

-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, APRIL 11, 1895.

NUMBER 15.

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, }
 CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, } - - - EDITORS.
 A. F. BALLENGER, - - - ASSISTANT EDITOR.

IN JAIL FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE.

OUR forefathers sought to lay broad and deep the foundations of religious liberty in this favored land.

Having themselves felt the heavy hand of

ment to the National Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The constitutions of most of the States of the Union contain similar guarantees of freedom of religious faith and practice; and of these guarantees none is more ample than that contained in Section 3, Article 1, of the Declaration of Rights of the State of Tennessee, which declares—

That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his con-

Sunday law of Tennessee. In this issue we present to our readers a picture of the jail at Dayton, Rhea County, where eight Seventh-day Adventists, including the principal of the closed academy and his first assistant, were imprisoned, March 8, for no other offense than doing ordinary secular work in a quiet and orderly manner, and permitting it to be done upon the school premises, on Sunday.


The indictments under which these men were convicted, were (varying only in names and dates) as follows:—

STATE OF TENNESSEE.

RHEA COUNTY.

Circuit Court, November Term, 1894.

The Grand Jurors for the State aforesaid, being



COUNTY JAIL, DAYTON, RHEA COUNTY, TENNESSEE.

"We are not, or should not be, living in an age of religious persecution. Yet EIGHT OF OUR BEST CITIZENS ARE BEING KEPT IN THE COUNTY JAIL, because as Seventh-day Adventists they conscientiously violated a bad law, that says they MUST observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath instead of the seventh. A good community has been disorganized; A splendid school, that has been diffusing the rays of knowledge among the people, has been broken up. The remedy is to change the law; and do it as quickly as possible."—Dayton (Tenn.) Republican, March 9.

oppression, they the better understood the value of liberty, and sought by declarations of rights and by constitutional guarantees to make it sure to all future generations.

The founders of this Government held that rights exist independently of government; that men are endowed with these rights by their Creator, and that they are inalienable.

In harmony with this fundamental principle of our Government, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the First Amend-

ment; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

But notwithstanding this seemingly ample guarantee of religious liberty, persecution for conscience' sake is to-day rife in Tennessee. Three weeks ago we published in these columns a picture of the Seventh-day Adventist academy at Graysville, closed by religious bigotry and intolerance under color of the

duly summoned, elected, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire for the body of the county aforesaid, upon their oath present: That Elder Colcord, heretofore to wit on the 30th day of September, 1894, in the county aforesaid, did unlawfully do, exercise and carry on the common avocations of life, the same not being acts of real necessity or charity, on Sunday, to the common nuisance, against the peace and dignity of the State.

A. J. FLETCHER,
 Attorney-General.

The following is the warrant for the arrest of Elder Colcord, President of the academy,

who is an ordained minister of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination:—

STATE OF TENNESSEE.

To the Sheriff of Rhea County, Greeting:

You are hereby commanded to take the body of Elder Colcord, if found in your county, and him safely keep, so that you have him before the judge of our Circuit Court for the County of Rhea, at the courthouse in the town of Dayton, on the first Monday in March next, then and there to answer the State on an indictment for violating Sabbath. Herein fail not, and have you then and there this writ.

Witness: C. G. GILLESPIE,

Clerk of said Court at office in Dayton, first Monday in November, A. D., 1894.

C. G. GILLESPIE, Clerk.

The "nuisance" charged in the indictment is simply a legal fiction. It is purely mental, and not physical. The annoyance felt is of the same kind that might be felt by a Protestant seeing a Catholic making the sign of the cross, or going to mass or to confession; or that the pedo-Baptist might experience in seeing a Baptist minister immersing candidates for church membership, or that a Baptist might feel in seeing the pedo-Baptist sprinkling infants. It is simply the annoyance of intolerance.

None of the work complained of in these cases was of a nature to actually disturb anyone on account of the noise made by it. In connection with the academy closed by the persecution, was a boarding home under the direct charge of Elder Colcord and his wife. Here such students as so desired were permitted to board. They paid a certain rate per week for their board and tuition, and assisted in the work of the house, which was shared alike by all in the family. Five days in the week were devoted to school work; one, the seventh day, was observed as the Sabbath-day "according to the commandment;" and Sunday was devoted to such work as is often done under like conditions in other families upon Saturday. The young men attending the school would saw and split wood, while the young women did the washing under the supervision of a matron. It was for permitting such work as this that Elder Colcord was indicted and imprisoned.

Only a single act of Sunday work was proved against Prof. I. C. Colcord, the first assistant, and that was carrying a few boards a short distance on Sunday. What the boards were for was not stated by the witness.

Three of the men were convicted for digging a well on Sunday; one cut some wood, another was seen "pulling fodder" [stripping the blades from cornstalks], while another was arranging some wire netting around a vegetable bed to keep the chickens from destroying it. It was for such heinous(?) offenses that the eight Seventh-day Adventists were imprisoned in a Tennessee jail, March 8, where five of them are to-day.

As our readers well know, Seventh-day Adventists observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, according to the fourth commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." They believe that this commandment not only requires rest upon the seventh day, but that it likewise establishes a difference between the Sabbath and all other days of the week, and that it is a religious duty to respect that difference. Therefore it is with them a matter

of conscience not to rest habitually upon two days of the week, because to do so would be to ignore the distinction which God has made between the Sabbath and "the six working days." (Ezek. 46:1). That this is a question of conscience with the Adventists, is admitted by his honor, Judge Parks, before whom the cases were tried, in the following language:—

Their position is not that of the person who claims that as a matter of personal liberty, he has the right if he chooses, to run an open saloon on Sunday, or do any like act. That is not a matter of conscience—this is.

In his defense before the court Elder Colcord said:—

It is a sad feature in human life that we are divided. The saddest divisions that occur are those arising from differences in religious opinion.

My convictions have undergone a change since I was first converted. Then, I believed it was right to keep Sunday—now I know that it is my duty to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. This thing is a part of my very being. You might just as well think to compel me to take the name of my God in vain as to imagine that I could for a moment consent to any compromise in this matter. The third commandment guards the sacredness of God's name; the fourth commandment guards his sacred day. Many in this house would not let judge or jury come between them and their God in the matter of the third commandment; no more can I in the matter of the fourth. I have no desire to set at naught the laws of my country, or to show disrespect to those who administer them. I honor earthly rulers, but I honor my God more. As I said, the fourth commandment defends God's holy day, and in obedience to that commandment I respect that day, and cannot show a like regard for another day.

This is a religious question. There is nothing in nature that gives rise to the Sabbath except the revolution of the earth upon its axis, but even then we know of the Sabbath only by revelation—only as it is revealed in the blessed Bible. This is therefore a Bible question, and I have a right to argue it from the Bible; and that Book tells me that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God, and commands me to keep it holy. This I cannot do unless I treat it differently from all other days; but this the State of Tennessee forbids me to do, and demands that I shall outwardly at least, pay the same respect to another day; but this I cannot do, for I must with the apostles "obey God rather than men." Now I am called to answer for my faith before an earthly tribunal; but I say to the court and jury that there is a time coming when there will be a change, and God, and not man, will be the Judge—and in that Court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God.

Not only have I a natural, God-given right to worship my Creator according to the dictates of my own conscience, but I have a constitutional right that ought to be respected by the courts of this State. Section 3, Article 1, of the Declaration of Rights, says, "that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience." No jury, no judge, no court, according to that law, has any right to come between me and my conscience in any matter whatever. I leave the case with you.

As stated in a previous issue of the SENTINEL, the pleas of all the Adventists were very similar in nature—all defending their right and asserting their duty to keep the Sabbath, and not to show like respect to another day. But in harmony with the decision of the Supreme Court of the State, his honor, Judge Parks, charged the jury that it was not a religious question, but simply a question of law. "What is the law? and has it been violated?" said his honor, "are the only questions before this court." The law, he declared, was that secular work should not be done on the first day of the week, "the Sabbath recognized by the law." Whether or not that law had been violated was a question of fact to be decided by the jury. Of course, as there was no denial on the part of the defendants, the jury had no option but to convict, and the judge had no legal option but to pronounce judgment in accordance with the law, as laid down in the statute books, and as defined by the Supreme Court of the State.

As previously stated in these columns, the judge imposed a fine of two dollars and a half in each case, and then immediately remitted the fine, expressing his regret that he could

not also remit the costs, declaring that his sympathies were with the defendants, but that it was his duty to administer the law as he found it, and not as he might think that it ought to be. Elder Colcord and one other of the defendants were convicted on four indictments, two others upon two indictments each; the others upon one each. This makes their terms of imprisonment range from twenty to seventy-six days. One and all refused to pay the costs, because to do so would be to recognize the justice of their conviction and to encourage further prosecution under the same unjust law.

Adventists are not the enemies of law and order. They are as far removed from anarchists as it is possible for men to be. They are in all points not touching their conscientious convictions, a most law-abiding and exemplary people. Their enemies can find nothing against them, except that touching the law of their God. (Dan. 6:5). They are subject to civil rulers in civil things, not from fear, but for conscience' sake; but in all matters of religion they choose to "obey God rather than men." Nor is this an exhibition of religious fanaticism. The principle thus stated is known and recognized by the best and most enlightened thinkers everywhere. In his work on moral philosophy, President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, says:—

It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine. There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

The Baptists and Quakers of New England acted upon the same principle. They disobeyed the laws which interfered with their religious liberty, and quietly submitted to the penalties imposed upon them; but did not resist the rulers, and the measure of religious liberty enjoyed in this country, to-day, is due largely to their fidelity to principle. Their disobedience of the unjust law, and quiet submission under unjust punishment, witnessed so loudly against injustice and oppression, that men were enabled to see the real principles involved, and were led to recognize them to some degree. When Elder Holmes, the Baptist minister of Massachusetts, was sentenced to pay a fine or be whipped, in 1651, he said:—

I would not give my body into your hands upon any other account, yet upon this I would not give a hundredth part of a wampum-peague to free it out of your hands, and I make as much conscience of unbuttoning one button of my coat as I do in paying the thirty pounds in reference thereunto.

On the same principle the Adventists refuse to pay a single penny. They have defrauded no man, they have corrupted no man, they have offended against no just law; they will not resist when they are put in prison; they will not seek freedom by flight; but they will not become parties to the wicked thing by voluntarily paying money as the price of their liberty; in other words, they will not purchase freedom by the payment of fines.

—♦—♦—♦—
"Has any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as the Sabbath?"
—From the opinion of Judge Parks.

THE VITAL PRINCIPLE INVOLVED.

THOSE who have read the foregoing article will understand something of the reasons why Adventists suffer imprisonment rather than keep Sunday. But a few additional facts on this point will not be out of place.

We have already seen that Adventists regard it as a sacred duty to habitually treat Sunday as a secular day, because they understand that the fourth commandment establishes a difference between the Sabbath and the six other days of the week, and requires men to respect that difference. To ignore this distinction between the Sabbath and the other days of the week would be simply to defeat the object of the divine law, and to set up a counterfeit of the memorial which God has ordained to keep in view the fact that he is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the sanctifier of his people.¹

As the Adventists view it, physical rest for man is not the primary object of the Sabbath; for it "was made for man" before the fall, and consequently before man stood in need of rest from wearing toil. Its object was clearly to keep in lively exercise man's loyalty to God as the Creator. The Fourth of July is designed to fan the flame of patriotism in the American breast, and is a finite illustration of the infinite wisdom and purpose of God in creating the Sabbath for man. Viewed from this standpoint, it is plain that the fourth commandment not only enjoins the keeping of the true Sabbath, but likewise forbids rivals and counterfeits.

Every law must show in some way the authority by which it was enacted, and this the Decalogue does only in the fourth commandment. In that precept it is declared that the giver of the law is the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It is this fact that gives the Sabbath its memorial character. The Sabbath commandment is in fact the seal of God's law, as it alone designates the Giver of the law, and states the basis of His authority to require obedience.

In like manner, the Sunday institution is the seal or mark of a rival power. It was anciently the badge of sun worship, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times."² It was dedicated to the worship of the sun and to the most abominable and revolting idolatries. In modern times it is set forth by the Roman

Catholic Church as the badge of her authority, as will appear from the following quotations from standard Roman Catholic authorities:—

Question.—Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

Answer.—Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.³

Question.—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Answer.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Question.—How prove you that?

Answer.—Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.⁴

Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants

other than a common working day. It is not, as many seem to regard it, simply a matter of a choice of days for physical rest, but is with the Adventists a vital question directly affecting their salvation. These facts show most conclusively that Sunday laws do interfere at least with the religious rights of Adventists by requiring of them a service which they cannot conscientiously render. This is in addition to the hardship of being deprived of one-sixth of the time divinely allotted to them for their work.


But let not the reader of this imagine for a moment that Seventh-day Adventists render themselves unnecessarily obnoxious to their neighbors by making an unnecessary display of their disregard for Sunday. It is a settled principle with Adventists to do unto others as they would be done by. For this reason they avoid doing on Sunday anything that would be likely to be a real disturbance in the

community in which they live; and this they do, whether there is a Sunday law or not, out of regard for their neighbors. They go even farther than required by the Golden Rule, for they do not expect that a like regard will be paid to them, or to their feelings upon the Sabbath. They recognize the fact that they are a minority, and they are willing to suffer any inconvenience or loss to which they may be subjected to for this reason, provided it is not a sacrifice of principle.

Seventh-day Adventists are a sober, industrious, peace-loving people. They are not found in our courts of justice except as they are haled

there for violation of the Sunday laws. Their enemies themselves being witnesses, they are in all other respects model citizens; but upon this point they are unyielding. They will not deny their faith nor prove untrue to their principles and to their God.

It is a significant fact that while hundreds, yes thousands, of people all over the land are working on Sunday, many of them habitually, very few of them comparatively are prosecuted; while Seventh-day Adventists are singled out and made the victims of unjust and unequal laws. In Rhea County, Tennessee, hundreds of men are employed on Sunday in various lines of work, but only the Adventists are prosecuted. One man, not an Adventist, was indicted last November, but when his case was called to trial at the recent term of court, the prosecuting witness refused to prosecute the case, and it was promptly thrown out of court, but every Adventist was



A COURT ROOM SCENE.

See preceding page.

"Now I am called to answer for my faith before an earthly tribunal; but I say to the court and jury that there is a time coming when there will be a change, and God, and not man, will be the Judge—and in that Court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God."—Elder G. W. Colcord.

is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church.⁵

Believing the papacy to be antichrist, and holding the Sunday Sabbath to be the badge of its power, it is evident that with Adventists the observance of Sunday would be equivalent to rendering homage to antichrist,—hence their steadfast refusal to obey Sunday laws, and their willingness to suffer imprisonment, the chain-gang, and even death itself rather than so much as appear to regard Sunday

³ "Doctrinal Catechism" by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1876, p. 174.

⁴ "An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Tuberville; Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1833, p. 58.

⁵ "Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur; Imprimatur Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston; Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, p. 213.

¹ Ex. 20: 10, and Ezek. 20: 12.

² North British Review, Vol. 18, p. 409.

diligently prosecuted, and promptly convicted. The same condition of affairs prevails elsewhere, and the explanation of the latter is that it is not the Sunday work of the Adventists that offends their neighbors, but their Sabbath rest. As was stated by a resident of Graysville, not long since, the object of the persecution is "to make them quit their Saturday keeping;" and as a resident of Western Tennessee expressed it some years since, "We are not going to have them teaching our children that Sunday is not the Sabbath and that Saturday is."

"Here we have a very respectable element of Christian believers who are honest, inoffensive, law-abiding people in all matters not conflicting with their sense of duty, who believe they are under divine command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. As a matter of abstract, individual right can they be required to observe another day also?"—From the opinion of Judge J. G. Parks, rendered in the cases of the imprisoned Adventists.

THE STORY BRIEFLY TOLD.

Fines, Imprisonment, the Chain-gang and Death Follow Faithfulness to the Law of God.

It is evident that the liberty-loving people of this country are not aware of the extent to which the principles of religious liberty are being violated in the United States, in the persecution of seventh day observers.

Not long since, the facts became known to the Baptist *Examiner*, of this city, and it was led to remark in its issue of February 7, in connection with a brief summary of the cases, that "in not a few of our States religious liberty is grossly, wickedly, and infamously violated."

We are certain that were the facts regarding these cases generally known, there would be thousands whose sense of justice and right would revolt at the injustice now practiced upon an inoffensive, conscientious people, whose only fault, their enemies themselves being judges, is that they observe the seventh day and work the "six working days" according to the commandment of God.

These persecutions began in Georgia in 1878, with the imprisonment of a Seventh-day Adventist by the name of Samuel Mitchell, for the offense of plowing his field on Sunday. Mr. Mitchell's age and feeble health were not able to resist his thirty days' imprisonment in a damp and loathsome cell. He contracted disease from which he died after a lingering illness.

Arkansas followed Georgia in 1884, and perpetrated some shameful crimes against religious liberty and humanity. In most cases the offense was doing common farm labor on Sunday. In some cases the only horse or the only cow was seized by the State to satisfy the fine and costs. In one case a father and son were imprisoned and made to sleep on the bare floor with only a Bible for a pillow. In 1887 the Arkansas Bar Association espoused the cause of liberty and recommended the enactment of a clause in the Sunday statute exempting seventh-day observers. Senator R. H. Crockett, grandson of Davy Crockett, championed the measure in the legislature, and it passed the Senate with but two dissenting votes, both cast by preachers, but in the face of a strong opposition lobby representing the churches of the State. However, notwithstanding the exemption, a member of this

church was recently fined for doing farm labor on Sunday, and the case is now pending on appeal.

Tennessee began persecuting Adventists in 1885, and has continued with slight interruptions until now. Respected citizens, born and reared in the State, against whose character there could be found no stain, men whose hairs were whitened and whose forms were bent with the care and toil of sixty winters, were taken from their farms hidden amid the groves of Tennessee, fined, imprisoned and driven in the chain-gang with criminals, and made to work as common felons on the streets of their county seat. It was from this State that the King case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, but terminated by the sudden death of the defendant. Justice-loving citizens of the State, like ex-Senator William P. Tolley, and ex-Governor Porter now United States Minister to Chili, have entered noble protests against these persecutions, but with no permanent result. The attitude of the popular churches was strikingly illustrated when the King case was before the Supreme Court of the State, and the Attorney-General was prevented by disinclination to prosecute, or from some other cause, from attending court. When this was learned, the Ministers' Association of Memphis called a meeting, and as a result, hired an attorney to appear and prosecute the humble farmer. The white-cap notice and the shot-gun mob have been utilized to intimidate these inoffensive people.

Maryland was the next State to fall in line with the backward march. The first case, that of Mr. Judefind, was tried in 1892, and the accused committed to jail for thirty days for husking corn in the shock on Sunday. The complaining witness was Mr. Rowe, pastor of the M. E. Church of Rock Hall. Since the imprisonment of Mr. Judefind, five of his brethren have been imprisoned in most cases for longer terms, while others have been prosecuted but released on technical blunders in the lower court proceedings. In one case an aged father was spied upon, arrested and prosecuted by his own son, the constable, and, astonishing to relate, imprisoned for setting out tomato plants in his own garden on Sunday.

To illustrate the character and spirit of these imprisoned men, we print below a letter written from the jail to Mr. Moon, President of the International Religious Liberty Association, by one of the "criminals":—

Centerville Jail, Centerville, Md., Nov. 29, 1893.

ELDER ALLEN MOON—Dear Brother: It is with pleasure I received your kind and most welcome letter. I thank God he is filling our hearts unutterably full of glory and of God. And we know that if our earthly house be dissolved we have a building of God not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. We will not murmur nor complain beneath His chastening rod, but in the hour of grief or pain will lean upon our God. And God has promised to withhold nothing from them that walk uprightly, and he knows our every need better than we do. And how precious are these truths when received in the heart with thanksgiving unto Him who is the author of our faith, and will be the finisher. I know, dear brother, you are suffering with me, for we are knit together in bonds of love. Now, brother, I thank God he lets his children have a test of faith and thank and praise his holy name, we do not think strange of the fiery trials which are to try us as though some strange thing had happened unto us, but rejoice inasmuch as we are partakers of Christ's sufferings. 1 Peter 4:12, 13. O, you know, dear brother, just how it is. It is because Christ is working in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure; that is the problem solved.

Now, Brother Moon, I shall close my letter to you as it is about my bed time, and I have been reading and visiting all day, and I feel tired. Do not think the hours go slowly. Why, time is rapidly flying and I want to improve the few precious hours in cheering those that may be cast down. I am daily drinking of salvation's well, and I want every one to come to the fountain. Write soon again. I love to hear and read words from you. I am in no way discouraged, but I am happy in the Lord. I have a precious wife and

eleven children, and I have given them all to the Lord. Though shut up in prison from them by the hand of the dragon, I can rejoice still. Pray for me. Write soon.

Your brother in Christ,

I. BAKER.

The last State to join the crusade against the Adventists is Massachusetts. Mr. Gibson, of Everett, Mass., was recently fined fifty dollars and costs, on complaint of the mayor, for selling a half pound of candy to the mayor's spy sent to get evidence against him. His case has been appealed and is still pending.

There have been, in the States named, fifty-three Seventh-day Adventists, convicted of violating the Sunday laws. Thirty of these have suffered imprisonment. The universal testimony of their persecutors is that they are good neighbors, and aside from Sunday work, they are law-abiding citizens.

Seventh-day Adventists have never been prosecuted for an actual disturbance of any person's Sunday rest. Of the hundreds of witnesses against them in the fifty-three cases, only two have sworn that they were disturbed by the work. One swore that though he did not see the work done, he was disturbed by the mere *knowledge* that it was being done. The other disturbed witness swore that he was "shocked" on seeing the Seventh-day Adventist hoeing in his field, while acknowledging under oath that at the same time he was so "shocked" with the seventh-day observer's Sunday hoeing, he, with his hired hand, was driving home a cow which they had gone to a neighbor to procure.

The whole situation is thus briefly summed up in a candid statement by Chief Justice Rafin, of North Carolina, in the case of the *State vs. Williams*:—

"The truth is that it [Sunday labor] offends us, not so much because it disturbs us in practicing for ourselves the religious duties, or enjoying the salutary repose or recreation of that day, as that it is itself a breach of God's law, and a violation of the party's own religious duty."

"They claim that it is not only their right, but their duty under divine command, to observe the seventh day. Calling them 'cranks' is no argument and has nothing to do with the question. 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."—From the opinion of Judge Parks.

PERSECUTION LONG EXPECTED.

THE denomination, five of whose members are now in prison in Tennessee, has long expected to meet these persecutions. This expectation was based upon the "sure word of prophecy." From the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Revelation and many other scriptures, they understood that there would come a time in the history of the United States when the leaders of the people would practically repudiate the great principle of religious liberty, and, papacy like, persecute those who dissented from certain law-enforced church dogmas, especially the doctrine of Sunday sacredness. These positions were taken and published to the world more than forty years ago.

At that time the principles of religious liberty were highly prized, and these predictions were ridiculed as the merest vagaries. However the church continued to teach them, and to declare that as the churches became more worldly and thereby divorced themselves from

the power of God, they would lose sight of the great principle of religious liberty and would seek the aid of civil law to force a recognition of the church by enforcing the observance of Sunday. It was thought that this was impossible because of the high importance which Americans attached to the principles of religious freedom. To this it was answered that the people, as they became farther removed from the scenes of the struggle for liberty, would lose its spirit in the effort for material gain. It was also declared that the churches, when transformed from poor, weak, struggling minorities, into rich, powerful, controlling majorities, they would forget the days of their affliction and the principles of liberty of conscience for which they strove, and would themselves turn persecutors.

There are a few who still contend for the principles of religious freedom for which their fathers fought. And these now bear testi-

do not hope for deliverance this side of the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven to reap the harvest of the earth. Rev. 14:14-16.

In the meantime Seventh-day Adventists bring no railing accusation against their persecutors. Their attitude toward all concerned is thus expressed in one of their publications:—

“Against those responsible for our persecution we bring no railing accusation. Against the honorable judges of the courts before whom our cases have been or may be tried, we speak no evil word. Against prosecuting attorneys and prosecuting witnesses we harbor no resentment. Against grand jurors who have found indictments, and trial-jurors who have returned the verdict, “guilty,” we speak no word of condemnation; and for those professed Christians who have instigated these persecutions by making complaint against us,

A LETTER FROM ONE OF THE PRISONERS.

THE following letter written to the *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich., by one of the Dayton prisoners will interest our readers:—

“Dayton, Tenn., Rhea County Jail,
“March 24, 1895.

“Perhaps you would like to hear some of the circumstances in regard to my being indicted for Sunday work. I live four and one-half miles north of Graysville, in what is called the ‘Cove’; it is a little valley between two mountains, three miles from the village.

“On Sept. 9, 1894, Charles Dungan and Mr. Rudd went to meeting about one mile from their home, and during the services they went off across a ridge through the woods, and found me pulling fodder (that is stripping the blades off the standing corn) out of sight of the public road or any public place. They

made an agreement that Mr. Rudd would go before the grand jury and prosecute me, and have Mr. Dungan marked as witness, dividing the witness fee. The law does not allow the prosecutor any pay for prosecuting, but the witness is allowed \$1 a day. Mr. Dungan received his pay and would not share it with Mr. Rudd. This made Mr. Rudd angry, and he told a brother about it. Since I have been in jail, Mr. Rudd has visited me, and asked if I wanted a bond, and said if I did, he would procure it for me. I explained to him that I was serving

Attie. This is the 6th day of March in the year 1895 A.D. and in the town in Rhea County Tennessee in the Southern part of America. and I go to Dayton to day expecting to go to Jail, for the crime(?) of believing the Bible. I was found guilty By the court in our case and have one more to come up today. get these things and worse have happened in all ages to Gods People. Why not to us? 2 Tim 3:12. I want you to be a good girl and live for God and his Truth; that is the only thing we can live for in this world, that is worth living for. Read and meditate on Heb 11:32-40. and you can see what awaits us only a little way in the future. But Luke 12:32. Your Father W. S. Burchard

THE above is a photo reproduction of a page from the autograph album of a thirteen-year-old school girl, and was accidentally discovered by a representative of the SENTINEL in the home of a Seventh-day Adventist miner, in the mountains of Rhea County, Tennessee. It was written only for the eye of the child, and with no thought that it would ever be given to the public. The sentiment expressed by this Christian father, who is now in the county jail at Dayton, Tennessee, is eloquent in its simplicity. The first scripture cited reads: “All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” The last text reads: “Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”

mony to the indifference to, or the repudiation of, the principles at one time so universally entertained.

The *Examiner*, before quoted, thus expresses its wonder and astonishment at this change of sentiment: “It is amazing how good people fail to understand what are the principles in this matter.” And again: “We wonder that the very stones do not cry out against such wicked travesties of justice; that Christian men do not lift up their voices in protest against this wicked perversion of religion, this insult to the name of Christ. And in particular, why do not Baptists whose fathers stood against the world for soul liberty, make themselves heard when these relics of mediæval bigotry and persecuting intolerance are found in our free country?”

Surely a change has come over the people, and it is now impossible to stir them to a re-alization of the situation, and the sufferers

and who in most cases, have been ashamed to allow their names to be known, we have only thoughts of pity. To these we say that by our labor on Sunday, we have not infringed the natural or constitutional right, civil or religious, of any man. ‘We have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man.’ 2 Cor. 7:2. And to all concerned we say with terrible earnestness, Count well the cost before taking upon yourselves the awful responsibility of attempting to force upon us, by pains and penalties, the sign of allegiance to Rome and the mark of her power. Beware, ‘lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.’ Acts 5:39.

“Do the defendants in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? Or is it an artificial right created by human law?”—Judge Parks.

and we could not pay our fines, it being contrary to our consciences. He said that my family should not suffer if he could help it, and it made me think of Ps. 76:10 and Rom. 8:28.

“The other case against me was for digging in a well in Graysville, more than forty feet deep. Between me and the most public road was a two-story house, and on the west side a pile of stone nearly as high as a man’s head; on the north side were a barn and a thick patch of corn: the other side was hidden by the house, fence, high weeds, etc.

“The man (Wright Raines) who had me indicted for working at the well neither saw nor heard me at work.

“Our courage in the Lord is good.

“Your brother in Christ,

“WM. S. BURCHARD.”

CONSCIENCE AND THE STATE.

It is clear that government cannot become the judge of men's consciences; and that the plea of conscientious conviction cannot be accepted as a final and sufficient defense in all cases of violation of law. What rule, then, can be adopted which will preserve the authority of the State and yet not trench upon the rights of conscience?

The question thus raised is well answered by a clause in the constitution of the State of Maryland: "No person 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 color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, . . . or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights." In this the line is drawn just where it should be, namely, *at the equal rights of others*. Under this provision the courts are not called upon to judge any man's conscience, but only to judge whether or not his conscience leads him to infringe the equal rights of his fellowmen. That a man's conscience is just what he says it is, no man has either right or occasion to deny. A man's statement of his conscience is an end of controversy; but it does not follow that one has a right to do whatever his conscience tells him is right for him to do. There is a difference between conscience and the *rights* of conscience. No man, however conscientious, has any right to infringe the equal right of another; and at this point civil government has a right to take cognizance, not of any man's conscience, but of the relation of the act to the rights of others.

The principle briefly stated is this: No man should be either required or forbidden to do any act contrary to conscience, however erroneous that conscience may be, *unless the doing or forbearing to do that act trenches on the equal rights of others*. This rule would (1) abrogate all civil laws requiring the observance of Sunday or of any other day; and (2) it would leave the courts free, not to judge men's consciences, but to protect all men against wrong in the name of conscience. But this is only saying in other words that which we have said many times before, namely, that civil governments are instituted not to create or to "grant" *rights*, but to guarantee the free and untrammelled exercise of equal, natural, God-given, inalienable rights, and that of these the highest and most sacred is perfect freedom in matters of religious belief and practice.

PRESS COMMENTS.

A FEW representatives of the religious press, and more of the secular press, have condemned the persecution of seventh day observers. The following brief extracts are examples:—

FROM THE RELIGIOUS PRESS.

The Seventh-day Adventists and Hebrews have the same claim on the protection of our laws in the exercise of their liberty as any other class in the community; and Christians ought to be quite as careful to claim that protection for them as for themselves. Let these abuses be ventilated. The sooner we understand whether this is actually a free country, the better it will be for all concerned.—*The Outlook, New York*.

In not a few of our States religious liberty is grossly, wickedly, infamously violated through the abuse of what are called the Sunday laws. . . . It is amazing how good people fail to understand what are the principles in this matter. . . . It is this sort of thing that brings reproach upon Christianity.—*The Examiner and National Baptist, New York*.

Let us be careful how we let in the camel's nose of religious legislation, lest the brute crowd his bulky form in and occupy the whole shop. If the law by which these men were legally imprisoned be a righteous law, then may any State, nation, or country set up a

religious creed and enforce it; then France treated properly the Huguenots; Russia, the Jews; and early New England and Virginia, the Baptists and Quakers. Protestant America had better be careful how she lays foundations for other men to build upon. Rome has as good a right to build in her way as we have to build in our way.—*Church Bulletin, (Baptist) Chicago*.

We wonder that the very stones do not cry out against such travesties of justice, that Christian men do not lift up their voices in protest against this wicked perversion of religion, this insult to the name of Christ. And, in particular, why do not Baptists, whose fathers stood against the world for soul liberty, make themselves heard when these relics of mediæval bigotry and persecuting intolerance are found in our free country? Sunday laws like those in Tennessee and Maryland are a disgrace to a Christian commonwealth in this nineteenth century, and should be repealed at the earliest possible moment.—*The Examiner, New York*.

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

THE SECULAR PRESS.

So long as the labor of Adventists on Sunday does not interfere with the rights of the Mosaic and Puritanic people on the same, the prosecution of them seems neither more nor less than persecution.—*Chicago Tribune*.

It seems absolutely incredible that in this age of enlightenment, in these free United States, men should suffer and families be plunged into sorrow because they have exercised a right of conscience guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the country.—*Chicago Daily Globe*.

People are asking if we are returning to the days of Cotton Mather or the Spanish Inquisition, that faithful, law-abiding citizens must be fined or driven from the country when their only offense consists in quietly carrying out the convictions of conscience.—*Louisville Courier Journal*.

The principle involved is simple and its application plain. The State has nothing to do with religion, except to protect every citizen in his religious liberty. It has no more right to prescribe the religious observance of Sabbaths and holy days, than to order sacraments and to ordain creeds.—*New York World*.

If in any State the Adventists, the Hebrews, or any other people who believe in observing Saturday instead of Sunday, should happen to predominate, and they undertook to throw Christians into dungeons, and after branding them criminals, should send them to the penitentiary for working on Saturday, indignation would blaze forth throughout Christendom against the great injustice, the wrong against the liberty of the rights of the citizen.—*The Arena*.

The keeper of Saturday has an undoubted moral right to his convictions. More than this, his legal right to observe Saturday as a holy day and Sunday as a secular day ought not to be called in question in free America, by any civil authority. It would not be in doubt for a moment were it not for the existence of legal anachronisms that should have gone out with the witchcraft laws, or at the latest, with George the third.—*Boston Daily Globe*.

My whole soul revolts at the barbarism and ferocious savagery which seeks by resurrecting obsolete laws to reënact in a measure the tragedies of the past, and which through legal technicalities ignores the constitutional guarantee of Tennessee. It is a shame, a crying shame, that such insane fanaticism, such anti-Christian intolerance, should flourish at this late day; and doubly shameful is it that our sense of justice and love of liberty are so benumbed by conventional hypocrisy that we do not as a nation rise up against such liberty-destroying inhumanity. To me there is nothing so terrible as the spectacle of just and upright men suffering as criminals.—*The Arena*.

All these religious laws and prosecutions which have stained the history of the Church in all ages, come not from an earnest, Christian desire to elevate mankind, but from the malicious disposition of the professor of religion to punish the man who dares to question the

superior excellence of his professions. The religious Sunday observer of Tennessee could afford to be lenient with the squirrel hunters whose rifles could be heard popping in the timber on all hours of that holy day. He could easily ignore their violations of his Sunday law because the transgressors were low white trash whose influence cut no figure. But when a man making equally high religious professions with himself, whose life was just as pure and exemplary, who derived the authority of his position from the same sacred volume from which he derived his, and could defend his positions with arguments and citations which could not be refuted,—when such a man disputed the sanctity of his Sunday observance, a challenge was thrown out which he could not afford to ignore without serious sacrifice of his professed sanctity.—*Sigourney (Iowa) Review*.

Indeed, a general lethargy seems to have overtaken our people and this is the most disheartening symptom present in the body politic at the present time. The day seems to have gone by when the cry of the oppressed or the weak arouses the sense of justice in the hearts of our people. Especially is it sad to see the religious press, supposed to represent the spirit of the Reformation (which struggled against such fearful persecution of other days), now so silent when fellowmen are being ground between the millstones for conscience' sake.

I believe that nations commit suicide no less than individuals, and that wrong done by nations will result in evil consequences; and believing this, while loving the great Republic, I cannot remain silent when she is unjust or when she wrongs, in the name of law, upright citizens because they do not believe as the majority believe. No State or nation can afford to allow a law not based on justice to remain upon the statute books. And when our Republic so far forgets the high ideals of justice, liberty, and human rights which made her the flower of the ages, as to permit unjust laws to be passed, or cruel, obsolete statutes to be resuscitated in the interests of any class, any sect, or any religion, she makes law-breaking citizens, and plants in her own breast the seeds of disintegration.—*The Arena*.

"If the day has been appointed by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly and conscientiously differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment? And shall one be given rights which are denied the other? Does might make right, and have the majority the right to dictate in matters purely of conscience?"—*Judge Parks*.

THEY PLEAD THEIR OWN CASES.

At the beginning of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday labor, prominent attorneys were employed to plead their cases; among them the Hon. Don M. Dickinson, of Detroit, Mich., and thousands of dollars were thus spent with the hope of securing favorable decisions, but to no avail. James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore bar, one of the ablest lawyers of Maryland, on learning of the injustice being done to seventh-day observers, volunteered his services, and made a noble fight for liberty in his State, but the decisions were against him. One case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, but was dropped from the calendar owing to the sudden death of the defendant. Since then, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that "this is a Christian nation," citing the Sunday laws of the several States as sustaining proof. Consequently, Seventh-day Adventists entertain no hope of relief from the Federal Court.

The failure of human counsel has led them to rely more implicitly upon divine assistance, and they now appear in their own defense, relying wholly upon the promise of the Lord: "When they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Luke 12: 11, 12.

The following are brief quotations from the

defenses of these people, who, in most cases, are farmers in possession of a limited education:—

I have a few words that I would like to say. This is something new to me. I was born and reared in Queen Anne's County, and I was never before the court until to-day. I have always endeavored to be a law-abiding citizen. But I am here on a matter between my Lord and myself. I would like to say to the court that I am a Seventh-day Adventist. I study my Bible, and my convictions are that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God.

I was raised in the Sunday-school, and I was taught the ten commandments. I was taught that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and then was taught to observe the first day in its stead. In my study of the Bible I cannot find where God, the Lord Jesus, or the apostles, ever changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. I am conscientious in the matter, and choose to stand for God and the right. I leave the case with the court.—*Robert R. Whaley, before the Circuit Court of Queen Anne's County, Md.*

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 of labor. I have a wife and four children, and it takes my labor six days to make a living. I go about my work quietly, do not make any unnecessary noise, but do my work as quietly as possible. It has been proved by the testimony of Mr. Fitch and Mr. Cox, 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, believing that 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 law of my God rather than the laws of the State. I do not desire to cast any reflections upon the State, nor the officers and authorities executing the law. I leave the case with you.—*W. S. Lowry, before the Circuit Court of Henry County, Tenn.*

I do not deny working on the first day of the week, but I do deny working on the Lord's day, because the first day of the week is not the Lord's day. The commandment of God says, "Six days shalt thou labor, . . . but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and we must keep it. If any one can point to a single scripture, showing that Sunday is the Lord's day and should be kept, I will confess being in error. I have lived in this county all my life excepting eighteen months, and was never before charged with wrong.

There has been offered \$2,000 for the production of a scripture which shows that Sunday should be observed, and Cardinal Gibbons has said there was no authority in the Bible for keeping Sunday; and some of you, gentlemen [to the jury], probably know of this. The Lord has said, "We ought to obey God rather than men," and he also said, "Ye cannot serve two masters."

I do not work on Sunday to defy the laws, but because I must obey God when his law conflicts with man's laws.—*W. G. Currett, before the Circuit Court of Queen Anne's County, Md.*

Your honor, the summons which brought me into this court accuses the defendant of keeping open shop on the Lord's day, to which charge I plead not guilty [drawing a New Testament from his pocket]; and I desire to define the Lord's day by the declarations of Him who is the Lord of the Lord's day as they are recorded in the Lord's book. . . .

I wish to refer you to Mark 2:27, 28, which reads: "And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Again, speaking of the Lord Jesus, the declaration is made in the second and third verses of the first chapter of the Gospel by John, that "The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and with-

out him was not anything made that was made." The first declaration, your honor, asserts that the Sabbath was made; and the second scripture declares that the Lord Jesus, who was in the beginning with the Father, made all things that were made in the beginning; hence, the Lord made the Sabbath day, and is therefore, rightfully Lord of the Sabbath day or Lord's day. He it was who labored six days and rested the seventh day; "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Now, having shown that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath day, I call your attention to Luke 23:56, to show which day of the seven is the Sabbath or Lord's day. The text reads as follows: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now (next verse, chap. 24, verse 1) upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." The text first quoted states that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. This text states that "the Sabbath day according to the commandment" is the day which precedes the first day of the week. The Son of man is therefore Lord of the day which precedes the first day of the week, and that day is the Sabbath or seventh day of the week. Therefore the only day which the Son of man declares himself the Lord of, is the seventh day of the week and not the first day, hence the seventh day of the week, or the day preceding the first day of the week, is the Lord's day. . . .

Your honor, I claim the divine right of dissent, and therefore deny the right of the pope of Rome, the czar of Russia, the president of the United States, or the mayor of the city of Everett, to prescribe for me my religious duty. All I ask, as a free-born American citizen, and as a man, is the free exercise of my civil and religious right to worship God according to the dictates of my own conscience. I deny the right of the magistrate to compel me to observe the first day of the week, and thereby deprive me of one-sixth of my time in which to earn my living.

I have observed the Sabbath since 1878, previous to which time I kept Sunday. I require no civil law to enable me to keep the seventh day, and every one around me exercises his right to keep Sunday and labor on Saturday; and no man disturbs me in keeping Saturday. I disturb no man on Sunday or on any other day, and no man thus accuses me. All I ask is the free exercise of my right to worship Him who said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," and the right to labor six days, according to the dictates of my own conscience, so long as I do not actually disturb my neighbors.

Your honor, I have not interfered with any natural or constitutional right of my neighbors, and I am not guilty of keeping open shop on the Lord's day. And I trust you will so decide.—*W. T. Gibson, before the First District Court of Eastern Middlesex, Middlesex County, Mass.*

Now, gentlemen of the jury, look me in the face, and tell me that I am guilty of any crime! You know, gentlemen, we are not criminals. Are we dangerous men to run at large who need to be restrained and deprived of our liberty? Look me in the eyes and tell me. Is there a single one of you that believes any man's person or property is endangered by our going at large?—Not one of you. Nor does any other man. No witness has come here and testified to anything of the kind. If our going at large is dangerous to anything, it is to somebody's religious sentiment, and if that be deemed a sufficient reason for restraining us, then it shows on the face of it that this whole thing is religious persecution.—*Eld. W. S. McCutchen, before the Circuit Court of Hall County, Ga.*

"SECULAR power has proved a satanic gift to the Church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State."—*Dr. Philip Schaff.*

CATHOLICS AND THE BIBLE.

ON March 3, Cardinal Gibbons preached a sermon in the cathedral at Baltimore, advising his audience to read the Bible. The Catholic press of the country hastened to publish the sermon, and to remark that it would have the effect, "to convince non-Catholics that they have been misinformed by the Protestant tradition concerning the attitude of the church toward the Word of God."

No wide awake Protestant will be deceived by the apparent change of attitude toward the Bible. But if there are any of our readers who believe that the Catholic Church is any more friendly to the Bible now than when she burned it, let them read the following from the Cardinal's official organ, the *Catholic Mirror*, which appeared in the issue preceding the publication of the sermon (February 23):

The Bible is a volume very difficult to be understood by anybody; hardly six lines can be properly comprehended without a commentary.

And now comes the April number of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, which is printed under the phrase, *Cum Approbatione Superiorum* (with approbation of superiors), and says:—

It is the Catholic position that the Bible, although a part, the principal part, of the remote rule of faith, is not the sole and exclusive rule, is not the proximate rule, and is not placed directly by God in the hands of individuals to learn from it by their private reading the truths of the Christian religion.

Protestants, don't be deceived. It is impossible for the papacy to experience a favorable change of heart and still remain the papacy.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

READ the following and see if there is not some publication among them which you desire to read, or which will benefit some friend:—

The Abiding Sabbath. By A. T. JONES. No. 9 of the *Bible Students' Library*. This is a review of two Sabbath "prize essays," one of \$500, and one of \$1,000. It contains mighty arguments on the Sabbath question; 174 pages; price, 15 cents.

Is Sunday the Sabbath? No. 24 of the *Library*. A brief consideration of New Testament texts on the first day of the week; 8 pages; price, 1 cent.

Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By J. H. Waggoner. No. 54 of the *Library*. Clear and strong in argument; price, 10 cents.

Sunday; Origin of its Observance in the Christian Church. By E. J. Waggoner. No. 80 of the *Library*. The testimony given with reference to Sunday is wholly Protestant. All Protestants should read it; price, 15 cents.

Who Changed the Sabbath? No. 107 of the *Library*. What God's Word predicted; what Christ says; what the papacy says; what Protestants say. A most convincing document; 24 pages; price, 3 cents.

"The Christian Sabbath." No. 113 of the *Library*. A reprint of four articles in the *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of Cardinal Gibbons. What Catholics have to say to Protestants on the subject; 32 pages; price, 4 cents.

Christ and the Sabbath. By Prof. W. W. Prescott. The spiritual nature of the Sabbath, what true Sabbath keeping is, and the relation of Christ to the Sabbath in both creation and redemption. A most important tract. No. 14 of the *Religious Liberty Library*; 38 pages; price, 5 cents.

The History of the Sabbath. By John N. Andrews. A complete history of the Sabbath and first day of the week in religious life and thought, from the earliest ages to the present time, and especially during the Christian dispensation; 550 large octavo pages; price, cloth, \$2.00; library binding, \$2.50

Catalogue of publications sent free on application. Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 Bond St., New York.
Or Oakland, Cal.



NEW YORK, APRIL 11, 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 mission of this number of the SENTINEL is to call attention to the injustice perpetrated against a harmless people in Tennessee, and to announce the principles for which they suffer. It is not to create sympathy for them. They do not need it. If their faith is not worth suffering for it is not worth professing. The object is to bring before all the people the vital principles of truth and religious liberty involved in these persecutions, that they may be saved from participating in the cruel work. "Offenses will come, but woe unto him through whom they come."

HE who fails to protest against the persecution of his neighbor, thereby virtually forfeits the right to protest when he is himself persecuted.

"AMONG all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God."—*From committee report adopted by the United States Senate, Jan. 19, 1829.*

OUR first page illustration shows the jail at Dayton, Rhea County, Tenn., in which are confined in this year of our Lord 1895, five Seventh-day Adventists, on the charge of "violating the Sabbath." Two of the eight imprisoned March 8, have served their sentence and are at liberty.

"It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime, of the offender. The fine, which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment."—*Gibbon.*

THE Sunday law of Tennessee is supposed to be for the purpose of protecting the public morals, and yet one of the questions asked several of the jurors in "the Adventist cases," was, "Have you any conscientious scruples against trying such a case, and, if so, can you lay them aside and decide according to the law and the evidence?" What kind of morality must it be that can be fostered by laws, to administer which courts and jurors must needs lay aside their conscientious convictions? And what guarantee of even common honesty remains when conscience is laid aside, violated, trampled in the dust?

THE Seventh-day Adventist academy at Graysville, Tenn., still stands a mute witness to the intolerance of certain Sunday-keepers of that State. It will not be opened again during the present school year, and with thirty or more new indictments against the teachers, patrons and students of the institution, it is clear that when it opens it must be with a new corps of instructors, and largely with new students. However it will open with the fall term.

O Freedom! * * * * *

Thy birthright was not given by human hands:
Thou wert twin-born with man.
* * * * * Tyranny himself,
Thy enemy, although of reverend look,
Hoary with many years, and far obeyed,
Is later born than thou; and as he meets
The grave defiance of thine elder eye,
The usurper trembles in his fastnesses.

Thou shalt wax stronger with the lapse of years,
But he shall fade into a feeble age;
Feebler, yet subtler. He shall weave his snares,
And spring them on thy careless steps, and clap
His withered hands, and from their ambush call
His hordes to fall upon thee. He shall send
Quaint maskers, wearing fair and gallant forms,
To catch thy gaze, and uttering graceful words
To charm thy ear; while his sly imps, by stealth,
Twine round thee threads of steel, light thread on thread
That grow to fetters; or bind down thy arms
With chains concealed in chaplets. Oh! not yet
Mayst thou unbrace thy corslet, nor lay by
Thy sword; nor yet, O Freedom! close thy lids
In slumber; for thine enemy never sleeps,
And thou must watch and combat till the day
Of the new earth and heaven. * * *

—William Cullen Bryant.

A letter received after going to press states that the sheriff at the time of writing was serving warrants on sixteen members of the Graysville Seventh-day Adventist church, who are charged with Sunday work. We will give the names next week. The letter also states that the petition for the release of those now imprisoned was rejected by a vote of 13 to 11.

A Stupendous Wrong.

[Editorial from the *Dayton Republican*, March 23.]

Do the good citizens of Dayton and Rhea County fully realize the enormous wrong being perpetrated upon the sacred rights of individual citizenship as guaranteed by our blood-bought Constitution, in the imprisonment in the county jail of eight of the Christian citizens of this county, because, forsooth, they have worshiped God according to the dictates of conscience?

Can they quietly and complacently look on while this startling nineteenth century paradox is being enacted?

Will God approve of this oppression of a branch of his devoted followers? and will he not rebuke in the day of judgment the persecution these people are undergoing for opinion's sake at the hands of others of his professed followers? and will he not further hold to a strict accountability the passive indifference of others of his followers who quietly allow this great wrong to be perpetrated?

Christians all, Presbyterians, Methodists,

Catholics, Baptists, Episcopalians and every denomination that worships in the name of the Lord of Hosts, and whose hearts have imbibed the humanity and love illustrated in the life of Christ, put yourselves in these men's place. They have been taken from their families, deprived of liberty, the stigma of felon placed upon them, their business broken up, and a portion of their property virtually confiscated by the State, and for what? *For worshipping the God of their fathers!*

Shades of Washington and Jefferson, look down upon us and restore our faith in, and love for, the Declaration of Independence!

Are we insensate blocks of wood, that we shall quietly allow this persecution to proceed? The very walls of the jail cry out in thunderous tones of eloquent indignation against this offense.

Do we need a new Declaration of Independence, in order to quicken our sense of liberty and justice?

In the broad light of the closing nineteenth century, with all the facts of the past ages serving as warnings, are Christians to still suffer a martyrdom for the faith that is in them? Have Luther and Wesley and Whitfield and Rogers lived in vain, that we have not yet learned the lesson that the truth shall make men free?

THE gravity of the situation in Tennessee demands that this issue reach a circulation of at least half a million copies. Price, one dollar per hundred; eight dollars per thousand.

Freedom.

Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No; true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
In earnest to make others free.

They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think;
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

—James Russell Lowell.

A BILL was introduced into the Tennessee Legislature on the 2nd inst., the purpose of which is to make all personal property liable for fines and costs, including the State and county tax, in misdemeanor cases. Should this bill become a law it will enable the enemies of the Adventists to absolutely strip them of personal property under the Sunday law of that State.

"THE whole history of the Christian religion shows that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by the alliance of power than of being crushed by its opposition."—*Macaulay.*

OUR issue of March 21, containing the cut of the closed academy, is a valuable companion number to this issue, and can be had in any quantities at the usual rates.

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,

48 Bond Street, New York City.