



"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."

Vol. 10. No. 26.

NEW YORK, JUNE 27, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

THE MODEL SABBATH-KEEPER.

ROBERT R. WHALEY, a Seventh-day Adventist, is now in jail at Centerville, Md.

He was placed there on complaint of a Methodist neighbor.

The complaint of the Methodist was that his seventh-day neighbor set out plants in his garden on Sunday.

If Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, should come to Maryland, would he enter the pew of this Methodist as he worships on Sunday, while his seventh-day, Christian neighbor, on his complaint, is locked in a cell,—would he enter that pew and say to the Methodist, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"? Would he?

Or would he go to the prisoner in his cell and say, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life;" and then visit Mr. Whaley's home and speak words of comfort to the weary wife, and bless the prisoner's little children?

Twelve honest, upright citizens of Rhea County, Tenn., are to be tried at Dayton, the county seat, July 1, on the charge of "violating the Sabbath." These twelve men are Seventh-day Adventists, and their offense is that after resting the "Sabbath day according to the commandment," they (without disturbing either the public or private worship of their neighbors) followed their usual vocations on Sunday.

On Which Side Would He Be Found?

If Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, should come to the court-room, at Dayton, next Monday, would he side with the professed Christians who are persecuting their seventh-day, Christian neighbors, or would he espouse the cause of the twelve men charged with "violating the Sabbath"? Would he be found at the prosecutors' table aiding the first-day observers to convict their seventh-day neighbors, or would he be found in the prisoners' dock, saying, "Blessed are they which are persecuted

for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"?

These questions can be answered with positive certainty by referring to the record of the attitude of Christ toward the Sabbath and toward self-constituted guardians of other men's Sabbath-keeping, when he visited our world about nineteen hundred years ago. He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." And what he did then he would do now.

What did he do then? To better understand the conflict between Christ and the Pharisees of his day over the Sabbath ques-

tion, it is necessary to briefly note the history of Sabbath-keeping among the Jews. The Lord, through the prophet Jeremiah, made the following promise to Israel:—

If ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day, to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall remain forever. Jer. 17:24, 25.

On the other hand, should the people dis-



CRUCIFYING THE MODEL SABBATH-KEEPER.

"Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day." John 5:16.

obey, they were threatened with the following judgments:—

But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched. Verse 27.

The Result of Disobedience.

They refused to obey, and the threatened judgments overtook them, as recorded in 2 Chron. 36:18-21: "They burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof." And this was done "to fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah."

Those of the people who survived the siege were taken to Babylon, where they remained for seventy years; after which their descendants were permitted to return and rebuild Jerusalem.

Remembering that their city and temple had been destroyed, and their fathers taken into captivity because of a failure to hallow the Sabbath, one of the first resolutions they made after returning, was as follows:—

They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord, and his judgments and his statutes: . . . and if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath. Neh. 10:29-31.

But a few years later the people disregarded their oath and again violated the Sabbath in the most flagrant manner, as recorded in Neh. 13:15, 16:—

In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem.

Nehemiah's Warning.

Remembering that both their city and nation had been destroyed because of Sabbath-breaking, Nehemiah warns the people thus:—

Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. Verses 17, 18.

From the days of Nehemiah to the coming of Christ, this threatened destruction of the Jewish nation was kept before the people by the priests, as a reason for the strict observance of the Sabbath. An almost endless number of hair-splitting rules for the observance of the Sabbath was enacted until the true Sabbath, and true Sabbath observance was lost sight of and a counterfeit, man-made sabbath, hedged about with traditional exactions, took its place.

The Sabbath of the Lord and the sabbath of the Jews were just as different and just as conflicting as were the Lord of the Sabbath and the Jewish leaders. Although these two Sabbaths occupied the same twenty-four hours, they could have been no more unlike *in character* if the sabbath of the Jews had been observed on Sunday.

True Sabbath observance is the hallowing of the hallowed day. The seventh day is the Sabbath, whether men recognize it or not. It is impossible to hallow the Sabbath on any other day than the one hallowed by the Lord. But it is possible to observe man's erroneous ideas of Sabbath-keeping on the seventh day

as did the Jews, without hallowing the Sabbath of the Lord. True Sabbath-keeping is a hallowing of the God-hallowed day in the God-appointed way.

The Sabbath of the Lord "was made for man," not against him; it was a merciful institution. The sabbath of the Pharisees was unmerciful in that it enslaved men. It included in its prohibited work the rubbing out in the hands of a little grain with which to satisfy hunger. Mark 2:22-28. It prohibited the healing of the most pain-racked sufferer. Proof that healing the sick was included among the "work" prohibited by the sabbath of the Pharisees is found in Luke 13:11-14:—

False Sabbath-Keeping.

And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day.

Thus it is seen that when Christ came to Israel he found a traditional, priest-made Sabbath, and he found the Jewish rulers watching sharply for violators of it, lest its violation should result in again bringing upon them the judgments of God, whereby they would lose their place and nation and be again taken into captivity.

What should the Lord of the Sabbath do? Should he rescue the Sabbath from beneath the traditional sabbath of the Pharisees, or should he leave it buried forever beneath that tyrannical institution? To rescue it he must violate the laws enacted to enforce the man-made sabbath, and consequently, rest under the charge of being a Sabbath-breaker, and of making the people Sabbath-breakers, and thereby inviting the judgments of God upon the nation. This he *must* do, and suffer all the consequences; for it was prophesied of him that "He will magnify the law, and make it honorable" (Isa. 42:21); and no part of the law was more dishonored by traditional enactments than was the Sabbath.

What He Did.

What the Lord of the Sabbath did under these circumstances he would do to-day, and what he did his followers ought to do to-day. It is recorded in Mark 3, that—

He entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse him.

Here we have the Lord face to face with the issue. To refuse to heal the afflicted man would be to surrender the true Sabbath to the claims of the false sabbath. To heal the withered hand would be to subject himself to the charge of Sabbath-breaking, and endanger his life.

And he said unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. And he said unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

This tells what the Lord of the Sabbath did; and the next verse tells what the defenders of the sabbath of tradition did:—

And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him.

Repeated Attempts To Kill Him.

The *first* account given by Mark of an attempt to "destroy" the Saviour is the one just quoted.

The *first* recorded attempt to "destroy him," as given by Matthew, is on this same occasion, and for the same offense,—violating the traditional sabbath by healing contrary to law, and keeping the true Sabbath by healing the afflicted, and doing good on that day.

The *first* attempt to kill him, as recorded in Luke, is at this same time and for the same reason,—healing the withered hand on the Sabbath day.

The *first* attempt to "slay him," recorded by John, was occasioned by his violating the traditional sabbath of the Pharisees. It is found in the fifth chapter of John, and reads thus:—

And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool; but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the Sabbath. . . . And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day. Verses 5-9, 16.

The *first* sending of officers to arrest him to put him to death was occasioned by another healing on the Sabbath, another honoring of the true Sabbath, and a disregarding of the false, traditional, unmerciful sabbath of the Pharisees; and is recorded in the seventh chapter of John, as follows:—

Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? . . . If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day? . . . Then they sought to take him: but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come. And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done? The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him; and the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take him. Verses 19, 23, 30-32.

Again, in the ninth chapter it is recorded that when Jesus healed the blind man on the Sabbath day, the Jewish leaders declared in their rage, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." Verse 16.

His Faithfulness.

Thus over and over again the Jewish leaders attempted to kill the Lord of the Sabbath because he violated their sabbath regulations and did honor to the true Sabbath. But notwithstanding he knew that they were watching him, and that every time he violated their sabbath laws he was endangering his life; still he persisted in doing that which was lawful on the Sabbath of the Lord, and that which was not lawful according to the sabbath laws of the Pharisees.

From these repeated attempts to kill the model Sabbath-keeper as a Sabbath-breaker, it is plain that when they *do* kill him, whatever may be the professed reasons, an important reason, if not the chief one, will be that he violated what *they* declared was true Sabbath-keeping; but which, in fact, was Sabbath-breaking,—a sabbath observance which they themselves had originated, and upon the keeping of which they rested the existence of their city and nation.

In the eleventh chapter of John, it is recorded that the Pharisees called a council and opened it thus:—

What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on

him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

It is very true, as the Lord had said, and as Nehemiah had reiterated, their place and nation *did* depend on the observance of the Sabbath; but they were now making it depend upon the observing of their false ideas of Sabbath-keeping. The council closed with these words from the lips of the high priest, Caiaphas:—

It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

The Real and the False Reason.

Thus the Sabbath-breakers deliberately decided to kill the model Sabbath-keeper in order to save the nation from the judgments of God. And they killed him (but not openly) on the charge of Sabbath-breaking. To have charged him publicly with Sabbath-breaking would have necessitated a public acknowledgment that he had *healed* on the Sabbath day, and this would have necessitated a public confession that he had *power to work miracles*, a fact which they were most desirous of concealing. Hence, they accused him before Pilate of being a *civil* offender,—“We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a king.”

This basely untrue and cruelly dishonest, civil charge availed, and the model Sabbath-keeper was murdered, by the Sabbath-breakers ostensibly as a civil offender; but in truth, as a religious offender.

The model Sabbath-keeper submitted to be nailed to the cross, and to perish as a malefactor, but he persistently and faithfully *refused* to submit to the laws enforcing a false Sabbath, and thereby rescued the Sabbath of the Lord from beneath the traditions of men.

The Parallels.

Christ observed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; so do Seventh-day Adventists.

There is absolutely no scriptural authority for the traditional sabbath observance of the persecutors of Christ; neither is there any scriptural authority for the Sunday-sabbath of the persecutors of Seventh-day Adventists.

The Sabbath observance of the Pharisees was man-made, and yet the salvation of the individual and the nation was made dependent upon it; it was therefore the sign of their salvation, and that a salvation by *human works*. The Sunday-sabbath of to-day is a man-made institution, and yet the salvation of the individual and the nation is made dependent upon its observance; it is therefore the sign of salvation by human works.

Christ broke the laws enforcing the observance of a sabbath made *by* man, in order that he might faithfully keep the Sabbath made *for* man; so do Seventh-day Adventists.

Christ could not submit to the laws enacted to do honor to a rival sabbath without dishonoring the true Sabbath; neither can Seventh-day Adventists.

Christ, because of his faithfulness to the Sabbath, was called a Sabbath-breaker and accused of “perverting the nation.” For their faithfulness to the same Sabbath, Seventh-day Adventists are called Sabbath-breakers, and accused of “corrupting public morals.”

Christ was crucified to save the nation from the judgments of God; Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted for the same reason.

Christ was persecuted before a *civil* court, ostensibly as a *civil* offender, when in truth his offense lay in his *religion*. Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted before the courts ostensibly as *civil* offenders, when in reality their offense lies in their *religious* beliefs and practices.

Christ was faithful in his Sabbath-keeping, even unto death; so have Seventh-day Advent-

ists been, and the Lord of the Sabbath being their helper, so will they be.

Again we ask, If Christ should come to Maryland or Tennessee, would he espouse the cause of the persecuting Sunday-keepers or the cause of the persecuted Sabbath-keepers?

PERSECUTION GONE MAD.

BY W. H. MCKEE.

THE Imprimerie Polyglotte, the publishing house of the Seventh-day Adventists in Basel, Switzerland, has been closed because of the persistent prosecution, for its Sunday labor, met with from the authorities of Basel. The work of the house, in the publication of the literature of the denomination, will be divided and carried on outside the regulation of the factory law. To make this complete revolution in the carrying on of the business will cause considerable expense, much trouble, and some loss from the quantity of valuable machinery and material left idle. However, there is every certainty that this will result in a far wider distribution of the denominational work and literature than before, and an increased production at cheaper rates. The handsomely situated and commodious building, formerly occupied by the publishing business, will be remodeled within and used as a nurses' training school, and for the introduction and development here of the rapidly increasing medical mission work of the denomination.

Such an outcome as this was, of course, unlooked for by those who brought the persecuting prosecutions. Yet it has been invariably and everywhere the result and will be no less so here than elsewhere. At the trial of the last case, brought on the 31st of May, the very day on which it had been previously decided to discontinue the business of the Imprimerie Polyglotte, the prosecuting attorney said in his summing up, “It is a satisfactory thing that, at last, the Seventh-day Adventists in Basel are broken up.” Yet he had already acknowledged that they were a quiet, peaceable, respectable, honorable people. It was clear that he had nothing to bring against them except the fact that they believed that they ought to obey God rather than men, and practiced their belief. On the occasion in which Peter and the other apostles were called before the council and made that reply, “We ought to obey God rather than men,” some very wise advice was given by a doctor of the law, which, though apparently forgotten, is still applicable,—“If this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it;” therefore he counselled that they leave them alone, “lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.”

The proceedings against the Basel publishing house, for its Sunday work, present as strange a legal medley as can probably be found upon the records of any modern court. According to the factory law, under which it was necessary to bring the prosecution, the manager of the establishment, alone, is responsible. Therefore, the manager, Mr. Holser, was fined and his household goods taken and sold to satisfy the fine. Again, he was fined two hundred francs, and imprisoned three weeks. The fine was not paid, and no goods were found to levy upon, all his personal effects having been taken to satisfy previous fines. When the authorities found that the fine could not be collected, they would have imprisoned Mr. Holser forty days more, in lieu of the fine, but, in the meantime he had gone to America to attend the biennial conference of Seventh-day Adventists of the world, to which he had been called as a delegate. He was then advertised as a bankrupt, accord-

ing to legal form. Upon his return to Europe, Mr. Holser did not come into the jurisdiction of the Basel court, but went to attend denominational meetings in northern Europe, to which he had been assigned. Apparently the limit of legal procedure in this line had been reached, and still the employes of the Imprimerie Polyglotte continued to work peacefully and quietly six days in the week and rest upon the seventh.

Also, in the meanwhile, the police had maintained a careful and systematic supervision over the house, on Sundays, and all its outgoing and incoming. During the last week in May a summons was received at the office of the Imprimerie Polyglotte, which was then preparing to go out of business on the 31st of May. On reading the summons, it was found that the “congregation of Seventh-day Adventists” was summoned before the court. As the congregation has no legal personality, and no one was summoned personally, the law firm which has previously attended to the legal business of the Imprimerie Polyglotte was asked to appear in answer to the summons and so represent, and request a dismissal of the case on the ground that it had not been brought against any person or corporation having a legal individuality to be proceeded against in law. This was done and the fact made very clear to the court that the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Basel was not a corporate business body, and owned no property, and did no business,—that it paid rent for the assembly room which it used in the building formerly occupied by the Imprimerie Polyglotte in its publishing business. But instead of dismissing the case, the court did about as strange a thing as can be found in the legal annals of our time. It fined “The Central European Conference of Seventh-day Adventists” five hundred francs, the limit of the law,—and threatened a similar fine for every Sunday upon which labor should be continued in the publishing house. This fine was decreed against this other religious body, as the court said, in “*contumaciam*,” which, of course, means for refusal or failure to appear before the court in answer to a summons. Note the remarkable inconsistency,—a religious body, not a definite person, was summoned, nevertheless an accredited lawyer appeared, and there were present in court the pastor of the church and several members,—the court then fined another religious organization, not mentioned in the summons, five hundred francs for not appearing. Neither the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Basel, nor the Central European Conference owns any property in Basel, or transacts any secular business anywhere, and yet the court fined “The Central European Conference,” which it had not summoned, and which is a religious organization anyway, five hundred francs, and threatened to continue the multiplication of the same fine weekly until work was stopped in the Imprimerie Polyglotte, the buildings and business of which is owned and managed by an incorporated business association having its headquarters in Battle Creek, Michigan. It scarcely seems possible that futility and inconsistency could have gone any farther.

This ends all possible proceedings against the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house at Basel. The next step will be to prosecute the members of the church individually, under the cantonal law, whenever they are complained of as laboring on Sunday. This law is very strict, and yet admits of an interpretation which is a sufficient protection to the ordinary citizen from its severity. It remains to be seen how long it will be before it is put in operation against Seventh-day Adventists.

Basel, Switzerland.

CERTAINLY.

"MORE than two hundred and fifty years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and more than two hundred years before the utter rottenness of the Papal Church in France had filled the country with the infidelity which we are told gave rise to the doctrine that the people are the source of civil authority, Luther, Linck, Melancthon, Bugenhagen and Amsdorff, 'the fathers of the Reformation,' announced the same doctrine. In a letter to the Elector Frederick, they said: "No prince can undertake a war without the consent of the people, from whose hands he has received his authority." This was good Protestantism and good Christianity then, and it is just as good Protestantism and just as good Christianity now."—*American Sentinel*.

Will the *Sentinel* be manly enough to add that more than eight hundred years before Luther was heard of, a pope named Zachary wrote to the French: "The prince is responsible to the people whose favor he enjoys. Whatever he has—power, honor, riches, glory, dignity—he has received from the people, and he ought to restore them to the people from whom he has received them. *The people make the king: THEY CAN ALSO UNMAKE HIM.*"—*The Monitor*.

Now the AMERICAN SENTINEL has been "manly" enough to publish the above, will the *Monitor* be manly enough to tell its readers that the AMERICAN SENTINEL copied the expression, "Peoples and Princes of the Universe" from the pope's encyclical as it appeared in the *Northwestern Chronicle* (July 20, 1894, page 5), a standard Roman Catholic paper, and that therefore its charge that "the AMERICAN SENTINEL is not able to interpret the title to a modern document, written in so simple a language as Latin," and that "any school boy who has got as far as *hic haec hoc* would be able to tell it [the SENTINEL] that this [*Principibus Populisque Universis*] does not mean the princes and peoples of the universe," applies to Cardinal Gibbons who sent the encyclical to the *Northwestern Chronicle*, or in case he sent a Latin copy, then to the editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle*, "Rev. John Conway." Will the *Monitor* be manly enough to tell its readers that this charge of gross ignorance, instead of applying to the AMERICAN SENTINEL applies to the editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle*, a priest of the "Church of the Latin rite"?

While we are compelled to differ with the *Monitor* on religious questions, we desire to regard the editor of that paper as being manly and honest.

WAS IT A "SLIP"?

THE *Truth Seeker*, of the 15th inst., thus takes us to task for a supposed "bad slip," which however was not a slip at all:—

The AMERICAN SENTINEL made a bad slip in its issue of May 30. During the trial of J. Q. Allison of Douglasville, Ga., for the violation of the Sunday law, the judge said, answering the plea of the defense that the Sunday statute interfered with the religious liberty of the citizen:—

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

To this the editor of the Adventist paper replies: "This statement by the judge would be true if the law were indeed a merely civil regulation based upon civil reasons."

The italics are his. He then goes on to show conclusively that the Sabbath law is not based on merely civil reasons and thus effectually disposes

of the judge's defense of the prosecution. But we are not here concerned with this aspect of the matter; what we would call attention to is the astounding admission of the SENTINEL that the State has a right to make honest labor a crime on any day for any reason. This is unconditional surrender.

The SENTINEL has made no such surrender. Our freethought critic has overlooked the *if* in what we said. The SENTINEL has many times proved that there is, and can be, no *civil reason* for enforced weekly rest. This was the thought in mind when we italicized the phrase "*based upon civil reasons.*" It would have been better, we confess, to have said plainly in the very next sentence that there could be no such reason; but we did say in the same paragraph: "The prohibition of secular labor and business on Sunday has absolutely no other basis except the supposed sacred character of the day. *No other reason could possibly exist* for forbidding a man to plow in his own field on Sunday."

It follows that there can be no civil reason for prohibiting honest labor upon any day, for if there could that reason could apply to Sunday as well as to any other day. The fact that after years of diligent search no such reason has been found proves that it does not exist. The SENTINEL has made no surrender either unconditional or otherwise, for the SENTINEL supposes no unsupposable case. The position of the SENTINEL is and always has been that a weekly day of rest can exist only on a religious basis and for religious reasons, that therefore the State could, of right, have nothing whatever to do with the question; and that all so-called civil reasons are mere figments invented for the purpose of evading constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience.

However, we are glad that the *Truth Seeker* is so clear-sighted as to detect even this supposed heresy, and we hope our contemporary will continue to seek the truth and point out the errors connected with this subject, even to the extent of correcting a supposed error in the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

DECISIONS DECLARING VOID THE SUNDAY STATUTES OF KENTUCKY.

As stated in these columns last week, Judge William L. Jackson, of the Circuit Court, and Judge Charles G. Richie, of the County Court, both filed opinions at Louisville, on the 1st inst., declaring void Sections 1,303, 1,321 and 1,322 of the Statutes of Kentucky. The following is the opinion of Judge Jackson in full, as reported in the Louisville papers of the 2nd inst:—

Judge Jackson's Opinion.

On the 19th day of February, 1895, a warrant issued from the Police Court of Louisville against the defendant, Louis Seelbach, charging him with the offense of keeping open on Sunday a bar-room and place for the sale of spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors, and alleging that he did sell spirituous, vinous and malt liquors on Sunday. On March 9, 1895, a demurrer to said warrant was overruled by said Police Court, and the defendant was fined \$20, and from the judgment assessing said fine he has prosecuted an appeal to this court, and the case coming on for trial *de novo* here, the defendant has again interposed a demurrer to the warrant.

This, a test case, and numerous cases await its decision. The warrant is drawn under Section 1,303, of the Kentucky Statutes, which section is as follows:—

Any person who shall on Sunday keep open a bar-room or other place for the sale of spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors, or any of them, on Sunday, shall be fined not less than \$10 nor more than \$50 for each offense.

As very many of the cases pending in the Police Court arise under Section 1,321, of the Kentucky Statutes, by agreement that section has also been fully ar-

gued and briefed, and it is to be considered as if case were pending under it.

Section 1,321 reads as follows:—

No work or business shall be done on the Sabbath day except the ordinary household offices or other work of necessity or charity, and work required in the maintenance or operation of a ferry, skiff or steamboat, or steam or street railway. If any person on the Sabbath day shall himself be found at his own or other trade or calling, or shall employ his apprentice or other person in labor or other business, whether the same be for profit or amusement, unless such as is permitted above, he shall be fined not less than \$2 nor more than \$50 for each offense. Every person or apprentice so employed shall be deemed a separate offense. Persons who are members of a religious society who observe as a Sabbath any other day of the week than Sunday shall not be liable to the penalty prescribed in this section if they observe as a Sabbath one day in each seven, as herein provided.

It is contended that these sections especially offend against Section 59 of the new constitution. The material parts of said section are here given:—

"The General Assembly shall not pass local or special acts concerning any of the following subjects, or for any of the following purposes, namely." After enumerating various subjects, that section provides: "29th—In all other cases where a general law can be made applicable, no special law can be enacted."

In discussing Section 1,303 of the Kentucky Statutes, it becomes necessary to settle the question, What is the generic subject of legislation under said section? On the one side it is claimed that the generic subject is Sunday observance: on the other, that it is regulation of the liquor traffic. A brief historical view of said section answers this question. Section 1,303, somewhat enlarged in its scope, it is true, is a reenactment, substantially of the Act of April 13, 1880. That act was an amendment of Section 10, Article 17, of the General Statutes, which was the general law for Sunday observance. From its history and its wording it seems clear to me that the paramount thought and central idea of said section is Sunday observance. Section 1,303, being a law for the observance of Sunday, questions raised upon the two sections now become cognate, and the lines of argument no longer diverge. Whatever may have been the reasoning in former opinions, it is now the accepted and approved doctrine of law writers and modern decisions that "Laws which prohibit ordinary employments on Sunday are to be defended as establishing sanitary regulations based upon the demonstration of experience that one day's rest in seven is needful to recuperate the exhausted energies of body and mind."

This being the beneficent purpose and object of Sunday laws, by reason of the points here raised, the twenty-ninth subdivisions of Section 59 of the constitution becomes material. That provides, "In all other cases where a general law can be made applicable, no special law shall be enacted." Can a general law for the observance of Sunday be made applicable? Is it not apparent that such a law can be made as "broad and general as the casing air?" Section 1,321, stripped of its exceptions, fully solves the problem.

If then it is true that a general law for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest can be made applicable, by what law and with what logic can it be contended that if one person keeps open a bar-room or other place for the sale of spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors, or who shall sell or otherwise dispose of such liquors, that he shall be punished more severely than another person who keeps open another place of business, or who sells any other article or commodity? Learned counsel attempt to answer this question by invoking the police power and claiming that under that power a greater punishment can be inflicted upon a party keeping open a bar-room or other place for the sale of spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors, and selling the same, or otherwise disposing of same, than can be inflicted for keeping open any other place or selling any other article or commodity. Would not this be placing the police power higher than the constitution? I now state the settled rule in regard to said power: "It is very broad and comprehensive. Its limit cannot be accurately defined, and the courts have not been willing definitely to circumscribe it, but this power, however broad and extensive, is not above the constitution, which is the supreme law, and so far as it imposes restraints, the police power must be exercised in

subordination to it." Again, stated in a very recent opinion, "It is very broad and far-reaching, but is not without its limitations. Legislative acts passed in pursuance of it must not be in conflict with the constitution."

In the face of Subdivision 29 of Section 59 of the constitution, by what law and with what logic can it be claimed that if one person on the Sabbath shall himself be found at his own or any other trade or calling, or shall employ his apprentices or other person in labor or other business, whether the same be for profit or amusement, that he shall be punished, while persons engaged in the maintenance or operation of a ferry, skiff, or steamboat, or steam or street railroad in the limits of this State, or who belong to a religious society who observe as a Sabbath any other day in the week than Sunday, and shall observe as a Sabbath one day in each seven, that they shall go free and unpunished?

In answer to this question it is ingeniously insisted that the exceptions enumerated in Section 1,321 are a legislative declaration of what are works of charity and necessity, and that accused cannot complain of these exceptions. To hold that these exceptions were meant by the legislature as a legislative declaration as to what are works of charity and necessity, would be to hold that the legislative department was invading powers expressly given to the judicial department by Section 27, greatly amplified by Section 28 of the constitution. To deny the accused the right to complain of this section by reason of the exceptions would be to hold that the exceptions were passed for his benefit, and that by them he was not discriminated against, neither of which is true. At first blush it appeared to my mind that if these exceptions did not make Section 1,321 obnoxious to the provisions of the constitution aforesaid, these exceptions should be held void, but I find this position is not tenable. The rule, as stated by Mr. Cooley, is as follows:—

"But if its purpose, that is, the purpose of the law, is to accomplish a single object only, and some of its provisions are void, the whole must fall unless sufficient remains to effect the object without the aid of the invalid portion, and if they are so mutually connected with and dependent on each other as conditions, considerations or compensations for each other as to warrant the belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and if all could not be carried into effect, the legislature would not pass the residue independently, then if some of the parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional or connected, must fall with them."

There is but one other question which I find it necessary to pass upon, and that is that if Section 1,303 and Section 1,321 are invalid, then Section 1,304 which reads, "Any person who shall, without license so to do, sell or otherwise dispose of any spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors, shall for each offense be fined not less than \$20, nor more than \$100," applies to this case, because defendant's license, if he had any, did not give defendant the right to keep open his bar-room on Sunday, or to sell or otherwise dispose of liquors on said day. It seems to me that the warrant is insufficient to raise this question, and that it would be a complete defense to Section 1,304 if any one produced a license, whether he had sold on Sunday or any other day.

For the reason given the demurrer to the warrant is sustained.

W. L. JACKSON, Judge.

We will print Judge Richie's opinion next week.

A LETTER.

[From the Examiner National Baptist and Christian Inquirer, New York, June 20, 1895.]

WE have received a letter from Mr. R. S. Owen, 450 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga., in which he expresses very high appreciation of the position taken by THE EXAMINER in its editorial columns in reference to the violation of religious liberty in the case of men sentenced to fine, imprisonment, and the chain-gang, for conscientiously engaging, upon the first

day of the week, in labor which does not disturb their neighbors. He also expresses his gratitude for the resolution passed by the American Baptist Publication Society, at Saratoga, on the motion of a representative of THE EXAMINER, protesting against these violations of religious liberty.

Mr. Owen further writes: "But a few days since, I visited one of my brethren in a loathsome prison, inclosed in an iron cage with incendiaries, thieves, and murderers, awaiting their departure to the chain-gang. This brother had wronged no one; he had molested no one. He had simply kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and, quietly, in his own back field, had worked at honest labor on the first day of the week. I talked to the clerk of the court, who had lived neighbor to him for years; he told me there was not a better man in the county. The sheriff told me he was a good citizen. After I had spent some time in the jail, visiting through the iron bars with this brother, I felt that his cold-hearted persecutors were more in need of sympathy than he. We prayed together, and although I could not refrain from weeping, his face was lighted up with joy. The presence of Jesus seemed so near to him that it turned the prison into a palace. May God bless you, and make you a blessing to those who are seeking to make men religious by law, showing them that the power of God is to be manifested through the gospel, and not through the pains and penalties of the civil law."

"ROME NEVER CHANGES."

[The following translation of a circular letter from the Bishop of Bogota, United States of Colombia, S. A., to the priests of his diocese, shows conclusively that Rome has not changed. She is the same in South America that she was in Europe five centuries ago. Rome establishes schools when she must, and controls, but never fosters education.]

Archbishopric of Santafé de Bogota.—

Ecclesiastical Government.

Bogota, May 6, 1895.

To the Priest of ———:—

As our divine Saviour says: the enemy continually invades the father's inheritance, and laughing at vigilance of the good, sows tares amongst the wheat. Such is the case in countries like ours, where, through divine favor, and, thanks to the zeal of our superiors, the only true, the apostolic Roman Catholic religion prevails. The proselyting Protestant sects endeavor to induce the faithful to apostatize from the faith professed by them at baptism. This we have witnessed during the past few years, principally, in this city, and elsewhere in the Republic.

One of the numerous Protestant sects—who agree among themselves, only to make war upon Catholicism,—the Presbyterian, has for some time been among us, supporting missionaries and propagating its false doctrines. Early, a church was built in which to celebrate its heretical worship. Later these missionaries undertake the task of collecting proselytes by sowing the evil seeds of heresy among the young.

To accomplish this, a college and school for girls was established, where, as it is well known, are gathered not a few children of poor parents; these they flatter by gifts and promises of pecuniary help. Next comes the establishment of a college and schools for boys; and recently a night school was opened for workingmen, in which, according to their lately circulated prospectus, they also offer to give, besides the primary instruction, that of religion; which is none other than the Protestant.

It pains us to see that some fathers and

mothers, some unintentionally, others perverted, have sacrificed their consciences and the faith of their families, and, perhaps for a small assistance, placed themselves and their children on the road to eternal destruction. We would be guilty of a grave neglect of duty if we did not earnestly call the attention of the clergy and faithful to these great evils which we have noted. Under a pretext of offering instruction, which is justly desired by all, it is not possible to permit them to snatch away, principally, from the poor the inestimable gift of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and his holy church.

The present energetical propagating of the Protestant faith by means of tracts, leaflets, and periodicals, in which, under a cloak of pretended virtue and false piety, they endeavor to gain the confidence of a simple, and naturally believing people in order to instill into their minds errors and heresies which are not always easy to discover, and in the end to persuade them, that they teach the true doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ; that this consists in believing; that faith and works do not go together; that it is enough to be sorry for sins and ask God's forgiveness in order to obtain justification; and, therefore, the teaching of the Catholic Church is false upon these, faith and good works, the sacraments in general, especially upon the holy eucharist, repentance, and confession.

You, the priest, well understand how imperative is our duty to instruct the faithful, who are under our pastoral care, of the dangers which threaten their souls, if they knowingly expose themselves to the reception of these miserable doctrines, clearly prohibited and anathematized by our holy mother church, and, especially, by the holy Council of Trent. Therefore we most earnestly exhort you by the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, to improve every occasion presented, in public and private, in the pulpit, the confessional, and your social relations, to dissuade Catholics under your jurisdiction, from receiving Protestant books and periodicals, or those of unbelievers, and from taking part in, or causing others to take part in, the establishments of education founded and sustained in this city, or elsewhere, by the Presbyterians or any other sect.

Therefore, in exercise of our authority, we decree that you persistently communicate and explain to the faithful the following points:

1st. Apostates from the Christian faith incur the penalty of excommunication, *latea sententia* reserved especially to the Roman pontiff, and with them all heretics, of whatever name or sect, and all who believe, harbor, aid or defend them; also schismatics, and all who obstinately depart from the obedience of the Roman pontiff.

2nd. The same penalty is incurred by all who knowingly read, without the authority of the holy see, books of the said apostates and heretics, wherein their heresy is defended, or books of authors which are expressly forbidden, also those who keep, print, or in any manner defend them.

3rd. No Catholic can, without committing mortal sin and incurring the other penalties imposed by the church, send his sons, daughters or those dependent upon them, or go himself to any establishment or school founded and known in this city by the name of the "American College for Boys and Girls;" nor can he give aid or help in any like educational institutions.

4th. The workmen, youth or adults, who go or encourage others to attend the night school, which has been opened in the American College for Boys, incur the same grave sin, and are under the same penalties.

5th. It is highly unlawful for all Catholics to cooperate or assist in any Protestant cere-

mony, funeral, etc., performed in the church or out of it.

6th. The faithful who receive, or have in their possession, tracts, leaflets, periodicals, such as the *Evangelista Colombiano*, and *El Progreso* of New York; Bibles or books of whatever class printed within or out of the Republic, which are distributed or sold by Protestant missionaries, or their agents, or any other bookseller, are positively obliged to deliver said books to their respective parish priest, or send them to the archbishopric.

You are to cause this circular to be read in all of the churches for three consecutive Sundays at the time of mass, so that the faithful may fully know its contents. God keep you.

BERNADO,

Archbishop of Bogota.

EARLY PERSECUTION OF SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS.

BY CHARLES E. BUELL.

IN 1631 Roger Williams landed at Boston, Mass.; and with his appearance in the then newly formed colony, a discord was produced. The generally held notion that persons should be made to believe a doctrine, as promulgated by the church, was destined to receive a blow from which it would never recover.

Roger Williams told the leaders of the New England society, in most distinct language, that to compel men to unite with those of a different faith is an open violation of natural right. He insisted that no one should be bound to worship or to maintain a worship against his own consent. This was a new thought seemingly, to most of the stern Puritans who had always championed the rule which a large proportion of the ministers had advocated, that, "persecution is not wrong in itself. It is wicked for falsehood to persecute truth, but it is the sacred duty of truth to persecute falsehood."

On the Sabbath question Roger Williams was so outspoken that the General Court remonstrated against his settlement in the colony. The historian says, he "declared the opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense, as it was a breach of the first table."¹ For these and similar teachings against a theocratic government which was being reared by the Puritans, Roger Williams was banished from the colony in 1635. The attempt was made, however, to arrest him and send him to England, where, upon complaint, he would have been killed for utterances against the State-Church of England and the government which supported it. Roger Williams, anticipating the arrest, fled, and for fourteen weeks, as he stated, "was sorely tossed, not knowing what bread or bed did mean." He had undoubtedly gone by boat around the coast from Boston to Providence, R. I., of the present time.

The story of his being received into the habitations of the savages, and, as he stated the case, "was fed by the ravens in the wilderness," is a familiar bit of history.

The going forth of Roger Williams and the founding of a port of refuge for those who were to be persecuted, seems to have been a providential provision. The colony growing out of this settlement on Sekonk River, known as Providence Plantation, became largely made up of those who differed with the Puritans, and who could not have remained in the Plymouth Colony.

It would be interesting to know in exact detail the names and the charges against those who followed Roger Williams in attempting to

maintain the truth, and who were banished, imprisoned, fined and openly whipped by the cruel Puritans.

After the escape of Roger Williams, a law was enacted making it more difficult to teach doctrines opposed to those given out by the church of the colony.

In 1637 John Wheelwright was arrested for preaching like words as those which sent Williams into exile, and he was convicted of sedition, to be disfranchised, and banished. Like Roger Williams, he was compelled to go forth alone in the bitterness of the New England winter. In the latter part of the same year Anne Hutchinson was brought before an ecclesiastical criminal court. Ministers, who were burning with hate, were her accusers. The story of her treatment would shame savages. She was condemned and banished from Massachusetts colony, and, with friends, went to Narragansett Bay and settled in the Roger Williams colony.

In all of the branch colonies, as at Hartford, Springfield, Windsor, Guilford, and New Haven, the policy of persecuting all those who taught anything differing from the Established Church was adopted, and various were the applications made of the new laws against heretics.

Of all the pests which the New England Puritans hated and also dreaded, the Baptists were the greatest. It was not the least of the offenses of Roger Williams that he was a Baptist. The teaching of the Baptists against infant baptism led to a law, in 1644, making it a penal offense to teach, openly or secretly, against baptizing of infants. This was punishable with banishment.

The Baptists of those early times were largely of the seventh-day belief, that is, they considered that the seventh day of the week and not the first day, was the true Sabbath, and their conduct was in accord with their belief. This resulted in the first Sunday law in Plymouth Colony. It was enacted June 10, 1650. The text of this law was as follows: "Further be it enacted, that whosoever shall profane the Lord's day, by doing any servile work, or any such like abuse, shall forfeit for every such default ten shillings, or be whipped."²

This law seems to have been specially aimed at certain persons, and in October of 1650 arrests were made under it.

There appears in the family history of the Buell family what seems to point to the earliest arrest under the first Sunday law in this country. It states that in the court record of Plymouth Colony (Bayliss 11.211) that William Buell and wife, with Joseph Tery and wife, John Hazel, Obadiah Holmes, Edward Smith, and the wife of James Mann, were indicted for failing to observe the Lord's day, contrary to the order of the court. This was in October, 1650. It further appears that William Buell and wife were indicted for being Baptists, and it is possible that all who were indicted for failure to obey the Sunday law were also indicted for being Baptists, which would not appear in the family book.

William Buell, from whom the Buell families in this country are descended, came from England in 1635, with his mother, Goode Buell. He was about twenty years old when he arrived. His mother was the wife of Sir Robert Buell, of London, and the daughter of Sir John Goode, of London; and she left husband and home on account of religious differences, and sought liberty in the new world. William Buell, her son, no doubt imbibed his belief from his mother, which would indicate that she was a Seventh-day Baptist. She is reported as being an educated person, and educated her son, giving him advantages in the

new land where school's had not been established.

The fact is indicated that William Buell and wife were not only Baptists, but Seventh-day Baptists, and the subsequent records of the other persons named in the indictment of 1650 shows them to have been Seventh-day Baptists.

In 1652, Obadiah Holmes, John Clarke and John Crandall, went from Providence Plantation to Lynn, Mass., to visit an aged Baptist friend, and were engaged in devotional worship when they were arrested, and told that they must attend worship at the meeting-house. For this private meeting they were fined respectively thirty, twenty, and five pounds, or each be well whipped. Friends paid the fines for Clarke and Crandall, but Elder Holmes, for some reason, failed to pay, and received thirty lashes with a three-thonged whip of knotted cord wielded with both hands, which lacerated his body in a frightful manner.

When asked to be shown the law under which they were fined, Governor Endicott broke in: "You have deserved death." As Elder Holmes left the court, he remarked: "I bless God I am counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus." Whereupon John Wilson, a leading minister, struck Holmes, and said: "The curse of God go with you."

When the whipping was over, two men, John Spur, and John Hazel one of the persons named with Holmes, Buell and others, in the indictment in 1650, went to the suffering man and shook hands with him, Hazel not speaking; yet both were fined forty shillings for sympathizing with the prisoner, with the choice of paying the fine or being whipped. They both refused to pay the fine; but a friend paid Spur's, and after a week's imprisonment, another paid Hazel's.

John Crandall preached in Westerly, R. I., in after years, to a Seventh-day Baptist Church. Another, Joseph Crandall, preached to the Seventh-day Baptist Church at Newport, from 1715 to 1737. The Congregation at Westerly came out of one at Newport, to which John Clarke had preached; and every indication points to the fact that the several persons referred to were Seventh-day Baptists.

Plainfield, N. J., June 18.

[From the *Jewish Spectator*, May 17.]

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, published by the Pacific Press Publishing Company at New York, and edited by Messrs. Alonzo Jones, Calvin Bollman and Leon Smith, one of the staunchest journals advocating and championing the complete separation of Church from State, in its issue of May 8th, has the following comment upon our editorial anent the intolerant Sunday laws of the State of Tennessee, so cruelly executed against Seventh-day Adventists:—

The SENTINEL is gratified with the approving words for the faithfulness of the persecuted Seventh-day Adventists which are found in our Hebrew exchanges. One of the most courageous and consistent of these and one which utilizes every opportunity to speak for the persecuted and for the principles of religious liberty at stake in the struggle, is the *Jewish Spectator* of Memphis and New Orleans.

And we assure our liberal and truly American contemporary that the *Spectator* will always be found among those journals who protest against any kind of injustice, prejudice, bigotry and priestcraft. There ought to be at least one spot within God's fair earth where religious freedom and civil liberty reigns supreme and is not shackled and fettered by the arbitrary power of man and the pernicious force of unjust laws—let that spot forever be—the United States.

¹ See American Encyclopedia, Article Roger Williams.

² "Plymouth Colony Records," Vol. 11, p. 57.



NEW YORK, JUNE 27, 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 *Dayton* (Tenn.) *Republican* is faithfully continuing its fight for religious freedom. Read its editorial on this page; also the one on page 207. All honor to the *Republican*.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS are refusing to obey statutes enacted to enforce a false sabbath, and in consequence are suffering persecution. In this are they following the example of Christ? Read the first-page article.

A POLICE OFFICER called at the SENTINEL office Sunday morning and ordered the manager to dismiss all SENTINEL employes, and not to permit them to labor on Sunday. The employes were informed of the order, but all remained at work. Up to the hour of going to press no arrests have been made.

THE case of John A. Faust, the Baltimore Seventh-day Adventist, arrested June 10, for cobbling in his own house on the preceding day, and who was locked in a cell and refused a bed, has been thrown out by the grand jury. Justices of the peace have exclusive original jurisdiction of Sunday cases in Maryland, hence violation of the Sunday statute is not indictable in that State.

IN the article, "Early Persecution of Seventh-day Baptists," on page 206, Mr. Buell gives some interesting historical facts which show clearly that the first Sunday statute enacted in this country was aimed at Seventh-day Baptists, and that observers of the seventh day were actually persecuted under that act. The conclusion is also well-nigh irresistible that Obadiah Holmes, John Clarke and John Crandall, the former of which was so cruelly whipped, were Seventh-day Baptists.

WE promised last week to give our readers this week the decisions of Judges Jackson and Richie. We find, however, that we have room for only one. The other will appear next week.

The decisions are interesting, because if sustained by the Court of Appeals, the action of these judges will leave Kentucky for the time being without a Sunday law. But inasmuch as both Judge Jackson and Judge Richie have intimated that a general Sunday statute would be constitutional, it is more than likely that the near future will see a very stringent statute enacted in that State prohibiting all labor and business on the first day of the week, under heavy penalties.

But it is somewhat difficult to see how any Sunday law can be held to be constitutional in Kentucky under the present constitution and

the ruling of Judge Richie. The judge holds the present statute to be unconstitutional, "because it is a religious statute." Now, whatever may be the pretense upon which such a statute may be based, there can, in the very nature of the case, never be a Sunday statute in Kentucky or elsewhere that is not religious. And if such a statute could be framed nobody would want it. Mr. Crafts says: "Take the religion out and you take the rest out." We shall watch the progress of events in Kentucky with great interest.

Wholesale Indictments!

Nineteen Graysville Adventists To Be Tried This Court.

[From the *Dayton Republican*, June 21.]

RHEA COUNTY Circuit Court will convene the first Monday in July, Judge James G. Parks, presiding, and Attorney General A. J. Fletcher, prosecuting. There are very few cases of importance, with the exception of the Graysville Adventists, who are to be tried on the charge of violating the Sabbath.

Nineteen of these Adventists will be tried upon this charge. Some of them are made defendant in several cases. Following are their names¹:

E. M. Plumb, 4 cases,	— Dieffenbacher,
— Harrison,	N. B. England, 2 cases,
Lewis Abbott, 2 cases,	H. C. Leach, 2 cases,
W. L. Burchard,	Oscar England,
E. S. Abbott, 2 cases,	Geo. Dodson,
J. M. Hall,	Allen Cathey, 2 cases,
Walter Ridgeway,	Columbus Myers,
E. R. Gillett,	Bird Terry (col.),
Dwight Plumb,	W. J. Kerr,
	Monroe Morgan.

We call the attention of the reader to matter published elsewhere in this paper² relating to these people. Some of them have been arrested upon the most trivial charge. They are none of them Sabbath-breakers within the meaning and intent of the spirit of the law. They are God-fearing, law-abiding, industrious citizens of this county.

One of the indicted parties is E. R. Gillett. A great many of our readers know "Uncle" Gillett, as he is called. He is a pleasant, mild-mannered, inoffensive old gentleman, well up in the sixties. He is everybody's friend and everybody loves him, for he is a lovable character. He would turn aside in his path to avoid crushing a worm. Like Abou Ben Adhem he can say, "write me as one who loves his fellow-man." In practicing his faith he has worshiped on Saturday and labored the remaining six days of the week. In doing this he has aroused the ire of some people who want everybody else to believe as they do, and now he is to be brought into a court of justice and tried like a common malefactor. It would be a strange sight indeed in this latter age of the world to see venerable "Uncle" Gillett behind the bars. Yet such is likely to be his fate. Jailer Smith should watch

this man with extra care. He is a dangerous criminal, and society is not safe while he roams at large.

OUR correspondent who sends us the translation of the circular letter to the priests of Bogota, printed on page 205, says: "The effect of the circular has been to increase the attendance at the college. In my own work [colporter], it has given me opportunity to more readily place tracts in the hands of the people. Yesterday in one of the parks I gave some tracts to two gentlemen, and meeting them a little later asked them how they liked them. They said they liked those they had read very well. In the course of the conversation which followed one said: 'I had a large Bible and some Latin books which I valued very highly, but one day a priest came to my father's house, accompanied by a policeman, and took my books away.'" Our correspondent adds: "For a Colombian there is little or no relief in such cases. The church is the conservator of social order, as is stated in the constitution of the country; and when it [the church] says that anything is contrary to social order the government must prohibit it, as it is bound to protect the church and see that it is respected." This is strikingly suggestive of some of the "arguments" used in this country, especially in justification of Sunday legislation.

THE California State Sabbath Association, so-called, was recently reorganized in San Francisco. The following is the official statement of its object:—

The object of this association shall be two-fold:—

Section 1. To promote the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath in the State of California and in the nation.

Sec. 2. To promote religious influence by State legislation and by county and municipal ordinances; to prevent all open acts of Sabbath desecration; and to secure by law the observance of the first day of the week as a day of rest.

But notwithstanding this plain statement, we suppose that when a Sunday law shall be enacted in California we will be gravely told that it is only a police regulation, a merely civil statute for the physical good of the people.

The end sought by this so-called Sabbath Association is, it seems, to be attained by way of the Sunday saloon, as witnessed by the following:—

Resolved, That among the first things for which this association will labor will be the closing of all saloons on the Christian Sabbath.

This means that the Sunday closing of saloons is to be a stepping-stone to a general Sunday law stopping all business and forbidding "all open acts of Sabbath desecration."

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

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

¹ We understand that two of the persons named are not Seventh-day Adventists, and two or three have not been arrested as they were temporary residents of Rhea County, and had left the neighborhood before the indictments were found.

² See page 207.