



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, JUNE 23, 1892.

NUMBER 25.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES,

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

ON another page of this paper will be found a detailed account of the trial of W. S. Lowry, one of the four Seventh-day Adventists, now in jail in Paris, Tenn., for doing quiet farm labor on Sunday. We trust that every reader of THE SENTINEL will peruse the whole report carefully. It is a sample of the other cases tried the same day.

IN these cases the defendants all refused to plead unqualifiedly, because they felt that they could not honestly either assent to or deny the indictment as a whole. It was true that they had worked on Sunday. They felt that it was not true that the work was "to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, to the evil example of morals, and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county, and against the peace and dignity of the State." Hence the refusal to plead.

It will be observed that in the case of W. S. Lowry only a single act of Sunday work was proved, except by the first witness, one of his own brethren in the church. And a single instance of Sunday work would not constitute a nuisance, even under Tennessee law. Without the testimony of T. F. Dortch, W. S. Lowry could not have been convicted; and yet, the indictment charges that his work was done "to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people." If this were true why were not some of "the people" there to testify to the annoyance? There can be but one answer to the question, namely, that the "annoyance," and "disturbance" was only the intolerance which springs

eternal in the breast of the bigot at the knowledge that others believe and practice differently from himself. It was simply the annoyance of knowing that Mr. Lowry was a Seventh-day Adventist, and that it is the habit of Adventists to rest on the seventh day and to work on Sunday.

THE character of the "annoyance" and "disturbance" occasioned by the Sunday work of the Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, is well illustrated by the following incident related to the writer by one of them.

Shortly before the prosecutions in question, a Methodist living a little out of the Adventist neighborhood, said to a member of the Adventist Church:

"You people are doing a great deal of harm in this country."

"Why, how is that?" said the Adventist. "We are quiet, inoffensive people."

"Yes," responded the Methodist, "but were it not for your church we [the Methodists] would have regular meetings here at Springville, and all the young people who now go to your meetings would be working members of the Methodist Church."

"Well," responded the Adventist, "show us our error and we will all be Methodists."

"That just what we're going to do," replied the Methodist; "we're going to prosecute every one of you."

And yet some people say that these Sunday prosecutions are not religious persecution, but only the enforcing of the civil law! Well, that is all any religious persecution ever was. Except in isolated cases of mob violence, religious persecution has always been under the color and forms of civil law.

ANOTHER noticeable feature of these Sunday cases is the latitude taken by the Attorney-General; for instance, the law confines the inquiry to one year before the finding of the indictment; but we find the

Attorney-General asking T. F. Dortch these questions:—

Q. How near do you live to him [the defendant], Mr. Dortch?

A. About three hundred yards.

Q. How long have you lived there, Mr. Dortch?

A. About four years.

Q. How long has he been living there?

A. About six years.

Q. Have you seen him at labor, his common every day labor within that time?

This was no slip on the part of the Attorney for the State. He did the same thing in other cases, and persisted in it until told by the Judge to confine his questions to the twelve months immediately preceding the finding of the indictment.

ANOTHER inconsistency in these trials was that while the Judge charged the jury that it was "not a question of religious belief or conviction at all either one way or the other," the Attorney-General asked such questions as these:—

"Are you a member of that church?"

"Is it the habit of members of your church to labor on Sunday?"

"There is a number of you gentlemen that belong to that church living in the same neighborhood?"

"Have you seen him go to church on Sunday?"

What place have such questions in cases that have nothing to do with "religious belief or conviction at all either one way or the other"? The fact is that the whole thing is a question of religious belief and conviction, and it is impossible to make it otherwise.

It has all along been stated that "while the law compels the observance of Sunday it leaves a man perfectly free to keep any other day he may see fit." This assertion was made by the Attorney-General in the case of W. S. Lowry, but in the case of James Stem, another of the men convicted for Sunday labor, the claim was disproved, and it was shown that a law requiring Sunday rest just as certainly requires Saturday labor for the average man dependent upon manual labor for a livelihood. The defendant, Mr. Stem, asked one of the witnesses for the State,

a Mr. Cox, who was not an Adventist: "Do you consider it necessary for a man to work six days?" *Answer*:—"Yes sir." The witness was then asked by the Attorney-General: "You do not think it necessary for people to work on Sunday, do you?" *Answer*:—"No, sir." But Mr. Cox had already testified that it was necessary to work six days; therefore, according to this witness for the State of Tennessee, the man who believes that he ought to keep the seventh day, is, by the Sunday law of Tennessee, under the necessity of violating either his conscience or the law of the State. He is not left perfectly free to keep any day, but must keep Sunday or else fail of securing what are termed the necessities of life. C. P. B.

Tried for His Faith.

WE have given in the last two numbers of THE SENTINEL some account of the trials of the Seventh-day Adventists indicted by the January Grand Jury of Henry County, Tenn., for working on Sunday. The following is a full report of one of the cases, and is a fair sample of all the others. Editorial comments upon it will be found on the first and last pages of this paper.

The trial was held in Paris, Henry County, Tenn., May 27, before Circuit Judge W. H. Swiggart. The counsel for the State was Attorney-General J. W. Lewis. The defendant, W. S. Lowry (as also the other defendants), feeling that he was on trial for his religious faith, declined counsel, committing his case to the Lord, in accordance with Luke 12: 11, 12, and parallel scriptures.

PRELIMINARY.

The Court (to defendant): Have you an attorney?
W. S. Lowry. No, sir.
Q. Are you not able to hire one?
A. I could have one if I chose.
Q. Do you propose to try the case without a lawyer?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. If you are not able to furnish a lawyer, the Court will furnish one.
A. I do not want any.
Q. You are entitled to a lawyer if you will take him, and the Court will appoint one if you will take him.
A. I do not want any.

The jury were sworn in groups of four, each juror placing the tips of his fingers upon a copy of the Bible, while the clerk who held the book repeated the oath.

The indictment was then read, as follows:—

State of Tennessee, { Jan. Term, A. D. 1892.
Henry County, }

The Grand Jurors of the State of Tennessee elected, impanelled, sworn, and charged to inquire in and for the body of the county of Henry, in the State aforesaid, upon their oath present that W. S. Lowry, late of said county, laborer, heretofore, to wit, on the eighth day of November, A. D. 1891, that day being Sunday, and divers other Sundays before that date, and up to the taking of this inquisition, in the county of Henry aforesaid, then and there, unlawfully, openly, publicly, notoriously, and unnecessarily did engage in his secular business, and did perform and follow his common avocations on Sundays, by working on the farm, plowing, hoeing, chopping, hauling wood, mauling rails and various and divers other kinds of work on Sundays; said work not being necessary, or a matter of charity, and it was and is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, to the evil example of morals, and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county, and against the peace and dignity of the State. J. W. Lewis, *Att. Gen.*

SECOND COUNT: And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present that the said W. S. Lowry, on the days and dates aforesaid, and in the manner and form as aforesaid, was guilty of a public nuisance by said working on Sunday, to the prejudice of society, and against the peace and dignity of the State. J. W. Lewis, *Att. Gen.*

The Court (to defendant). Do you plead guilty, or not guilty?

W. S. Lowry. I can not plead either way to all the indictment.

The Court. As a matter of law it is necessary for you to plead guilty or not guilty on the whole as read. Which do you plead? (Silence.) I suppose you had better enter a plea of not guilty. Do you so plead? (Silence.)

W. L. Carter (a bystanding lawyer). By his si-

lence it is necessary to enter a plea of not guilty for him.

The Court (to clerk). Enter a plea of not guilty.

The witnesses for the State were called, and as with the jury, each witness placed his hand upon a copy of the Bible while being sworn.

Mr. T. F. Dortch (an Adventist) was then called by the State, and testified as follows:—

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

Attorney-General. Mr. Dortch, do you know the defendant, Mr. W. S. Lowry?

Mr. T. F. Dortch. Yes, sir.

Q. How near do you live to him, Mr. Dortch?

A. About three hundred yards.

Q. How long have you lived there, Mr. Dortch?

A. About four years.

Q. How long has he been living there?

A. About six years.

Q. Have you seen him on Sunday at labor, his common, every day labor, within that time?

A. No, sir; within the last year you mean?

Q. Yes, sir; within last year, up to the first of January?

A. Yes, sir, I have in the last year.

Q. How many Sabbaths have you seen him at labor?

A. Sundays, you mean?

Q. Yes, Sundays.

A. That is quite different. I have seen him I don't know how many times.

Q. What sort of labor did you see him do?

A. I don't just remember now. I saw him at different kinds of work.

Q. Mention some, please.

A. Well, I don't know that that is necessary.

Q. Well, I think it is.

The Court. The witness can state what he has seen him do.

A. Well, I have seen him at work, but I do not know that I can describe it right now.

Attorney-General. Most any kind of work? See him plow any?

A. I do not think I have.

Q. Did you see him driving a team, hauling?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see him chopping any?

A. Saw him cutting fire wood.

Q. Hauling wood?

A. No, sir; I do not remember that he hauled any wood.

Q. Well, what kind of labor do you remember to have seen him do on Sundays?

A. I do not know that I can say.

Q. Is it, and was it his habit, Mr. Dortch, to follow his every day avocations on Sundays? do the work on Sundays that is ordinarily done by other men on the other days of the week?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, he would perform the same kind of work on Sundays that he would do on other days?

A. Yes, sir; all but Saturdays.

Q. And you seen him at different kinds of work?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in this county?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he do Saturday?

A. He quit his work Friday evening in time to clean up and get ready for the Sabbath, and he kept the Sabbath as he thought according to the commandment.

Q. In other words, he recognized Saturday as the Sabbath?

A. Yes, sir, he did.

Q. And he followed his every day avocations and worked at other kinds of work on Sunday?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you seen him at all these sorts of work?

A. Well, I suppose most every time.

CROSS EXAMINATION.

W. S. Lowry. The indictment charges that the work performed was a public nuisance, and disturbed the community. Were you really disturbed by my work, or did it interfere with your particular views in any way?

A. No, sir, not a bit. It did not disturb me any.

Q. Do you think a man ought to have the privilege of working six days in the week?

A. I think every man ought to have the privilege of working when he pleases; I think that is his right. And he has the right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, I think.

RE-DIRECT.

Attorney-General. Are you a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church out there?

T. F. Dortch. Yes, sir.

Mr. A. W. Fitch (an Adventist) was next called for the State, and testified as follows:—

Attorney-General. Mr. Fitch, do you know the defendant, Mr. Lowry?

Mr. A. W. Fitch. Yes, sir.

Q. How near do you live to him?

A. About a mile and a half, I suppose.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Fitch, if you know whether he follows his every day avocations on Sunday or not?

A. Well, I have never seen him.

Q. Have you heard him say that he did?

A. No, sir, I do not know that I have.

Q. And you have never seen him at work on Sunday?

A. Well, I could not say that.

Q. Have you seen him on Sundays?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What have you seen him doing?

A. It was not in this county that I have seen him.

Q. Have you seen him at work in this county at all?

A. Not within the last eight or ten months.

Q. Have you within twelve months before last January?

A. I saw him loading some wood on a wagon one Sunday.

Q. Where was that, Mr. Fitch?

A. Down there near the railroad.

Q. In this county?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was he hauling it?

A. He was putting it in a car.

Q. Did you see him at that more than once?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you seen him doing anything else in the way of labor within twelve months before that time?

A. No, sir, I do not remember.

Q. Are you a member of that church, Mr. Fitch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it the habit of members of your church to labor on Sunday, to follow your secular business on Sunday?

A. Yes, sir, I think it is.

Q. There is a number of you gentlemen that belong to that church living in that same neighborhood?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is your custom, and your belief, and your habit—

A. Well, I have not been a member of the church but a few months.

Q. It is their custom, and belief, and habit, to labor on Sunday?

A. Well, I think so.

(No cross-examination.)

The next witness called for the State was Mr. J. C. Fitch (not an Adventist). He testified as follows:—

Attorney-General. Mr. Fitch where do you live?

Mr. J. C. Fitch. Well, sir, I live in the neighborhood of Mr. Lowry.

Q. Have you known of Mr. Lowry's working on Sunday?

A. No, sir, I never saw him.

Q. You live in the settlement where the people of this church live, do you?

A. Yes, sir, within half a mile of the church.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Fitch, if that laboring on Sunday by members of that church is a nuisance to the people there?

A. Well, sir, I do not know; I could not say whether it is or not. I believe some claim they are annoyed, and some say they do not mind it.

Q. Of course it is no annoyance to members of that church; but outside of that?

A. Yes, I have heard others say they were annoyed, and others that it did not bother them at all.

Q. And you have heard others complain?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And there is a dissatisfaction among a good element of people about it?

A. Well, yes; there are some that claim to feel dissatisfied about it; while others do not seem to care about it.

Q. It is the habit and custom of this people, so far as you know, to work on Sunday?

A. I think so; that is my opinion about it.

CROSS EXAMINATION.

Mr. Lowry. Mr. Fitch, were you yourself disturbed?

Mr. J. C. Fitch. Not at all.

Q. Do you know of any one that was really disturbed?

A. Well, I do not know that I could call to mind now any in particular; only that I have heard people say they did not just like it. I could call names if it was necessary.

Q. Were you disturbed yourself?

A. No, sir.

The next witness for the State was Mr.

L. J. Cox (not an Adventist), who testified as follows:—

Attorney-General. How near do you live to Mr. Lowry?

Mr. Cox. I suppose it is nearly a mile.

Q. Do you live in the settlement down there in which members of his church live?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen Mr. Lowry engaged in his secular work on Sunday within twelve months before January last?

A. I do not think I have.

Q. Is it the habit and custom of that church, of this people, to labor on Sunday?

A. I think it is.

The Court. You should inquire concerning the habit and custom of this particular defendant.

Q. Does that create confusion and dissatisfaction among the people?

A. There has been some trouble.

CROSS EXAMINATION.

Mr. Lowry. Has it bothered you, Mr. Cox?

Mr. L. J. Cox. No, sir.

Q. Are you disturbed?

A. I do not know that it disturbs me.

RE-DIRECT.

Attorney-General. Had you rather not see it?

Mr. L. J. Cox. I can stand it.

The Court. Attorney-General do you wish to argue the case?

Attorney-General. No, sir.

DEFENDANT DECLINES TO TESTIFY.

The Court. Mr. Lowry, do you wish to be sworn as a witness, or to plead your case? If you want to testify, be sworn by the Clerk.

Mr. Lowry. I do not wish to testify, but would like to make a statement.

The Court. You can make a statement to the jury if you wish.

STATEMENT OF W. S. LOWRY TO THE JURY.

I would like to say to the jury, that, as has been stated, I am a Seventh-day Adventist. I observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. I read my Bible, and my convictions on the Bible are that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, which comes on Saturday. I observe that day the best I know how. Then I claim the God-given right to six-days' labor. I have a wife and four children, and it takes my labor on six days to make a living. I go about my labor quietly, do not make any unnecessary noise, but do my work as quietly as possible. It has been proved by the testimony of Mr. Cox, and Mr. Fitch, who live around me, that they were not disturbed. Here I am before the court to answer for this right that I claim as a Christian. I am a law-abiding citizen; believe we should obey the laws of the State; but whenever they conflict with my religious convictions and the Bible, I stand and choose to serve the laws of my God rather than the laws of the State. I do not desire to cast any reflection upon the State, nor the officers and authorities executing the law. I leave the case with you.

ARGUMENT OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL J. W. LEWIS.

I want to say, gentlemen of the jury, so far as Mr. Lowry's case is concerned, that we have a law that points out and recognizes a certain day as Sunday, and the Legislature of Tennessee has thrown around that day safeguards of protection. It says it shall be a misdemeanor for any man to follow his secular work on that day; and, so far as the laws of Tennessee are concerned, it is a violation of that law when a man follows that work. It is not a matter of conviction as to whether he believes that his Sunday, or his Saturday, is Sunday, or the Sabbath, as Mr. Lowry terms it. And while the Constitution guarantees unto him, and to every other citizen of this Republic, the right to keep Saturday if he sees proper, or to keep Monday if he prefer, or to keep any other day, if your Honor pleases, that he sees proper, and guarantees to him the right to work according to his own convictions and his own ideas of these things, that very same guarantee is given to you and to all the citizens of this commonwealth. And the American people by law, and the people of Tennessee by the laws, designate and point out a certain day as the Sabbath, and they say that day shall be kept holy, and around it they throw the safeguards of law; and they say that no man shall work on that day, unless it is a work that is necessary, a work that is absolutely necessary and can not be foregone. Now Mr. Lowry has not gone to pull an ox out of the ditch, or to put up a fence to keep stock out of his farm; but he follows his every day avocations on Sunday. While the Constitution guarantees to him the right to keep Saturday, and protects him in his worship while engaged in that worship; and if in his church others should disturb him, he would have the same safeguards thrown around him, and

the same solemn protection given him in that worship that you have in your own church, yet he must bow to the laws of the State of Tennessee; he must bow to the laws of this county; he must bow to the laws that have been made and recognized and must be enforced by the courts of this country. And if he feels that it is his duty to keep Saturday, his Honor will charge that the law makes him desist from his secular work on Sunday. It is not a question of fact at all; it is only a question of law; because he does not dispute that he follows his every day avocations, but admits it; he does not dispute that he follows the work on Sunday that he follows during the week, but admits it, and gives as an excuse that it is a conviction of his church belief. This is a question that has been decided by the higher courts of this country, that this people must respect and regard the laws of the State. It is that a man can not justify himself in the violation of a State law by religious scruples, by religious belief. It is a matter that I can not conceive how that a man who claims to be a peaceable, law-abiding citizen, can go on disregarding the day, openly, in the face of the law, openly, in the face of the protections that are thrown around the holy Sabbath as we believe it, and hold it, and protected by the laws of this State; and it is a question that I presume you gentlemen will not have any difficulty in coming to a decision upon.

It is a question that has been decided by the courts, and whatever protection, whatever rights are guaranteed to a man in his own peculiar religious beliefs, no law could be enacted that would say that a man who violated the Sabbath was not guilty. It is a day that we are taught to respect, and, as alluded to by Mr. Lowry here, the seventh day we should keep holy, and protect it with the laws of the State.

While I regret that we have that class of people among us with that belief,—not that we have the people,—while I regret that there is that difference, yet if they want to keep Saturday the law says they must keep Sunday; that is to say they must not violate the Sabbath laws; they must not follow their every day avocations on that day. It is to be regretted, because of the fact that so far as I know they are good citizens; yet it is a solemn duty that rests upon the jury, and rests upon the Court, and upon all the officers of the court, to see that this law is enforced. It is a duty that I take it the Court will do. So far as I am concerned it is a painful duty to me; nevertheless, it is a duty that I would not shun. I leave the matter with the court.

CHARGE OF JUDGE SWIGGART TO THE JURY.

Gentlemen of the jury: This indictment against the defendant, W. S. Lowry, charges him with the offense of committing a nuisance by openly, and publicly, and habitually following his daily avocations upon Sundays. It is charged that on the eighth of November, that day being Sunday, and divers other Sundays before that date, and up to the taking of this inquisition, the defendant unlawfully, openly, publicly, notoriously, and unnecessarily did engage in his secular business, and performed and followed his common avocations of life on Sunday, by working on his farm, plowing hoeing, chopping, hauling wood, mauling rails, and doing various and divers other kinds of work on Sunday; that this work was not necessary nor a matter of charity; and that it was and is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, and an evil example to society, prejudicial to the morals of the people, and a public nuisance to the citizens. The defendant does not plead; but the Court has entered the plea of not guilty. In order to return a verdict of guilty, the State must prove the guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and that the offense was committed in Henry County, within twelve months before this indictment was returned by the Grand Jury.

It must appear from the proof beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant did habitually—that is, more than once—openly and publicly perform his daily work, and did engage in his daily vocations by doing the work described in this indictment, or some portion of it; and that it was done in such an open and public way as to become a nuisance, that is, a disturbance to the community.

If you find, gentlemen of the jury, these facts proven beyond a reasonable doubt, and that the offense occurred in Henry County, and within twelve months before this indictment was returned to the Grand Jury, you are to return a verdict of guilty. If these facts are not so proven beyond a reasonable doubt, you are to return a verdict of not guilty.

It is not a question of religious belief or conviction at all, either one way or the other. So far as, and for the purposes of this case, and in the administration of the laws of the State, it is not a matter of any importance, or to be considered by the Court or jury, as to whether Saturday or Sunday is the Sabbath of the Bible, or as to what the peculiar religious opinion of the defendant may be, or the

religious opinions of other people in the community. It is a question of observing Sunday as a civil institution under the laws of the State.

If you find this defendant is guilty of the acts, in the manner, and to the extent as charged, then it will be your duty to find him guilty, regardless of what may be his religious convictions upon the question of the Sabbath. It is the duty of every citizen to observe the laws of the State. It is a question for you to determine from the proof, as to whether he has been proven to be guilty. You are the judges of the facts and the circumstances. It is your duty to take the law as the Court charges you. You are to look to the manner and intelligence of the witnesses, whether they corroborate or contradict each other in their statements. Draw from your experience, from the knowledge of men, and from the affairs of men in construing the evidence. Give it a reasonable construction, with the view of arriving at the facts in the case.

There is one other matter, if you find the defendant guilty, gentlemen of the jury, and should be of the opinion that his offense merits a fine of more than fifty dollars, it will be your duty to assess the fine at any sum that you consider proper under the facts of the case. If, however, you should be of the opinion that the penalty should be under fifty dollars, it is the business of the Court to assess the fine, and you would simply return a verdict of guilty. You may retire, gentlemen.

After being out about ten minutes the jury returned a verdict of guilty.

The Republican Platform and the National League.

THE Republican National Committee was urged to adopt the proposed Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, offered by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, as a plank in the Republican platform.

The memorial to the committee claims that—

this Amendment has been introduced into the Fifty-second Congress, in both Houses, and is substantially in accord with a similar one proposed in 1876 by President Grant; introduced by Mr. Blaine, passed in the House by an overwhelming vote, and in the Senate by a majority of 28 to 16, lacking a few votes of the necessary two-thirds. This same proposition was indorsed by both the Democratic and Republican conventions of 1876, by twenty-one State conventions, and has received the autographic approval of over 250,000 prominent citizens in all parts of the country, ninety patriotic organizations, with a membership of 1,500,000 voters, and of a number of religious bodies, etc.

This is the anti-Roman Catholic constitutional amendment, and if adopted into the platform of the Republican Party would commit that party to a partisanship in religion. This is an extremely subtle movement to mingle religion with the politics of this Nation, and originates solely in the sectarian jealousy of the Roman Catholics felt by Protestant denominations, fanned into a flame by the success of the Roman Catholics in obtaining Government appropriations for Indian schools under their charge, and in some instances State favor for schools nominally public, but really parochial in character.

The constitutional amendment to which the Republican Party was asked to give its support is this:—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

The first phrase of this amendment is not offered in good faith, for the principle there affirmed, has been, and is continually, denied by those who drew and present the article. They, themselves, declare that the effect of the proposed amendment is intended to be restricted to

the rendering of financial aid by the Government to organizations falling under their definition of sectarian. They would earnestly deny that it prohibited the Government, either State or national, from promoting the interests of the Christian religion by legislation.

The Republican platform did not contain such a clause as that asked, unless this can be so construed:—

We declare anew our devotion to liberty of thought and conscience, of speech and press, and approve all agencies and instrumentalities which contribute to the education of the children of the land, but while insisting upon the fullest measure of religious liberty, we are opposed to any union of Church and State.

It may be found, upon analysis, quite difficult to obtain any definite meaning from this clause, but perhaps that was the intention with which it was drawn; the intent of diplomatic language, Talleyrand says, is to conceal thought. W. H. M.

A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation.

[Further extracts from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

WHEN Henry VIII wanted a divorce from his wife the Pope could not make his political ends meet so as to grant it; and Henry took the matter into his own and Cranmer's hands, and divorced both his wife and the Pope. This separated the Church of England from the Catholic Church. Then that which had formerly been the Catholic Church in England, became the Church of England, the only difference being that Henry was head of the church instead of the Pope. Thus Henry still maintained his title of "Defender of the Faith," and it was the same faith—except only as to the head of it.

Under Edward VI, a few very slight steps were taken further away from the absolute Catholic faith. Under Mary, a powerful effort was made to bring all back into full harmony with the papal religion. Mary soon died, and Elizabeth succeeded, and would have been glad to complete Mary's scheme, but could not, and was obliged to be content with things as they were left by Edward, for the nation and people, while in her own private individual life, she inclined strongly to the papal religion outright. So that the sum of the matter is, that the religion professed in the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, was a religion which was just as near to the Roman Catholic religion as was possible, without being precisely that religion.

And this is the religion which the Supreme Court of the United States finds to be historically intended to be established here, and which by this decision the court declares now to be established here, according to the meaning of the Constitution of the United States; because the language of the Constitution and the language of all these other documents is *one language*, "having one meaning." It is to be expected also that the religion established should be as much like the papal religion as possible, without being precisely that religion itself, as the prophecy says that it would be said "that they should make an image to the beast"—the Papacy.

Yet the court does not propose to be partial, nor presume to establish strictly this particular phase of religion without giving any other any chance or recognition. It proceeds next to introduce Puritanism, as follows:—

The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the *Mayflower*, 1620, recites:—

"Having undertaken for the glory of God and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the honor of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the ends aforesaid."

Having thus established what it chooses to declare to be "the Christian faith" as the religion of this Nation, the court next proceeds to cite historical evidence that it is legitimate to use the civil power to maintain "the discipline of the churches." This is done by citing the compact of the Puritans who settled Connecticut, as follows:—

Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise dispensation of divyne providence so to Order and dispose of things that we the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vpon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyning; And well knowing where a people are gathered together, the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; doe therefore assciate and conioyne ourselves to be as one Publike State or Comonwealth; and doe, for our selves and our Successors and such as shall be adioyned to vs att any tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to mayntayne and presearve the liberty and purity of the gossell of our Lord Jesus wch we now professe. AS ALSO THE DISPLYNE OF THE CHURCHES, wch according to the truth of the said gossell is now practised amongst vs.

By this "historical" citation, the Supreme Court just as certainly establishes and justifies the employment of the "Civil Body Politick" for the maintenance of "the discipline of the churches," as by the previous ones it establishes the Christian religion as the religion of this Nation. And this decision declares that the language of this citation and the language of the national Constitution is "one language," "having one meaning." By this, therefore, the Supreme Court has decided that the civil power, even of the United State Government, can rightly be employed to maintain the discipline of the churches. And this, as we know and have shown over and over again, is exactly what the churches are aiming to bring about by the national enforcement of Sunday laws; and this is precisely what is done by the enforcement of Sunday laws, either State or national. And this the decision of the Supreme Court fully establishes, and sanctions and justifies by its (mis)interpretation of the national Constitution.

So far, therefore, in this decision, we find a national religion established with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches. What next?—Why, the requirement of the religious oath of witnesses, and the religious test oath as a qualification for office. After citing William Penn's grant of privileges to the province of Pennsylvania, and the Declaration of Independence, in which "the Creator," "the Supreme Judge of the world," and "Divine Providence" is referred to, and the Constitution of Illinois, in which God is recognized, the court quotes from the Constitution of Maryland, as follows, and for the purpose of establishing the legality of the religious oath and the religious test-oath:—

That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no per-

son ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent or maintain or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief: *Provided*, He believes in the existence of God, and that, under his dispensation, such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor, either in this world or the world to come.

"Provided he believes in the existence of God." That is, in other words, no man ought to be interfered with in his profession or principles of religious belief, *provided* he holds these according to the dictates of the State. That has been the practice in all the history of the Catholic Church. It is the very doctrine of the Papacy. It was also the doctrine of pagan Rome, before the Papacy supplanted it. Paganism declared that "no man should have particular gods of his own, except they are recognized by the laws of the State." But the court continues this quotation, providing further:—

That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, *other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God*; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

That is the provision and the requirement of the Constitution of Maryland. But, says the Supreme Court, that speaks the same language as the Constitution of the United States, and that the Constitution of the United States and this quotation have "one meaning." And although the Constitution of the United States positively declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under this Government, this decision says that it *means* that no *other* religious test shall ever be required, as does the Constitution of Maryland, for these documents "all" have "one language" and "one meaning."

So, then, we find that so far, this decision establishes a national religion, with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches, and the requirement of the religious oath in court, and the religious test-oath as a qualification for office. And what next?—Why, public taxation for the support of religion. This is justified and established by a quotation from the Constitution of Massachusetts, as follows:—

It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. . . . As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government are essentially dependent upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their Government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their Legislature with power to authorize and require, and the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic or religious societies to make suitable provision, at their own expense for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.

And says the court, This document and the Constitution of the United States have the same language, have "one meaning," and both alike, with all the other quotations, "speak the voice of the entire people." So far, then, by this decision there is es-

tablished here a national religion, with maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power, the requirement of the religious oath and the religious test-oath, and public taxation for "the worship of God," and for "the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of religion." The wicked thing grows rapidly as it goes.

"The Gentleman from South Carolina."

A POSTAL card has been received at this office, postmarked South Carolina, and signed, "A South Carolina Man," bearing these words, "Your criticism, June 9th, No. 23, of Hon. Geo. Johnstone is unjust and wrong."

If this gentleman from South Carolina will obtain copies of the *Congressional Record* of the dates of May 26 and 27, and read the report there published of the proceedings of the House, while in consideration of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair as asked by the amendment, proposed by Mr. Johnstone, to the clause in reference to the Government exhibit at the World's Fair in the sundry civil appropriation bill, he will there find a record such as would justify a far sharper criticism of the course of the Representative from South Carolina, in this matter, than has appeared, or will appear, in this paper.

At this time the House had under consideration the matter of further appropriation for expenditures necessary to the Government exhibit at the Exposition. The general management of the Fair was not under discussion in any particular. The subject matter brought to the attention of the House was confined to the exhibit to be made by the Government, and that alone. And yet, ignoring this fact, Mr. Johnstone offers an amendment, "That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be available unless the doors of the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday." Mr. Johnstone's intent, by this amendment, was to make the United States Government say to the World's Fair Managers that although Government appropriations to a large amount had already been made both for the Fair in general and also for the individual exhibit of the Government, yet if the Fair should be opened on Sunday the Government would forfeit all this and refuse to make its individual exhibit. Mr. Johnstone's own words show that this is what he intended, for, in replying to Mr. Taylor, of Illinois, he said:—

As this paragraph relates to the exhibit to be made by the Government of the United States, this limitation upon the appropriation would simply mean that this exhibit by the Government shall not be made unless the World's Fair corporation consents to have the Exhibition remain closed on Sunday.

And again in another place:—

The amendment if adopted would simply mean that the agents of the Federal Government, before they could get the use of this money, would have to get an agreement from the World's Fair corporation that the fair should be closed on Sunday during the Exhibition.

And yet again in still another place:—

The point I desire to emphasize by my amendment is that this appropriation of money of the American people should not be expended at all unless the institution upon which, or in connection with which, this fund is to be expended shall be closed on Sunday.

And again, at the close of the second day's discussion when the substitute offered by Mr. Dockery, "That the Government exhibits at the World's Columbian Ex-

position shall not be opened to the public on Sundays," had been adopted, Mr. Johnstone, in his zeal to condition the exhibit of the Government upon the Sunday closing of the entire Fair, offered his previous proposition as an amendment to the substitute, even after that had been passed as the completed action upon the subject and there was nothing before the House.

Mr. Johnstone's zeal in this matter is shown by the *Record* which names him as being on his feet thirty-seven times in the course of this discussion. Mr. Johnstone offered the proposition; he assumed the responsibility of precipitating the discussion of this question upon the House, and just as far as he could he showed his dissatisfaction with that which was done in the matter, although it differed from that which he wished done, not in kind, but only in degree. The kind of legislation asked, and which was secured, is religious legislation. Is legislation upon religious questions contrary to the Constitution of the United States as it was established, or is it not? If it is, as none will deny, Congress was stopped by the Constitution from legislating at all upon the Sunday question; and Mr. Johnstone with one hundred and thirty other Congressmen not only ignored an express provision of the Constitution, but Mr. Johnstone attempted to delude Congress into inserting in an appropriation bill a measure indirectly compelling the Managers of the World's Fair to themselves yield obedience also to a religious edict formulated by Congress and made an essential part of the appropriation for its own exhibit.

If Mr. Johnstone's course in this matter were really being made a subject of critical examination, what characterization could be used which would do him wrong or injustice? W. H. M.

Union or Not?

In a lecture not long since, Rev. Joseph Cook wished it understood that he did not believe in the "union of Church and State." The fact is, people, generally, seem to have learned enough about religious liberty to know that Church and State must be kept separate; but very few understand the real meaning of these terms.

Mr. Cook went on to say that Sunday ought to be kept more holy, and he wanted a law to compel people to keep it; others have desired the same. Now, do these people understand the meaning of "Church" and "State?" Since they believe the Bible, consistency requires that they accept all of it, as it is. What is the scriptural idea of this subject? Where does the Bible draw the line between the authority of God and of earthly governments and our allegiance to both? Christ said to the Jews (Matt. 22: 21;) "Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Cæsar, standing at the head of the universal empire of Rome, was the representative of all earthly governments. He had a right to control many things, but Christ limited civil power when he commanded, "Render unto God the things that are God's." According to this plain direction, Cæsar is not to come between the people and their duty to God in anything. The Church, *i. e.* the people of God, are doing God's work on the earth; so far as they do it and he accepts it they represent him, just as our ministers to foreign countries represent the United

States Government which indorses the work of its foreign representatives as though done by itself.

Christ gave his Church definite directions about treating offenders. The extreme penalty of the law was not to be fines, imprisonment, etc.; for as the Church is spiritual, so is all its work. "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." "Whatsoever ye (the Church) shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18: 17, 18. Jesus did not give this power to the civil authority; on the contrary, Paul reproved his brethren for going to law before unbelievers. The people of God are appointed to control the things of God, entirely exclusive of Cæsar or any worldly power; and when civil authorities legislate regarding anything religious they unite their (State) power to the power of the Church, and there is a union of State and Church. Our Saviour, who is our example, refused to interfere with the authority that rightfully belongs to the courts of justice. Said he to one, regarding his earthly inheritance, "Who made me a judge or divider over you?" Thus did Christ draw the line sharply and unmistakably between the things of God and those of Cæsar.

To ascertain if any particular instance is a union of Church and State, we have but to inquire, Is it of a religious character?

Whether it is right or wrong makes no difference. If it is religious the law must not touch it. We may trust the Lord to take care of all that belongs to him.

What about keeping Sunday? We have only to decide whether the Sunday Sabbath is a religious institution, or merely a civil one, like the Fourth of July, or Decoration Day. It is evident that Mr. Cook does not want a civil Sabbath, since he is calling for a more holy (religious) observance of the day. A law to compel people to keep it holy, unites the two essential points of Church and State; and while Mr. Cook blindly asserts that he does not want them united, he is at the same time pleading for it.

M. E. STEWARD.

A Faithful Press and a False Pulpit.

At this particular time it is more than ever essential that newspapers should be conducted by Christian men, guided and controlled by Christian principles and convictions. The pulpit in several conspicuous instances has gone utterly astray in its teachings. Instead of proclaiming the great principles of Christianity and thus glorifying God, it is disseminating satanic doctrines ruinous to the soul. It is betraying the cause which it was appointed to defend. Ministers of the gospel are showing that their hearts are hardened to its teachings and that their minds have become so far perverted that they can not perceive its sublime philosophy. They are teaching men doctrines which are subversive of the foundations of the moral order and destructive of every valuable safeguard of social virtue. They are justifying anarchy and every crime which men can commit against society. They say that because Parkhurst's motives were to expose crime, he was right in himself committing a crime against the moral law. They justify him in deceiving, tempting, and hiring harlots to make a shameful exhibition of themselves before him in order that he might betray

them. In order to detect a murderer, then, they would have to justify the hiring of him to commit murder. Dr. Rainsford says that the saloon is an evil, but he would have the Church take charge of it, so that the evil might be used for good.

Other ministers are showing that they have no belief in the Christian principle of dealing with evil by opposing to it good. They think it is too slow and too tiresome in its workings. It takes too long to change the hearts of men, so that they shall hate evil and love good. They instruct them to take a short cut by doing evil in order to get good. If the purpose is to use the money for charity, they can steal it. If they think a man is a swindler, they can themselves swindle in order to catch him. If people are licentious, they can descend into any depths of licentiousness in order to expose them. If others sacrifice their self-respect, you can sacrifice yours in order to see them do it. If they will not degrade themselves for nothing, pay them to degrade themselves.

These are vile principles, and as pulpits are teaching them, the newspaper must take the place of such pulpits and proclaim the heavenly doctrines essential for the preservation of society. Hence, editors should be Christian men who work for the glory of God by inculcating sound Christian principles.

The public should hold every newspaper up to the highest religious standard always, and more especially at this day when that standard has fallen so low among many sensational ministers.—*The Sun*.

THERE is an effort in Chicago to prevent the unconstitutional appropriation of State funds to religious institutions. The following incident as recorded in the *Chicago Tribune* of May 7, will materially aid in that direction:—

At yesterday's meeting of the Woman's Alliance, some commotion was raised by the reading of a report from a committee which endeavored to "inspect" the House of the Good Shepherd.

The report claimed that nine of the members visited the house, found it barred and locked like a prison, and were refused admission by Sister Philomena, who gave as a reason the absence of the Mother Superior. The latter, however, appeared after the committee had shown sufficient persistence. The Mother Superior said that as she was about to start for Europe it would not be convenient to show them through. The committee informed her that they had a permit from the Governor to visit all institutions receiving public money. This authority did not move the Mother Superior, who at once ended the conversation, which was carried on through the bars.

The committee then sent two of their number to invoke the aid of the Chief of Police, while the remainder sat in a little closet and regaled themselves, according to the report, with crackers and cheese. While waiting for developments they again sent for the Mother Superior, who sent Sister Philomena in her place. The sister in answer to numerous questions said that she had been there thirty years but knew nothing about two hundred and sixty girls, inmates, their names being changed when they entered. Any records kept were not for the public.

The sub-committee finally returned with a letter to the Mother Superior from Judge Scales advising her to allow the women to go through the house. Another refusal was the result. A positive "no" was also given when the committee sent a message asking if they could do so at some future time. A threat was then made to call a police officer, and this having no effect, the committee gave up the siege as hopeless, and retired.

The Catholic Church, and all other churches now receiving State appropriations, must either submit to the State inspection, and dictation as to the use made of the appropriation, or relinquish that appropriation. This last is the proper thing to do.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE *Denver Daily News* suggests that if the Fair is to be closed on one day of the week to satisfy one religious element, it should also be closed on any other day that other religionists should see fit to ask.

LADY SOMERSET has addressed letters to the archbishops and bishops and the heads of all religious denominations in the United Kingdom, asking their support for legislation, in Parliament, favoring Sunday observance.

AT a meeting of the Woman's National Press Association held lately at Washington, D. C., the question of opening the World's Fair on Sunday was discussed. The members generally took part in the discussion, and the majority favored the opening of the gates.

THE Southern Presbyterian General Assembly, in session at Hot Springs, Ark., May 24, passed resolutions demanding that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday. It is a noticeable fact that very few, if any, religious bodies meet nowadays without passing such resolutions. Yet many still tell us that they can see no menace in this to our freedom either civil or religious.

ON Sunday, June 12, a reporter for the *Sun* was refused information as to the name of a smallpox patient just sent to North Brother Island, on the ground that the Health Department being closed on Sunday no information could be given. That is to say that although open for business, the office was "constructively" closed, and therefore, as, by fiction of law, no business was being transacted, there could be no information to give. Great is king humbug!

THE *Mail and Express* publishes the following:—

The news that a number of German families who settled at Kieff, Russia, have been driven out of the Czar's empire because they refused to give up their religion and join the Russian Orthodox Church, confirms the opinion of those who, like M. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, maintain that the Russian Government has adopted the policy of gradually driving out all strangers from the country, and that their expulsion of the Jews is but one, although the principal manifestation of this policy.

The attention of the *Mail and Express* should be called to Arkansas and Tennessee, where there has been and is now a determined effort to drive out peaceable and worthy citizens, acknowledged to be conscientious men, because of a difference in religious belief and practice.

NOT only has Congress been asked to manage the local affairs of Chicago on Sunday during the World's Fair, but all Europe is now giving its advice to the Columbian Commission as to what disposition it shall make of its Sundays, as shown by this paragraph from the *Christian Advocate*:—

"We have already noticed memorials in favor of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair from the International Federation of Europe, with its headquarters at Geneva, and also the interesting volume of memorials from representatives of different classes in England. Recently other petitions on the same subject have been received by Dr. Atterbury, of the New York Sabbath Committee, for transmission to the Columbian Commission, from the committee of the Free Church of Scotland, from the Workingmen's Sabbath Association of Glasgow, and from some prominent business firms of Glasgow. And now comes another memorial from the Continent. An international congress on the Sunday observance has just been in session for three days in Stuttgart, in Germany, attended by

representatives from different parts of Europe. Its president was Count Von Bernstorff, Chamberlain of the Emperor of Germany. The sessions of the congress were largely attended, and much interest was shown in the reports and discussions. On one occasion the famous ex-Court Preacher Stoeker delivered an address of great power before an audience of three thousand persons. By this congress a petition was unanimously adopted asking for the closing of the Exposition on Sunday, both for the sake of the numerous employes, who would otherwise be deprived of their Sunday rest after the hard labors of the week, and for the influence which such an example would have upon the visitors from the Old World in showing how the American people appreciate the divine institution of the Sunday rest, to which they owe to a great extent their national and economical greatness."

A WEST VIRGINIA exchange notices the presence of a lecturer named Bennett at Berea and other places in West Virginia, in the interests of the Prohibition and Farmers' Alliance parties, both of which seem to have entrusted their cause to his advocacy. This speaker, who has been dubbed the "Kansas Cyclone" by his adherents, came out openly, it seems, and "plainly stated the design of the parties he represented; he plainly declared their intention to make everything secondary to the agitation of the Sunday question. Immediately following the speeches of Mr. Bennett, the Republican primaries were held, and religio-political matters discussed on every hand." Political religion is certainly becoming popular when its voice is heard from the stump.

THE attention of Mr. Johnstone, of South Carolina, is called to the following dispatch:—

CHARLESTON, S. C. June 14.—The city council to-day, under pressure of public opinion, adopted a resolution authorizing the Mayor to relax the stringent blue Sunday laws recently enacted under the law, as adopted by the present administration. The only article purchasable in this city on Sunday was the Sunday cocktail, which was of course obtained through side doors. The soda water, ice cream and fruit stands were hermetically sealed, and even the drug-stores were prevented from selling sweet stuff. The public became restive, especially as murder and crime seemed to be on the increase. Hence the resolutions adopted by the Board of Aldermen to-day.

Perhaps the call for the establishment of political religion, from South Carolina, is not quite so pressing as its representative has thought. If that be so, when the debate comes up in the House, on the conditioning of the five million loan to the Exposition, on Sunday closing, his voice will not be heard thirty-seven times in favor of enforcing political religion at Chicago.

POLITICAL religion and religious politics are developing quite rapidly in New Jersey. A very good evidence of this may be found in the following from the *Sun*, of June 14:—

"In a sermon on Sunday the Rev. Dr. Scudder, of Jersey City, said: 'As long as Police Superintendent Smith remains in office we may expect little else than the present lawlessness and defiance on the part of saloon-keepers. When Mayor Wanser gets through with the Board of Works, let him pay his respects to Superintendent Smith and ask him to resign.'

"'Dr. Scudder,' said Superintendent Smith yesterday, 'is an active Republican politician. He makes his pulpit a political stump from which he advocates the election of Republican candidates. Before the last election he called a meeting of ministers, and endeavored to get up a boom for the Republican candidate for Mayor. His effort failed. The majority of the ministers were not disposed to mix practical politics with their religion, and by their positive refusal to join in the scheme they virtually condemned Dr. Scudder and his method. I have never had any conversation with Dr. Scud-



NEW YORK, JUNE 23, 1892.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

A "WITCH" has been sentenced to death in Sonora, Mexico. The victim is a girl only twenty years of age, and her only offense is being credited by the people with miraculous powers in the healing of disease, for which she steadfastly refused to accept any compensation. But this is in Mexico.

IN Tennessee, conscientious, Christian men, observing the Bible Sabbath, are taken from their families and fined and imprisoned, and executions issued against their property to pay the fees of their official persecutors. And their only offense is quietly working on Sunday in order that they may provide things non-est in the sight of all men. *This* is not in Mexico, but in the United States, "the home of the free!"

But it is according to law—and so are the witchcraft proceedings in Mexico, and so they were in Massachusetts two hundred years ago.

IT is a matter of testimony in the late Tennessee Sunday cases that while none of the witnesses were disturbed they had "heard some complaints." What the nature of the complaints were we are left to surmise, except for a slight clew given by one witness who stated that "some thought the work ought to be stopped." This indicates that the annoyance was only of that hazy sort always occasioned in narrow minds by the knowledge that everybody does not agree with them. It could be felt just as keenly fifty or a hundred miles from the scene of the work as within sight or sound of it; and is, in fact, no annoyance of which the State has a shadow of just right to take cognizance.

IT seems a little strange that the courts of Tennessee hold that work done on Sunday by Seventh-day Adventists "is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, to the evil example of society, prejudicial to public morals, and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county, and against the peace and dignity of the State," when the judges and attorneys who prosecute these cases for the State know that the Adventists are among the very best citizens of the State. Were the people of the State all as well disposed

and as conscientious as are these Adventists there would be no need either of criminal courts or of prisons. Indeed, all courts might be disbanded, for whatever slight difficulties might arise would be settled by arbitration. Schools would abound, but saloons would be unknown. Is it reasonable that the example of such people is evil, and prejudicial to public morals?

IT may not be amiss to remind the readers of THE SENTINEL that in their zeal for the morals of the country the supporters of Sunday-Sabbath sacredness by law, sent in from the States of Ohio and Michigan petitions purporting to represent nearly two millions more people than the total population of both States!

IT seems that the Attorney-General for the Northwestern District of Tennessee means to make good his threat to prosecute the Adventists to the full extent of the law; for, not content with sending some of them to jail for quietly pursuing their vocations on Sunday, he is endeavoring to take their property for the payment of costs. However, only one of the imprisoned men has, we believe, property that can be taken under the law of Tennessee. A homestead, and necessary farming implements are, we understand, exempt from execution, even for costs.

THE "luxuries" which this imprisoned Adventist has, and of which the sheriff must deprive him and his family to satisfy the majesty of Tennessee law, are a spring wagon used for going to meeting, and for general trucking about—marketing light farm products, etc.—and a cottage organ, the property of his wife. It has then come to this in Tennessee that Seventh-day Adventists can have only the necessities of life. The "luxuries" are only for those who honor the Sunday. It is well to have the issues clearly joined and the situation fully understood.

THE *Christian Nation* and *Christian Statesman* in their notes on the International Sunday-school lessons on the third and sixth chapters of Daniel, both justify disobedience to civil law when it contravenes the law of God. How then can they condemn conscientious observers of the seventh day for obeying that part of the commandment which says, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work"?

THE fourth commandment puts a difference between the seventh day and all the other days of the week, and that for a purpose, namely, to distinguish the seventh as God's rest day, the memorial of his work in creating the heavens and the earth. To treat all days alike or to habitually treat two days alike by abstaining

from work upon them is simply to violate the fourth commandment. It is just as impossible that the conscientious observer of the seventh day should also habitually observe the first day by laying aside all secular labor and business, as it is that he should labor on the Sabbath. Those who assert that Sunday laws do not invade the realm of conscience, lack either knowledge of the subject or candor to express their convictions.

IT is announced that now, "after an agitation of a quarter of a century, the Hungarian Chamber of Deputies has adopted a resolution which commits that country to religious equality by binding the Government to introduce bills, making it possible, among other things, for Christians and Jews to intermarry, and for Christians to become Jews in faith." This is all plain enough, but not so the statement also made that "the new legislation will affirm the supremacy of the State over all creeds." That is, that whereas in the past a single creed has ruled the State, now the State is to rule all creeds. And this is heralded to the world as a victory for religious liberty! Will people ever come to understand that while the Church is supreme in its sphere, and the State supreme in its sphere, that those spheres no more touch than do Polaris and Crucis.

THE National Prohibition Convention will meet in Music Hall, Cincinnati, at 10 A. M., June 29. This is the sixth national convention of the party. In his circular letter to the press, Oscar B. Todhunter, Chairman of the Press Committee, says that "the policy of the party is well settled in its previous platforms." If anybody is in doubt as to the policy of the Prohibition Party he should read No. 49 of the *Sentinel Library* (advertised on another page of this paper).

"THE chief interest at this Convention," says Mr. Todhunter, "is likely to relate to a proposition to change the name of the party, and to fraternize or coalesce with other reform parties." This is significant, but not altogether reassuring. Some day enough of these National Reform forces will get together to accomplish something for their own aggrandizement, and for the overthrow of liberty of conscience.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

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, post-paid, \$1.00.

In clubs of less than 100 copies, per year, each, - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

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