, but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and hot water in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men.

"This do I say unto you; for the Lord's holy day, you shall die the death; and for the other festivals of my saints which you have not kept: I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels, and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away to the tombs of the dead, and to hide yourselves for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from before your eyes, and will send darkness upon you, that not seeing, you may slay one another, and that I may remove from you my face and may not show mercy upon you. For I will burn the bodies and the hearts of you, and of all those who do not keep as holy the day of the Lord.

"Hear ye my voice, that so ye may not perish in the land, for the holy day of the Lord. Depart from evil, and show repentance for your sins. For, if you do not do so, even as Sodom and Gomorrah shall you perish. Now, know ye, that you are saved by the prayers of my most holy mother, Mary, and of my most holy angels, who pray for you daily. I have given unto you wheat and wine in abundance, and for the same ye have not obeyed me. For the widows and orphans cry unto you daily, and unto them you show no mercy. The pagans show mercy, but you show none at all. The trees which bear fruit I will cause to be dried up for your sins; the rivers and the fountains shall not give water.

"I gave unto you a law in Mount Sinai, which you have not kept. I gave you a law with mine own hands, which you have not observed. For you I was born into the world, and my festive day ye knew not. Being wicked men, ye have not kept the Lord's day of my resurrection. By my right hand I swear unto you, that if you do not observe the Lord's day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send unto you the pagan nations, that they may slay you. And still do you attend to the business of others, and take no consideration of this? For this will I send against you still worse beasts, who shall devour the breasts of your women. I will curse those who on the Lord's day have wrought evil.

"Those who act unjustly towards their brethren, will I curse. Those who judge unrighteously the poor and the orphans upon the earth, will I curse. For me you forsake, and you follow the prince of this world. Give heed to my voice, and you shall have the blessing of mercy. But you cease not from your bad works, nor from the works of the devil. Because you are guilty of perjuries and adulteries, therefore the nations shall surround you, and shall, like beasts, devour you."

The promulgation of this document greatly stimulated Sunday observances in England as indeed its modern prototype may possibly do in Tennessee.

It will be noted that there is some conflict between the two documents as to the proper time to begin the observance of Sunday. The Sunday commandment, which now turns up in Tennessee, commands those to whom it is directed that "You shall finish your labors every Saturday at 6 o'clock in the afternoon, from that time the preparation of the Sabbath begins." The document brought to England by the abbot names the "ninth hour [three o'clock] on Saturday" as the hour at which all work must cease, and many remarkable things are related as happening to those who disregarded this injunction. Hoveden relates some of these stories as follows:—

One Saturday, a certain carpenter of Beverley, who, after the ninth hour of the day, was, contrary to the wholesome advice of his wife, making a wooden wedge, fell to the earth, being struck with paralysis. A woman also, a weaver, who, after the ninth hour on Saturday, in her anxiety to finish a part of the web, persisted in so doing, fell to the ground, struck with paralysis, and lost her voice. At Rafferton also, a vill belonging to Master Roger Arundel, a man made for himself a loaf and baked it under the ashes after the ninth hour on Saturday, and ate thereof, and put part of it by till the morning, but when he broke it on the Lord's day blood started forth therefrom; and he who saw it bore witness, and his testimony is true.

At Wakefield, also, one Saturday, while a miller was, after the ninth hour, attending to grinding his corn, there suddenly came forth, instead of flour, such

a torrent of blood, that the vessel placed beneath was nearly filled with blood, and the mill-wheel stood immovable, in spite of the strong rush of the water; and those who beheld it wondered thereat, saying, "Spare us, O Lord, spare thy people!"

Also in Lincolnshire a woman had prepared some dough, and taking it to the oven after the ninth hour on Saturday, she placed it in the oven, which was then at a very great heat; but when she took it out, she found it raw, on which she again put it into the oven, which was very hot; and both on the next day and on Monday, when she supposed that she would find the loaves baked, she found raw dough.

In the same county also, when a certain woman had prepared her dough, intending to carry it to the oven, her husband said to her, "It is Saturday, and is now past the ninth hour, put it one side till Monday;" on which the woman, obeying her husband, did as he commanded; and so, having covered over the dough with a linen cloth, on coming the next day to look at the dough, to see whether it had not, in rising, through the yeast that was in it, gone over the sides of the vessel, she found there the loaves ready made by the Divine Will, and well baked, without any fire of the material of this world. This was a change wrought by the right hand of Him on high.⁵

"The historian [Hoveden] laments that these miracles were lost upon the people, and that they feared the king more than they feared God; and so, 'like a dog to his vomit, returned to holding markets on the Lord's day.'"⁶

It is by such subterfuges as this Tennessee discovery and its legitimate predecessor invented by the Abbot Eustace, that the Sunday institution, now hoary with age, was first foisted upon the Christian Church; and it is by means little less dishonest that it is now maintained as a sacred day.

A LETTER TO A CLERICAL FRIEND.

DEAR BROTHER:—

As promised I will now write you again, addressing myself to the scripture you quoted in closing your kind letter to me. The text reads: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20.

You did not quote the last clause, but evidently did not purposely omit it. However, I am at a loss to know why you quoted this text in connection with a consideration of the question, Ought the Sabbath of the fourth commandment to be observed? Surely you do not believe that because men are not justified by the deeds of the law, but by faith, therefore faith makes void the law; for to draw this conclusion from the text would not only be contrary to the manifest trend of the argument of the chapter, but contrary to its plainly expressed conclusion as stated in the last verse, which reads: "Do we then make void the law through faith? *God forbid: yea, we establish the law.*" Rom. 3:31.

The fact that we are saved by faith in Christ instead of by the deeds of the law, does indeed "establish" the law instead of abrogating it. For it teaches that the law is so "perfect," "spiritual," "holy," "just and good," that after we had violated it, and could not by future good works, even if it were in our power to perform them, atone for past violations, the Son of God came to earth to die to save us from the penalty of transgression and to make it possible for us, through faith in him, to so connect with his infinite power as to have him work in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.

In order to explain the thought further and at the same time give you the position of Seventh-day Adventists on the question, I will quote from a sermon delivered at their last General Conference, and published on page 232 of the Conference *Bulletin*:—

There was something that the law could not do, and that God, sending his own Son, did. But why was it that the law could not do what it desired, and what was required?—It was weak through the flesh. The trouble was in the flesh. It was this that caused the law to fail of its purpose concerning man. Then God sent Christ to do what the law could not do. And the law having failed of its purpose, because of the flesh, and not because of any lack in itself, God must send him to help the flesh, and not to help the law. If the law had been in itself too weak to do what it was intended to do, then the thing for him to have done would have been to remedy the law; but the trouble was with the flesh, and therefore he must remedy the flesh.

It is true that the argument nowadays, springing up from that enmity that is against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, is that the law could not do what was intended, and God sent his Son to weaken the law, so that the flesh could answer the demands of the law. But if I am weak and you are strong, and I need help, it does not help me any to make you as weak as I am: I am as weak and helpless as before. There is no help at all in all that. But when I am weak and you are strong, and you can bring to me your strength, that helps me. So the law was strong enough; but its purpose could not be accomplished because of the weakness of the flesh. Therefore God, to supply the need, must bring strength to weak flesh. He sent Christ to supply the need; and therefore Christ must so arrange it that strength may be brought to our flesh itself which we have to-day, that the purpose of the law may be met in our flesh. So it is written: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," in order "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

I will not enlarge upon this thought further, for I cannot believe that you would seriously argue that because we are not saved by the deeds of the law but by faith, therefore we are at liberty to violate the law.

In closing, you say: "When the Lord shows me I am wrong then I will turn, and not before." In this conclusion, you are correct if you are willing, as I believe you are, that the Lord shall show you his will in his appointed way, that is, through his Word. It is through his Word he shows us the truth, and to ask that he work a miracle to show that he desires us to obey that Word, is asking too much. When the lawyer came to the Lord with the question, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" the Lord answered, "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" Luke 10:25, 26.

Again, when the rich man in the parable asked that a miracle be wrought to convince his unbelieving friends, the answer is returned, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." And when the plea was made, "But if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent," the former reply is emphasized by the words, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Luke 16:29-31.

Again, in 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, the Scriptures are affirmed to contain sufficient "instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Now to apply this to the question of Sabbath-keeping: We are repeatedly told in Scripture that Sabbath-keeping is a good work (Isa. 58:13, 14), but we are nowhere told that Sunday observance is a good work. Its observance cannot, then, be necessary "that the man of God may be perfect."

In closing let me say, settle this question by the Word of God, and let not majorities, social relations, or any human considerations effect that decision.

Yours fraternally,
A. F. BALLENGER.

RELIGION is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both.—*James Madison.*

⁵ Hoveden, Vol. 2, pp. 529, 530.

⁶ Andrews' "History of the Sabbath," p. 395.

THE WISCONSIN SUNDAY LAW.

[From Die Rundschau* (Chicago), May 1.]

THE Wisconsin Sunday law is not as harmless as was recently maintained by the *Germania*. We at least did not find "that with the utmost care it sought only the *civil* Sunday rest." On the contrary, nothing distinguishes it from the Sunday laws of other States. Even the superscription "Violation of the Sabbath," is suspicious and makes it a religious law.

But its several actions too are of a similar nature. It prohibits and punishes "any manner of labor, business, or work, except only works of necessity and charity," also the presence of any person "at any dancing or public diversion, show, or entertainment," and the participation "in any sport, game, or play, on the first day of the week." One need not have any great powers of perception in order to see that thereby Sunday is made a *holy* day by the State of Wisconsin, on which day things the State allows of on other days are criminal, and the permission to perform on Sunday "only works of necessity and charity" makes this yet more patent. 'Tis the so-called Anglo-American Sabbath idea entertained and fostered by almost all "Protestant" sects of this country, that finds its expression also in the Sunday law of Wisconsin.

But when the *Germania* says, "Our Wisconsin law explicitly defines that any person observing *any other* day of the week as the Sabbath may perform his daily occupation and work to his heart's content on Sunday," then this sentence yet more clearly proves her to be in error with this her opinion.

The section of the law under discussion literally reads as follows: "Any person who *conscientiously believes* that the seventh, or any other day of the week, *ought to be observed as the Sabbath*, and who actually refrains from *secular* business and labor on that day, may perform secular labor and business on the first day of the week, unless he shall willfully disturb thereby some other person, or some religious assembly on said day." This exemption clause plainly shows what ought to be one's opinion of the entire Sunday law. A law granting exceptions in order not to conflict with the inalienable rights of man and the conscientious convictions of certain people must necessarily be wrong and unjust. Besides this clause evidently grants only *toleration* and not *freedom of conscience*. It puts certain people, together with their religious convictions, in an *exemption-position* over against the State—in a position they enjoy not *by nature* and *by right*, but which is granted them first *by an act of grace on the part of the State*.

But according to the fundamental principle of American jurisprudence, the citizens of this Republic enjoy from the very beginning complete *religious liberty*, which they can demand as their *right* solemnly granted them in the "Declaration of Rights," and which may not first be *granted* them by a legislature as a *special privilege*.

And, finally, the State of Wisconsin by this exemption clause claims *jurisdiction over the consciences and the belief of its citizens*, in that it grants only such the benefit of this exemption as "*conscientiously believe*" they ought to observe *another* day than the first "as the Sabbath." Thereby at the same time silently admitting the Sunday law to have been enacted in the favor of those "*conscientiously believing*" that *Sunday* ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and that, therefore, considera-

tions of a religious nature prompted and enforced the same. *Sunday laws, together with their exemption clauses, have, evidently indeed, this object*, to effect the observance of a church ordinance and to coerce the consciences.

In fine, the *Germania* can make as little of a showing with the Sunday law of Wisconsin, as, for example, the *Rundschau*, could with that of Illinois.

THE LORD'S INTERPRETATION OF THE SECOND COMMANDMENT VS. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERPRETATION.

THE *Monitor* finds great fault with the AMERICAN SENTINEL for having in its head-piece a picture of the Bartholdi statue of liberty enlightening the world. It declares that this is a violation of the second commandment; and that therefore we are inconsistent in insisting on the observance of the Sabbath while breaking the second commandment. Here is the argument of the *Monitor*:

On its title page it [the AMERICAN SENTINEL] has a picture of a graven image made to represent the goddess of liberty. This graven image is set up in New York harbor contrary to the laws which the Almighty gave to Moses, and which are as binding as the law concerning the Sabbath day. "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me: and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Surely this commandment is as clear as the commandment concerning the Sabbath. It is an open and explicit prohibition against the making of images, and against honoring them in any way. There are no exceptions. All images are *tabu*. How then can the *American Sentinel* continue to violate this commandment by retaining Bartholdi's statue in its head-piece, especially as it is crying woe and desolation against Christendom for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day?

After the outcome of the *Monitor's* emphatic decision as to who may have "got as far as *hic haec hoc*" in "so simple a language as the Latin," it may not be positively irreverent for us to suggest that its exposition of the second commandment is not correct. "All images" are not "*tabu*," and never were. For immediately after the giving of this commandment by the Lord, the Lord himself gave the following directions with regard to the building of the sanctuary:—

"Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering. . . . And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.

And thou shalt make two cherubim of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat. . . . And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim." "And thou shalt make a vail of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cunning work: with cherubim shall it be made." Ex. 25:2-22; 26:31.

After all this had been done, again there is this record:—

And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole. . . . And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole. Num. 21:8, 9.

And when the temple took the place of the tabernacle, it also was built according to the plan and pattern given to David by the Spirit of God, and which was written out by the hand of the Lord upon David for the guidance

of Solomon in the building of the temple. 1 Chron. 28:11, 12, 19. And of this it is written:—

Now these are the things wherein Solomon was instructed for the building of the house of God. . . . He overlaid also the house, the beams, the posts, and the walls thereof, and the door thereof, with gold; and graven cherubim on the walls. . . . And in the most holy house he made two cherubim of image work, and overlaid them with gold. . . . And he made the vail of blue, and purple, and crimson, and fine linen, and wrought cherubim thereon. 2 Chron. 3:3-14.

This is evidence enough to show that the sweeping interpretation of the second commandment given by the *Monitor* is directly contradictory to the plain word of the Lord. And all this time, too, the Lord was "crying woe and desolation against Israeldom for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day." But the *Monitor* says to the Lord in that case as certainly as to us: "There are no exceptions. All images are *tabu*." How then could the Lord continue to violate this commandment by retaining images of cherubim in and all about the most holy place of his worship, especially as he was "crying woe and desolation against Israeldom for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day"?

But was the Lord right? or is the *Monitor* right? Which? Is the Lord's interpretation of the commandment correct? or is the *Monitor's* interpretation correct?

It is true that the second commandment does forbid the making of all manner of images or likenesses of things to be *bowled down to*, to be *feared*, to be *reverenced*, or to be in any way *served*. This is true of images made at the direction of the Lord as well as images made altogether in the imagination of men. This is shown by the fact that when Israel showed reverence to that brazen serpent and burned incense to it, it was broken to pieces before them and called, as it was, only "a piece of brass." 2 Kings 18:4. And when Israel came to attach virtue to the temple and to trust in it, the Lord brought up the Chaldeans who stripped the temple of its gold, left the temple in ruins, carried the people captive, and made the land desolate. Jer. 7:4-15.

Among images or likenesses so used there are indeed "no exceptions." All images of all sorts so used, or in any such way regarded, are indeed "*tabu*." All such use of images and likenesses of any persons or things is idolatry. And such is precisely the use which is made of images and likenesses by Catholics everywhere.

We make no charge of inconsistency, however, against Catholics in their *bowing down* to graven images, likenesses, etc., for they both bow down to images and put away the Sabbath day. They disregard both the second and the fourth commandments. There is no room there for any charge of inconsistency. The thing is sheer, straight idolatry and abandonment of the God of heaven and earth.

OUR LEGISLATORS SEE IT.

BY C. L. BOYD, NASHVILLE, TENN.

FOR years in the past the AMERICAN SENTINEL has been faithfully crying aloud to our municipal, State, and national legislators, and to the people at large. It has stood as a bold sentinel, guarding the religious liberty of the whole people. It has also acted as an educator, teaching the principles of liberty in the broadest, deepest, and highest sense of the sacred term.

Among those who indorse the righteous principles of liberty therein taught, I am proud to mention some at least of our Tennessee

* Translated by Rev. Oscar Goetz, Gretna, La.

legislators, as the following from the *Nashville American*, of May 14, plainly shows:—

Mr. Waddell, of Marien, called up the bill excluding persons who observe another day as the Sabbath from the penalties of the law against violation of the Sabbath.

Mr. Stratton moved to lay the bill on the table, and the ayes and noes were demanded. Ayes 36, noes 39.

Mr. Heiskell spoke in favor of the bill. The Seventh-day Adventists were conscientious, God-fearing people and should be allowed to worship when they saw fit.

Mr. Slatter said freedom of conscience was the substratum of the liberties of this country. He argued that if any one church had the power it would stop all the others. Might did not make right. He hoped freedom would be granted the Seventh-day Adventists.

Mr. Akin was for maintaining the Christian Sabbath. If the Seventh-day Adventists could not observe the laws of Tennessee they were not bound to live here. The perpetuity of our country was dependent on the maintenance of the Christian Sabbath. Constitutional government and liberty depended on the maintenance of the Sabbath.

Mr. Smith said the question was what was right. Was one day holier than another. The Mohammedans said Friday was; the Jew said Saturday; the Christian, Sunday. Each had a different day and quoted Divine authority. He challenged any Christian to cite ecclesiastical edict that transferred the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. Christians were to-day upholding a pagan in worshipping on Sunday. Street cars were run and railroad trains, and yet they punished men for working on their secluded farms. He wanted equal rights for all.

But notwithstanding the fact that the bill was ably championed, it was defeated the next morning, by a vote of 57 to 24.

The facts presented by Mr. Smith show plainly that our Sunday laws are the baneful, though logical, fruit of the compromise made between professed Christians and the pagan, sun-worshipping Constantine, fit representative of the Roman Church from that time onward.

This compromise has been honored full-long. The time has fully come when the command of God should be heard and heeded by every man: "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

All good people should thank God and take courage, in view of the fact that our statesmen, legislators, editors, and popular ministers everywhere are agitating and discussing this important question. The public mind is being enlightened, and men are daily and intelligently deciding whom they will serve.

While some are slow to learn, they are nevertheless learning the priceless principles of liberty, which were held so dear by our forefathers. But alas, others fearing "that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the idol "of the great" god baal "should be despised, and" his "magnificence should be destroyed, whom all" Rome "and the world worshipeth," are intrenching themselves behind State laws, and are loudly calling for a national despotism. Having secured an "image" to the papacy, they now demand that this image be exalted "above all that is called God," and that it be worshiped by obedience to unconstitutional and unchristian laws.

MORE PRESS COMMENTS ON TENNESSEE PERSECUTIONS.

Tennessee Partly Redeemed.

[From *Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*, May 2, 1895.]

ALL honor to Judge Parks who recommended that the men be pardoned whom he was obliged to condemn, under the letter of a bad Sunday law. And all honor to Governor Turney who, on the 9th of April, pardoned five of the Sabbath-keeping Adventists who were still in jail at Dayton, Tenn.

The injustice which has been done to those Sabbath-keepers has aroused a storm of indig-

nation, North and South alike. The *Chattanooga Times* and other journals in Tennessee, have done nobly in "speaking out" upon the wrong and shame which has been done in these cases. Such words and the act of Governor Turney go far to compensate for the bigotry and injustice of lesser men. And we trust that all things combined will result in a speedy abrogation of the law which has made such injustice possible. The fact that the Sunday laws are not executed, and cannot be enforced against common labor, except in such cases as of the Sabbath-keepers at Graysville, makes the need of repeal all the greater. Throughout the land, the pretended observers of Sunday break the laws at will, especially the larger corporations, and the State and national governments, while those against whom bigotry can array local and temporary prejudice are made to suffer.

There seems no room for doubt that the enforcement of the Sunday laws against respectable labor on Sunday, would hasten their repeal in almost every case. The friends of these laws know, and acknowledge, that their formal continuance is secured only by non-enforcement. This fact alone brands the persecution of Sabbath-keepers as a double shame. Again we say, honor to Governor Turney and Judge Parks.

[From the *San Juan Times*, Farmington, N. H., April 19.]

THE prosecutions of the Seventh-day Adventists of Graysville, Tenn., for violating the Sunday law, are causing a deal of comment and hostile criticism. It appears that the prosecutions are the result of the determined persecutions of their enemies; but it has not been denied that the Adventists are a quiet, law-abiding people, and were laboring for the good of their fellow-men. None of the work was of a nature to disturb the quiet or peace of the neighborhood.

This sect had an academy at Graysville, where young persons were being fitted for lives of usefulness. The school prospered, and one hundred pupils were enrolled.

Judge Parks at the trial, stated that his sympathies were with the defendants, but that the law was plain, and his duty was to enforce it. The judge said: "If I were to express my private feelings, there is nothing I regard with more concern than the encroachments of legislative enactment upon the rights of the individual in matters of conscience." Now, the argument of the Adventists is that they are obeying the law of God in working six days and resting on the seventh. The commandment as to keeping holy the Sabbath day is repeated in our churches frequently, and the seventh day referred to as the day of rest. Our laws generally hold with the Christian idea of recognizing Sunday as the Sabbath. Here we have a law-abiding set of people who hold that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Now, as a matter of individual right, can they be forced to recognize another day also? It is to be remembered that this is a question of conscience, not of mere personal liberty. The result is strange.

Here is a question of belief, and statute cannot settle it because it is held to be a matter of Divine command. Are not these prosecutions merely persecutions? No one contends that any man can enforce a right to become a nuisance on the Sunday, but with reference to certain duties and work, how far should statutes prevail?

Again, what is Sunday? Sunday is the first day of the week, the day fixed upon by the Christians for rest and religion. The Sabbath, the day appointed by God as a day of rest, was undoubtedly originally the seventh

day, not the first, and so here appears an anomaly. The resurrection of Christ on the first day led to the institution of Sunday as Sabbath by the Christians. Here, then, is a matter of belief and conscience, and the argument arises, how far should a legislature go in interfering with the religious tenets of a people, when it is contrary to the very rights of that people, and the policy of the nation, to assert control in matters relative to religion?

Religion by Law is Not "Religious Liberty."

[From the *Washington Chronicle*.]

THE tendency is more aggressively manifest than at any period of this country's history toward a practical establishment of a "State" or governmental "religion." Any law that touches, directly or remotely, the subject of any system of religion or religious belief, or requiring any kind or degree of religious observance or practice, is to that extent enforcing a "State" religion, and a union and coöperation of Church and State. The most general application of a law-religion is the laws upon observance of Sunday as a "holy" day. Only biblical Christians regard Sunday as a holy day, and certain distinct sects of Christians absolutely reject Sunday and believe in Saturday as the Sabbath or holy day of the Bible. The Hebrew religionists, believing in the Old but not the Christian Testament, reject Sunday and observe Saturday as the "Lord's day."

But, despite this diversity of opinion, belief and faith, among Christians themselves, and though we regard this a land of absolute divorce and separation of Church and State, of religion and government, yet statutory and municipal laws and rules everywhere abound enforcing a specific religion, a particular interpretation of the Bible, that adopted as part of the religious systems of Roman Catholicism and most of the Protestant sects—the Sunday "Sabbath" religion.

Severe penalties are inflicted in many or most parts of the country for ignoring that law-religion and adopting any other course of life than that required by Sunday laws. At this moment a number of moral and reputable citizens of Tennessee are imprisoned and suffering untold indignities, persecuted by "religious despotism"—the enforcement of the odious and despotic Sunday law of Tennessee. These victims of religious despotism are members of that most reputable sect of Christians known as Seventh-day Adventists. They keep Saturday as the "Lord's day," regarding it as the day mentioned as the holy day in the Bible.

"The Finger of Scorn."

[From the *Red Wing (Minn.) Argus*, May 9.]

THE *Progress*, published at Minneapolis, Minn., comes out with a ringing editorial under the caption of "Modern Religious Persecution." It first speaks of the act of the governor of Tennessee in granting pardon to the imprisoned Adventists, and adds: "The act of the governor in exercising the pardoning power in this case is upheld by the best sense of the commonwealth of Tennessee and will be approved by the lovers of justice and liberty everywhere." In giving an account of these persecutions for the last ten years, the *Progress* goes on to say that "fifty-three have been convicted and thirty have suffered imprisonment."

Then follows a statement which should be placed in the hat of every friend of enforced rest. It is as follows: "The observance of the first day of the week instead of the seventh as a day of rest was a change made by the

Christian church since the death of Christ, and was purely a church regulation. The observance of either rests with the conscience of the individual, and the laws of a free country are supposed to protect every individual in the free exercise of his own conscience, provided he does not interfere with the rights of others."

And here the *Progress* raises the questions: "Is the United States of America a free country? Are men to be deprived of freedom of conscience that interferes with no other's rights? Press and public are pointing and should continue to point the finger of scorn at the States which retain laws which make religious persecution possible."

The *Evening Press*, of Ogden, Utah, has some editorial comments concerning Sunday laws. The friends of these laws say that they do not "attempt to interfere with the rights of individuals to worship on Saturday and keep it as the Sabbath if they choose." "Aye," says the *Press*, "there's the rub. These Sunday laws do not seek especially to prevent persons from worshipping on Saturday and keeping it as the Sabbath if they choose, but they do say that those who believe that it is a religious duty to worship on the seventh day shall not pursue their ordinary and necessary avocations on the first day. Such laws, we firmly believe, are subversive of human liberty. They have been passed and enforced in deference to the religious opinions of a minority, not a majority of the people. They seek and do deprive others who have different religious convictions, or no convictions at all, from enjoying themselves on a particular day, even though it involve no open desecration or interference with the rights of those who consider the first day of the week the Sabbath. The States which maintain these unjust, restrictive and oppressive laws are not specially noted for the morality, sobriety, and intelligence of their people. Tennessee is a good example of this fact—a State where more than 100,000 of its citizens can neither read nor write.

"We contend that the advocates of Sunday observance have no right to ask the State to require of others conformity with their religious faith or doctrine, and that it is not the province of the State to enforce by law obedience to the rules of any religion. When it goes beyond this and seeks by law to interfere with personal rights and to restrict the liberty of the citizen to enjoy himself in any manner he sees fit, provided such enjoyment does not interfere with the rights of others to do the same, in our opinion, the State does something which is repugnant to the American Declaration of Independence and contrary to the spirit of the National Constitution itself."

Religious Intolerance.

[From the *Coast Advocate*, *Half Moon Bay, Cal.*, April 24.]

THE dispatches announce that the governor of Tennessee has pardoned the eight men who were serving sentences in the jail of Rhea County for violating the Sunday law of that State. The pardon was granted on recommendation of the judge in whose court the men were convicted, and who had previously remitted the fines, leaving only the costs of the trial charged against the prisoners, which could not be remitted. It is also reported that a number of other citizens of Rhea County have been arrested for violating the Sunday law, in that they attend to their usual duties on the first day of the week, after having rested on the seventh day, as they believe the Lord commanded them.

This Rhea County affair seems to be liter-

ally persecution, as in many other parts of Tennessee as well as in that county, ordinary avocations are followed by people who profess no religion, without the law being enforced against them. At any rate, the punishment of citizens of any State in the Union for the non-observance of a religious law, or of a law commanding obedience to a religious doctrine, is contrary to the spirit of our Government and repugnant to our ideas of justice and equality. The State has just as much right to command its citizens to join a particular church as to religiously observe a particular day as holy. To admit the State's right to do either, is to admit its right of control over individual conscience.

California has already admitted the entering wedge of obnoxious religious laws by the passage in the last legislature of the barbers' Sunday closing law, which compels every barber to close his shop at noon on Sunday. Such a law is so clearly unconstitutional, in that it is the grossest kind of class legislation, that all the lawyers in the State are wondering how the governor could have signed it after a duped legislature had passed the bill. If barbers must close at noon on Sunday, why not everybody? Why should they be particularly favored, or otherwise? Let us stop stages and trains and buggy riding and fishing and picnics, in fact everything but going to church and Sunday school, and arrest every man, woman and child who does not attend church at least once on Sunday without a valid excuse.

That is the logical conclusion of the movement. And then, to complete the scheme, there should be an annual tax to support the church. Either that, or keep Church and State apart, as the builders and defenders of our Constitution decided we should, and let each person worship God as seemeth best.

Large Type
BIBLES

For Those with Poor Eyesight

We have many inquiries for a Bible of convenient size to use and carry, and with large clear print. The Bible, specimen type of which is shown below, we think will meet the requirements of the case. (Specimen of type shows only one column of the Bible. It is a two-column book like most Bibles, the full size of page being 5½ x 8½ in.) Persons desiring such a Bible as

The burnt offering EXOD

32 And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the bread that is in the basket, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

33 And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement

Specimen of Small Pica Type in Bible No. 1730.

this are usually elderly persons, and want simply the Scriptures themselves, without helps or references. This Bible contains a Family Register, Tables of Weights and Measures, and 16 excellent Maps, but has no references or other additional matter. It is printed from clear, new, small pica type, and is bound in French Morocco, limp round corners and has gilt edges. Sent postpaid on receipt of price. Order by number.

PRICE:

No. 1730. French Morocco, Limp Covers, Round Corners. Side and Back Title in Gold, Gilt Edges, Postpaid, \$2.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

OAKLAND, CAL.

.. The Story of ..

Pitcairn Island

BY ROSALIND AMELIA YOUNG,

A Native Daughter.

PITCAIRN ISLAND, one of the volcanic gems of the Pacific, has been heard of wherever the English language has been spoken. The story of the working out of the problem of human life on its limited territory

Reads stranger and more thrillingly

in many respects than a romance. But most if not all of the tales told and books printed have either been too fragmentary, or incorrect and misleading. It will be interesting to the friends of that miniature world to know that

An Authentic History

has been written, and that by a native of the island, one to the manor born. The title of the new work appears above. It is written by Miss Rosa Young, one of the direct descendants of the mutineers of the *Boonny*. The book, of 256 pages, is a plain, unvarnished tale of Pitcairn and its inhabitants from its settlement to the year 1894. It is written with a

Charming Simplicity of Style

which refreshes the reader and invites a continued perusal. This work is illustrated with 26 engravings by the half-tone process, and its 23 chapters have each a neatly engraved heading.

PRICE \$1.00, POSTPAID.

Thousands can be sold by those who will canvass their neighborhood. Address any State Tract Society, or

Pacific Press Publishing Company,

Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal. New York City.

STEPS TO CHRIST,

By Mrs. E. G. White.

We take pleasure in announcing an important and exceedingly helpful work, under the title of STEPS TO CHRIST. The rare ability of the author in the presentation of Scripture truth has never been used to better advantage than in this little work. STEPS TO CHRIST is not alone suitable as a guide to the inquirer and young convert, but is rich in thought and suggestion for the most mature Christian. Some idea of its scope and practical character may be gathered from the following table of contents:—

THE SINNER'S NEED OF CHRIST. REPENTANCE.
CONFESSION. CONSECRATION. FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE.
THE TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP. GROWING UP INTO CHRIST.
THE WORK AND THE LIFE. KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.
THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER. WHAT TO DO WITH DOUBT.
REJOICING IN THE LORD.

The book is issued in a rich, neat cloth binding, embossed in silver, at 75 cents per copy; in white vellum cloth, silver edges, \$1.00. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address Pacific Press,
43 Bond Street, New York City.
or Oakland, Cal.



CAN I OBTAIN A PATENT? For a prompt answer and an honest opinion, write to MUNN & CO., who have had nearly fifty years' experience in the patent business. Communications strictly confidential. A handbook of information concerning Patents and how to obtain them sent free. Also a catalogue of mechanical and scientific books sent free.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice in the *Scientific American*, and this are brought widely before the public without cost to the inventor. This splendid paper, issued weekly, elegantly illustrated, has by far the largest circulation of any scientific work in the world. \$3 a year. Sample copies sent free.

Building Edition, monthly, \$2.50 a year. Single copies, 25 cents. Every number contains beautiful plates, in colors, and photographs of new houses, with plans, enabling builders to show the latest designs and secure contracts. Address MUNN & CO., NEW YORK, 361 BROADWAY.



NEW YORK, MAY 30, 1895.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

THE SENTINEL will have a representative at the trial, this week, of Mr. Nash, a Seventh-day Adventist, recently arrested in Mississippi, and our readers can depend on a prompt report of the case.

READ the article, "The Lord's Interpretation of the Second Commandment vs. the Roman Catholic Interpretation," on page 173. Every Protestant should know how to answer the carpings of Rome.

WE are glad to note that our efforts to brighten and freshen the AMERICAN SENTINEL are appreciated by our readers. And now let them help us sustain the character of the paper by aiding in an effort to increase its circulation.

LET it be remembered that it is not the fault of the law nor of the courts of Georgia that J. Q. Allison, an honest man and a good neighbor, is not to-day serving a sentence of "twelve full months" in the chain-gang for plowing in his own field on Sunday.

THE bill referred to in these columns last week, introduced into the Tennessee legislature exempting from the penalty of the Sunday law, observers of the seventh day, was defeated in the House on the 14th inst., by a vote of 57 to 24. The facts are given on another page by C. L. Boyd, of Nashville. The Adventists asked bread and received a stone; they asked equality and are refused even toleration; they asked liberty but bonds and imprisonment await them.

THE Boston Pilot (Roman Catholic) in its issue of May 18, says:—

If it [the AMERICAN SENTINEL] will persuade itself and some of its anti-Catholic neighbors not to lie about them [Roman Catholics], that will suffice.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL lays no claim to infallibility, but it does desire to tell the truth; and if the Pilot will point out wherein the AMERICAN SENTINEL has lied about Roman Catholics, the SENTINEL will sustain its utterances or print an apology. Will the Pilot do as much with its charge that we have lied about Roman Catholics?

THE first two articles in this paper treat of the case of J. Q. Allison, convicted on the 15th inst. in the Superior Court of Douglas County, Ga., of "violating the Sabbath." These articles are interesting and will repay a careful perusal. The judge's testimony as to the irreproachable character of the defendant is worthy of note, as is also the simple but earnest manner in which Mr. Allison gave the

reasons for his refusal to obey the Sunday law of Georgia. The cause of the Bible Sabbath lost nothing in this trial. The humble farmer with truth on his side is more than a match for a whole State; and even though he had gone into the chain-gang he would have gone a victor.

THREE Seventh-day Adventists in Bienne, Switzerland, have just been imprisoned for refusing to send their children to school on the Sabbath. When Elder Holser was imprisoned for keeping the Seventh-day Adventist Basel publishing house open on Sunday, it was said that the law did not interfere with his right to keep the Sabbath if he wanted to, but only forbade him to operate a factory on Sunday; but how about the law requiring observers of the seventh day to send their children to school on the Sabbath? Does that law "leave Seventh-day Adventists perfectly free to keep Saturday if they choose to do so"?

"KOREA," says the *Independent*, "is not yet a Christian country, even if the Ministers of Justice and the Interior are Christians; and it is surprising to learn from *The Korean Repository*, published at Seoul, that since the appointment of the new ministry, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, the government offices are closed from Saturday afternoon till Monday morning." But we fail to see anything strange about this fact. Sunday was originally a heathen festival, and why should it not be still honored by heathen nations? It is a prediction of Holy Writ that all the world shall worship the beast, the papacy, and this will be done by exalting the Sunday, adopted by the papacy from paganism, and made the badge of papal authority.

AN exchange announces that a bill has been introduced in the Illinois Senate aimed at Schweinfurth, the so-called prophet, of Rockford, Illinois. It provides that whoever assumes or pretends to be a deity or to possess the attributes of a deity, or pretends to be a son of God, or Jesus Christ, or claims to be the incarnation of the Holy Ghost, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for from one to two years.

This measure exhibits a lamentable ignorance of the principles of religious liberty, and the sentiment behind the bill is more dangerous than the pretender, Schweinfurth. Let Illinois keep a level head and proceed against her bogus Christ in a statesman-like manner. It is none of the State's business whether Schweinfurth claims to be the incarnation of Christ, the Holy Ghost, Confucius, Mohammed, or Beelzebub. It is only when his claims lead him to violate the rights of his fellow-creatures that the law can properly interfere, and then only with his *acts* and not his *claims*. Illinois already has ample law to cover the case. If the element behind the proposed law had lived in the time of our Saviour, it would doubtless have joined in the cry, "Crucify him."

THE Sunday newspaper has another enemy. One of the monthly magazines of this city complains that the Sunday papers have invaded its domain, and that instead of buying the magazines people now buy and read the Sunday papers. We may now expect to see the publishers of literary magazines join the crusade against the Sunday paper, in the interests, of course, of "good morals" and "a day of rest for overworked printers and newsboys."

THE *Christian Work* says:—

The college student who abhors compulsory attendance at chapel would probably reject compulsory salvation.

He ought to reject it, for compulsory salvation is unchristian. Christ says, "Whosoever will," let him come. It is the compulsory-salvation error that gave rise to papal persecutions. This is not to condemn the regulation of a denominational school requiring attendance at chapel services at the opening of the daily session; but it only condemns the *Christian Work's* unfortunate attempt at its defense.

THE Boston *Republic* (Roman Catholic) is willing to give credit where credit is due. Of the tendency to adopt Romish ceremonial, it says: "If it does not ultimately bring about the reunion of all Christians in one true faith, it will yet have some good effect. Formerly it was a severe task to get prospective converts to understand and accept the ceremonies of the church. The Protestant sects, in adopting them and using them in their churches, are doing a great deal of educational work which formerly came upon the shoulders of the Catholic priests. Protestants, in thus becoming acquainted with Catholic ceremonies, render themselves easy converts to the faith." Romanizing Protestants ought to paste this in their hats.

THE National Reformers would have us suppose that the political doctrine that governments derive "their just power from the consent of the governed," had its origin in the infidelity of the eighteenth century. But more than two hundred and fifty years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and more than two hundred years before the utter rottenness of the Papal Church in France had filled that country with the infidelity which we are told gave rise to the doctrine that the people are the source of civil authority, Luther, Linck, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and Amsdorff, "the fathers of the Reformation," announced the same doctrine. In a letter to the Elector Frederick, they said: "No prince can undertake a war without the consent of the people, from whose hands he has received his authority." This was good Protestantism and good Christianity then, and it is just as good Protestantism and just as good Christianity now.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and is 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.

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