



"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. 27.

NEW YORK, JULY 4, 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, }
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, } EDITORS.
LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

ARE NOT CRIMINALS.

[From the *Dayton (Tenn.) Republican.*]

ELSEWHERE in this issue of the *Republican* we publish a letter¹ written by D. W. Reavis to Elder G. A. Irwin, regarding the case of an Adventist at Amory, Miss., who was arrested and fined for working, according to his faith, on the first day of the week or Sunday.

We ask the reader to read that letter carefully, and also this article, in view of the fact that at the July term of Circuit Court in this county a number of similar cases will come up for disposal. It is possible that some of our readers may think that we place too much stress upon these cases. We know that some of our subscribers have intimated as much. They want to dismiss the whole affair by saying that the Seventh-day Adventists, by observing Saturday as the Sabbath and working on Sunday, are contravening the law of the land and defying the rule of the majority. They admit that these people are not criminals, in the ordinary meaning of that term, but when appealed to to awaken a public sentiment that will frown down these senseless and useless prosecutions, they shrug their shoulders and say that it is none of their business.

Pontius Pilate said the same thing when the clamoring multitude brought Christ before him for judgment. In all ages men who are tenacious enough of their own rights have regarded with indifference the demand of others for their rights. A simple application of the Golden Rule would settle the whole question: "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you."

With this rule in view we wish to put to the Sunday observer this question: Suppose, by a factitious advantage, a majority of the people should enact a law making Saturday

the legal day of worship and forbidding you to work on that day. Regarding Sunday, as you do, as the holy day of worship, you would still continue to worship on that day. But you would be compelled by law to rest on Saturday, your neighbor's Sabbath. Would you not consider this a hardship? yes, you would. You know you would. By doing this the State deprives you of one-sixth of your time. This places you at a disadvantage in the race of life. It is class legislation of the worst kind.

How we strain at the gnats and swallow camels in this world! A few Seventh-day Baptists here and there worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, yes, in accordance with the command of Holy Writ, by solemnly and consistently observing Saturday as the Sabbath. Having performed their duty to their God they next discharge their obligations to their families and to society by laboring the remaining six days of the week. Is there any sane man who will say that they have not the inalienable right to do this? No divine law has been violated. Society has not been injured. The natural rights of no individual have been invaded; and yet these people are dragged to jail, put in the chain-gang, robbed of their personal liberties and their material possessions, in order that a few bigots and zealots may have the satisfaction of applying the thumb-screws of intolerance and superstition.

See here: The community of Seventh-day Adventists at Graysville numbers about one hundred and forty, including men, women and children. We will give a year's subscription to any one who will prove that they lie, steal, curse, indulge in neighborhood broils or quarrels, cheat in business, refuse to pay their just debts, or in any way fail to live up to the obligations exacted of every citizen by the rules of good society; we mean any one of them. Of course, they are not perfect; but they come about as near it as any set of people on God's green earth. They live very close to the Bible, and consequently, literally obey its teachings. They read in this Book that the seventh day or Saturday, is God's day of rest; and so it is. We will give another year's subscription, yes, ten of them, to any one who can prove the contrary.

A score of these people are to be tried next July for working on Sabbath. Substantially, the charge is worshipping on Saturday, for this necessitates work on Sunday; so the law

under which they were arrested is negatively a law restricting them in their mode of worship. Now, what is the sentiment of our people in regard to these cases? Don't say it is none of your business, that they are in the hands of the law. You cannot clear your skirts of their blood in this way. Don't say that we are making too much fuss over these people. They are people of like passions as are we, they are our friends, neighbors and fellow-citizens, and their liberties are threatened. It is no light matter to go to jail, even for conscience' sake, and have your business broken up and your family made wretched. If you think it is, come to Dayton and try it.

We are supposed to be living in an intelligent and Christian age, and yet we do some of the most absurd things. We let our livery stables, our furnaces, our railroads, our barber shops and numerous other forms of industry run wide open on Sunday, and yet if an Adventist is found carrying a few boards across a lot or digging a well or pulling fodder, we arrest him for disturbing the ethics of the public; and although we know he is a good man and a model citizen, we fine him and imprison him and goad him and harass him just as if he were some wild beast threatening to break into and destroy society; and all the while we are doing it we acknowledge that it is somehow and somewhere wrong. But then, we say, it is the law and the law must be obeyed; and a glow of satisfaction permeates our being at having discharged our duty, and we rub our hands and say: "Poor people, we are sorry for them, but they shouldn't be so verdant as to follow God's command in preference to the law of the State;" and the devil grins and the old Spanish Inquisitors smile amid their torments and recount the good old days of the Middle Ages, when the shrieks of agony from tortured Christians were sweet music in their ears.

The statutory law of the State defines the prosecution of the common occupations of life on Sunday as a misdemeanor, triable before a justice of the peace and liable to a fine of a few dollars and costs. But through some hocus-pocus of the law the common law of nuisance has been applied to these cases, and they are thus thrown into the Circuit Court and given an infinitely involved punishment. Just think of it. Making honest toil and honorable industry a nuisance. What a travesty on the spirit of jurisprudence! O, for a

¹ The letter referred to narrates the facts of the trial and conviction of R. T. Nash, of Mississippi, for performing farm labor on Sunday. The facts have appeared in the *SENTINEL*.

spirit of broad and liberal interpretation, that would set at naught bad precedents and establish a landmark of common sense and justice. A nuisance to whom? Has one individual rights over another in matters of freedom of conscience and action that do not violate well-established custom, propriety and good taste? A nuisance instinctively puts one in mind of something repugnant to good taste, obnoxious to the morals, shocking to the sensibilities, injurious to the well-being of society.

We might say much more but space forbids. We ask the reader to think over this matter as something that vitally interests him, and hope that he will array his influence in favor of the broadest possible amount of spiritual and secular liberty consistent with good citizenship and the best interests of society.

THE IMMORALITY OF SUNDAY LAWS VS. THE "IMMORALITY" OF SUNDAY WORK.

THE charge against the Seventh-day Adventists on trial this week at Dayton, Tenn., for Sunday work, is that they are guilty of nuisance, because Sunday work is "immoral and of pernicious effect." But is Sunday work immoral?

The word immoral is defined by the best dictionaries, as follows:—

Not moral; inconsistent with rectitude, purity, or good morals; contrary to conscience or the divine law; wicked; unjust; dishonest; vicious; licentious; as, an immoral man; an immoral deed.—*Webster's International Dictionary.*

Not moral; wanting in principle or morality; unprincipled; dishonest; depraved.—*Encyclopedic Dictionary.*

Not moral; not conforming to or consistent with moral law; unprincipled; dissolute; vicious; licentious.—*Century Dictionary.*

It is evident from these definitions that the moral or immoral character of an act rests upon a more substantial basis than the mere whim or even the deliberate judgment of men; it is inherent in the act itself. An immoral act must be violative either of one's duty to God or to his fellow-men. Nothing can be made either moral or immoral by human law. For instance, marriage, which is a proper, natural and perfectly moral relation, would not become immoral even if prohibited by civil statute; nor would prostitution become moral even if legalized in every country in the world. *The divine law alone*, whether revealed in nature or by inspiration of God, gives moral character to human actions.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," and that for this purpose and within this sphere "the powers that be are ordained of God," and ought to be obeyed. *Outside this sphere all pretended civil authority is usurpation and is itself immoral.*

Sunday Work Not An Offense Against God.

That Sunday work is not an offense against God is evident from the fact that *it is forbidden by no divine law* revealed either in nature or by inspiration. The divine law of the Sabbath declares: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." To violate this law is to be guilty of immorality; but the Tennessee Adventists do not violate this law. It is admitted on all hands that they obey this divine Sabbath law. They must therefore be acquitted of immorality from the standpoint of duty toward God. The Divine Being does not require Sunday rest. But even if this

were not true; if Sunday were the divinely-appointed Sabbath, and everybody admitted the fact, secular government would have no right to enforce its observance.

Sunday Work Does Not Interfere With The Natural Rights Of Others.

It is argued by some, however, that the prohibition of Sunday labor in Tennessee does not rest upon the religious idea, but upon a purely civil basis; and that the immorality of Sunday work lies not in the idea that it offends God, but in the fact that it is a violation of civil law. But such forget, or never knew, that "no man has a natural right to commit aggressions on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him;"* and that "every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; and this is all the laws should enforce on him."*

It is not pretended that private Sunday work by one man or by one family interferes with any natural right of another man or family, or that it prevents others from resting upon that day. No such charge is made against the Tennessee Adventists. Indeed, the universal testimony even of their enemies is that *they have not disturbed others* by their Sunday work; and the courts of the State have held that "it is not necessary to show that anybody was disturbed." In Georgia it was expressly stated by Judge Jones, in the Allison case: "You are not on trial for disturbing anybody." It follows as certainly as effect follows cause, that Sunday work is not immoral from the standpoint of natural human rights; and again and finally, the Adventists must be acquitted of the charge of doing that which is "immoral and of pernicious effect."

Sunday Workers Not Immoral.

If Sunday work were "immoral and of pernicious effect," as is charged by the courts of Tennessee, its evil effects ought certainly to be most clearly seen upon those who engage in it habitually; but instead of being noted for immorality, the Seventh-day Adventists are everywhere acknowledged to be most exemplary people, honest and of good report. Even their enemies being the witnesses there is no fault to be found with them except concerning their Sunday work; in all else they are admittedly the best of citizens.

The Immorality of Sunday Statutes.

But what shall we say of the morality of Sunday laws, so-called? They, as we have seen, contravene the divine law of the Sabbath. They command rest when the law of God enjoins activity; and they, indirectly at least, enjoin work when the law of God commands rest. The inevitable effect of such "laws" must be to destroy respect for the law of God, and to exalt the creature to the place which belongs of right to the Creator.

When the State forbids honest labor on Sunday it forces men into idleness. When God enjoins rest from labor, it is that the time may be employed in spiritual worship. God requires man to cease from his labor on the Sabbath, but he gives to man a spiritual nature, by means of which the cessation from labor is profitably employed. On the other hand the State compels idleness, but does not and cannot give to the idler that spiritual nature which enables him to properly employ the enforced idleness; and therefore, as Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do, the State, in enforcing idleness on Sunday instead of promoting morality, is in reality fostering immorality. It is generally admitted that

more crimes are committed on Sunday than on any other day of the week.

Again, Sunday statutes are immoral, because they demand for the State that which belongs to God. A weekly day of rest is the badge of God's authority, a sign of loyalty to him as the Creator and of faith in his power to save. By its Sunday laws, so-called, the State robs God of the honor due him, destroys reverence for his law, and stifles the conscientious convictions of many who might otherwise be won to the service of the true God and to the keeping of his divinely-ordained Sabbath.

Again, when the State exempts certain occupations such as barbering, railroading, steamboating, and certain trafficking such as selling drugs, meats, and groceries during certain hours,—by these exemptions the State undertakes to amend the law of God and to decide for the individual what necessary or charitable labor is permitted on the Sabbath and what is not. In other words, the State presumes to act as conscience for the individual and to decide questions which belong to the domain of individual conscience.

From the reasons thus briefly given it must be clearly seen that Sunday legislation and not Sunday work "is immoral and of pernicious effect."

THE "CANADIAN BAPTIST" AND SUNDAY LAWS.

A CORRESPONDENT has sent us editorial clippings from the *Canadian Baptist*, Toronto, relative to the question of compulsory Sunday observance. He underlines some of the inconsistencies in the editorials, and then writes at the bottom of the matter the words, "probe tenderly." The advice is good; and, at no time is it more needed than when examining a Baptist's attempt to justify enforced Sunday observance. After all that Baptists have suffered for their refusal to obey State-enforced church dogmas, and while proclaiming to the world that one reason for their existence is to teach the world the great principle of "soul-liberty" and separation of Church and State, to find them now defending the prosecution of seventh-day observers for refusing to bow to the laws enforcing the traditional church dogma of Sunday sacredness, it requires the exercise of more than human charity to prevent one from probing deep and energetically. But remembering our own mistakes, and how patient the Lord has been with us, and how slow we have been, and still are, to see and faithfully obey the unfolding light of truth, we are admonished to "probe tenderly."

The *Canadian Baptist* is led to notice the question of Sunday laws, by learning of the conviction of the Seventh-day Adventists, J. Q. Allison and R. T. Nash, of Georgia and Mississippi, for doing farm labor on Sunday, and of the resolution passed by the American Baptist Publication Society, at its recent annual meeting at Saratoga, condemning these persecutions.

After criticising the severity of the Georgia Sunday laws, the *Canadian Baptist* says:—

But, on the other hand, what are the State authorities, entrusted with the enforcement of the laws, to do with men who openly and, possibly, ostentatiously, persist in working on Sunday in the open fields, when their fellow-citizens are not permitted to do so? Is it clear that such persons have any claim on our sympathies when the laws of the land are put in force against them? It may press hardly, and no doubt does so, on many, to lose the second day from the week. But, is it not the duty of a good citizen to obey the laws of his country? He may, of course, meanwhile do all in his power to obtain a modification or repeal of the law which he believes to be unjust.

To show that this is the language of the persecutor, we will put it, slightly altered, into

* Thomas Jefferson, "American State Papers," p. 69.

the mouth of Cotton Mather, and direct it against Baptists.

It is true that the laws requiring Baptists to have their children baptized, are severe, but what are the civil authorities, entrusted with the enforcement of the laws, to do with men who openly persist in refusing to have their children baptized, when their fellow-citizens are not permitted to disobey? Is it clear that such persons have any claim on our sympathies when the laws of the colony are put in force against them? Is it not the duty of good citizens to obey the laws of their country? They may, of course, secure the modification of the law (however they should not be allowed to succeed in this), but in the meantime it is their duty to obey the law and have their children sprinkled.

At this point an attempt will be made to show that the cases are not parallel, because the statute enforcing the traditional church dogma of infant baptism is a religious act in conflict with conscience, while the acts enforcing the observance of the traditional church dogma of Sunday sacredness are not religious statutes. But this no man can do.

The *Canadian Baptist* will not deny any of the following statements:—

1. Sunday statutes originated in a union of Church and State.

2. They were originated for the purpose of enforcing the religious observance of the day.

3. No attempt was made to defend them on civil grounds until the great principle of separation of Church and State was applied to governments.

4. And even now the greater portion of those who advocate Sunday statutes do it on the religious basis.

5. The very wording of the statutes even to-day betray their origin, nature and object.

These facts are so patent that we believe that the *Canadian Baptist* will not have the hardihood to deny any of them; and yet, while admitting all this, it attempts to prove that though Sunday laws were born and reared in a union of Church and State, and still wear their ecclesiastical dress, and are vitalized and utilized by ecclesiastics, that nevertheless they are purely civil enactments.

The Baptist historian, Robert Baird, has this to say on the *civil* excuse for ecclesiastical statutes:—

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

The *Canadian Baptist* urges seventh-day observers to obey the Sunday act, even though they must lose one sixth of their time thereby. If it were merely a matter of loss of time, this advice would be good from a financial standpoint, since the fines and imprisonments are far more expensive than the loss of one day each week. But their attitude toward the act does not turn on the financial problem. Once for all we want to impress the *Canadian Baptist* with the thought that Seventh-day Adventists cannot conscientiously obey Sunday "laws." They regard the Sunday-sabbath as the sign of papal apostasy from the Word of God, and Sunday "laws" as attempts to compel them to bow to this mark of the papal beast.

The *Canadian Baptist* may deny that they are conscientious in the matter, and that the enforcement of the "laws" is religious persecu-

tion. Russia denies that it is persecuting Jews and Stundists, and argues that its "laws" are for the good of society; but that does not change the facts. The Massachusetts authorities denied that they persecuted Baptists and denied their claim of conscience, and contended that the laws were wholesome and necessary for the common weal; but this did not change the fact that Baptists were conscientious, that they were persecuted, and that the acts under which they suffered were persecuting measures. Oh! for another John Bunyan, or Roger Williams!

It is gratifying to know that the *Canadian Baptist* still regards the Sunday-law problem as a "vexed and difficult question." This indicates that the struggle between Baptist principles of separation of Church and State and the old error of Church and State union have not yet been definitely settled in its mind in favor of persecution.

AN OPEN LETTER TO JUDGE JANES.

JUDGE JANES—*Dear Sir:* As a citizen of Georgia, and a lover of *justice* and *right*, I address these lines to you, inspired by the facts of the trial and conviction of Mr. J. Q. Allison, at the court house in Douglasville, May 15.

I have always supposed that laws and courts were instituted for the sole purpose of administering justice and equity between citizens, and to protect individuals in the enjoyment of their inalienable or God-given rights against all invaders. But according to your ruling and that of judges in other States, law seems to be a travesty on justice, because the States and courts themselves become the invaders and criminals against the inalienable rights of individuals. Now, Mr. Janes, I want to know where the State and the courts get the right to invade a man's home and drag him up before a court and extort from him his property, or deprive him of his liberty when he has done no wrong to any one? Is this your highest idea of justice? You admitted what his neighbors said about him, that is, he was a good man, but you must make an example of him so as to deter bad men from committing such a crime against the State and humanity! Is this your highest idea of justice? Is it any less a crime for the State to deprive an individual of his property, liberty, or life, without just cause, than it is for an individual to do it? Did legality make it right to hang Quakers on Boston Common, or to burn heretics in England or Spain? You are versed in the science of law, and a judge, and ought to be able to answer these questions.

Again, does legality transform a wrong into a right? It would seem that you think so, judging from your decision. Your talk to Mr. Allison savored strongly of the character of a certain judge that figured in the interest of King James II. in 1683. You say substantially: "We will, in consideration of your being a good man, let you off by paying costs, or twelve months in the chain-gang; but if you come up here again we will put you where you won't get out of the State for a long time." Again I ask, is this your highest idea of justice and right?

Now, Judge Janes, you have made an example of this good man, Mr. Allison, in order to deter bad men from committing the heinous crime of working on Sunday. Now let me tell you that there is but a few of the good citizens in the State of Georgia who do not violate that Sunday law every week in the year, and you by that decision have given to every bad man in the State the opportunity to

drag any of these good citizens up before you, or some other judge, where they may be deprived of their property, or liberty. Is this the highest idea you can express for the good of humanity?

Then again, here are the cars thundering along right by the court house and churches, making more disturbance than all the Seventh-day Adventists in the State would working Sunday. Isn't this a violation of the Sunday law? The corporation can violate the law with impunity, but the good citizen, Mr. Allison, must be made an example so as to deter all bad men from violating this Sunday law. Your plea about civil law is on a par with the Jeffrey judges that hung Quakers on Boston Common and burned heretics in England, Holland, and Spain. They were good men, but the civil law must be carried out to the letter—that was the oath of these judges.

This case is not the first legal crime that has been committed in the Douglasville court house; it is not the first time that good men have been punished legally, when they had done no wrong to any person; but the law must be carried out even if it grinds good citizens to powder, because this is your oath.

Now Judge Janes, you should keep in mind that *you*, the same as all the rest of mankind, must, some time in the future, stand up in a court and render an account for all acts done in the past. Your plea of civil law, and of your oath that compels you to injure one in person or property who has committed no crime nor injured anyone (there was no evidence that Mr. Allison had injured anyone in person or property) won't amount to much in a court where eternal justice is to be done. You will find, sir, in that court it is no crime to work on Sunday, and all legislators and lawyers in the world cannot make it a crime either. You will find, sir, that you are the criminal in this Allison case. He had done nothing wrong to anyone. No human enactment can ever abrogate the eternal principle of justice. You, sir, injured him without any just cause, and you may some time in the future find yourself in a state, or condition, that you cannot get out of, until you have paid the last farthing. Chattel slavery was made legal, but the breath of eternal justice swept it away with a vengeance. *Deo postulo justitia et rectus ad omnis.*

A. M. RICHARDSON.

JUDGE RICHIE'S DECISION.

The defendants are presented on warrants drawn under Section 1,303, of the Kentucky Statutes, and charged with "keeping open a bar-room for the sale of spirituous, vinous and malt liquors on Sunday." To these warrants a general and special demurrer have been interposed, and upon these demurrers the cases are submitted.

The special demurrer raises the question of jurisdiction. The Criminal Code at Section 13, Subsection 5, provides: "Justices shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Courts in the prosecution of offenses, the punishment of which is limited to a fine not exceeding \$100."

Subsection 6, of the section aforesaid, declares that "Judges of the County Courts shall have the same original criminal jurisdiction as Justices' Courts."

The misdemeanors with which the defendants are charged are punished by fines of not less than \$10 nor more than \$50. Clearly then, these offenses are within the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace, and therefore within the jurisdiction of this court. It follows then that the special demurrer to the jurisdiction of this court must be overruled. The general demurrer, conceding the technical sufficiency of the warrant under Section 1,303, questions the constitutionality of that section.

Prior to the adoption of the new constitution we had a general Sunday law, universal in its terms and

uniform in its punishments. That law has been more than once considered by the Court of Appeals and always held to be constitutional, and if the law was the same now as then, and the constitution the same now as then, the constitutionality of this act would not be an open question in Kentucky. However, in enacting laws under the new constitution the legislature has seen fit to ingraft on what was the general Sunday law, Sections 1,303 and 1,322, and has also materially changed the intentions and language of the act, and it is now contended that Section 1,303, denouncing a heavier penalty upon persons selling liquor on Sunday than upon any other violator of the act is unconstitutional, because the same is special legislation. On the contrary, it is urged, with much research and learning by the learned assistant county attorney that this section is no part of the Sunday law, but is a part of the liquor law of the State. I can not, however, concur in this view. The mere position in the statute books is immaterial. That the purpose of this act was to compel the observance of the Christian Sabbath by all persons who did not observe some other day of the seven, is, I think, evidenced alike by this prosecution and the construction always given to this act. That it was intended to operate more severely upon the vender of ardent spirits is demonstrated by the increased penalty.

Section 59 of the constitution of 1890 provides: "No special law shall be passed to regulate the punishment of crimes and misdemeanors," and "in all cases where a general law can be made applicable, no special law shall be enacted."

The Kentucky authorities cited by learned counsel for the prosecution consider alone the general Sunday law existing prior to 1880, the constitutionality of which could not be questioned either upon principle or authority. But the Kentucky Court of Appeals has never construed Section 1,303 of the present statutes at all, *nor has it ever construed any Sunday law in the light of the Bill of Rights as amended.* I am of the opinion that both under the constitution of 1849 and the constitution of 1890 this section is void as special legislation discriminating against one class of citizens.

That one general law, applicable to all persons, can be made, is demonstrated by the fact that upon our statute books from 1801 to 1880 we had just such a law, but the legislature, by discriminating against one class of citizens, under the act, and seeking to exempt certain other classes from the operation of the act, have cast a cloud over the whole law. I am of the opinion that Section 1,303 is violative of Section 59 of the new constitution, and is void. It follows, therefore, that the general demurrer to the three warrants must be sustained and the defendants discharged.

Neither of these defendants is arraigned under Section 1,321, but together with the learned Circuit Judge, I am asked to express my opinion as to its constitutionality. It is not involved in this case, but as counsel with great labor and patience have presented the matter, we have consented to state our views.

General Sunday laws are upheld by the courts as legitimately within the purview of the police power of a State, and not because of any religious idea that they represent. But not even the police power can discriminate. It must apply with equal force to all. The Sunday law, as it existed from 1801 to 1880, applied to all persons and forbade labor on Sunday, except the ordinary household offices and works of necessity and charity, but did not apply to any person who is a member of a religious society who observed any other day of the seven as a Sabbath. The recent revision of our laws, however, undertakes to except from the operation of this act persons who labor in the maintenance or operation of a ferry, skiff, steamboat or steam or street railway. The statute is silent as to the reason for these exceptions. It is urged that the legislature has construed these to be works of necessity, but it is not the work of the legislature to construe the law; that is the duty of the courts. Counsel for the prosecution concede great trouble at this point, but attempt to meet the objection by arguing that the exceptions are void and not the law. But this is not reconcilable with the usual canons of construction. The Court of Appeals within a month past has held that the operation of an excursion train

on Sunday is a labor of necessity, and that the employes and railroad are not punishable under this act. Here, then, is a statute applicable to all persons except wharfmen, steamboatmen, railroaders, ferrymen, and men who may operate skiffs.

These men, notwithstanding their faith in the Christian Sabbath, may be compelled by their employes to work on that day without fear of punishment, while on the other hand a citizen, however sincere his faith, and devout his observance of some other day of the seven than Sunday, yet if he be not a member of some religious society, is not exempt from the operation of the act. If this law is to be enforced as a humanitarian measure, bringing to the tired laborer a needed surcease from toil, why except from its benign operation the five classes above referred to, than whom none work more assiduously? It is at this point that the "rest-from-labor" argument fails, and the statute stands upon the religious idea alone. The Act of 1801 was on principle and authority constitutional. With its ingrafted exceptions, I am of the opinion that it is unconstitutional, both because it comes within the inhibitions of the new constitution against special legislation, and because it is a religious statute, violative of Article 5 of the Bill of Rights.

I do not hold that a general Sunday law may not be passed in accordance with the new constitution. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that such a law could be passed, but I am forced to the conclusion that Sections 1,303, 1,321 and 1,322 are each and all out of harmony with the provisions of the organic law, and, therefore, void.

This section of the constitution is unique in its provisions that "the civil rights, privileges, and capacities of no person shall be taken away or in any wise diminished or enlarged on account of his belief or disbelief of any religious tenet, dogma or teaching."

This recognition and protection of the disbeliever as well as the believer I find in no other published constitution. Any punishment for non-observance of a "religious day" is violative of this section.

CHARLES S. RICHIE, Judge.

A CRIME TO LAUGH.

[From London Queen.]

THE introduction of the Sunday bill by Lord Hobhouse brings us the fact that we are governed in respect to Sunday observations by an act of the year 1781.

It seems that a Sunday lecture can always be made the subject of prosecution. Some time ago a Sunday lecturer at Leeds was actually sacrilegious enough to make his audience laugh. The proprietor of the lecture hall was thereupon prosecuted for keeping a disorderly house.

Music can now be given in the open air on Sunday, but if it is given in a room nothing must be charged for chairs. In other words, it will be possible for any body of men and women to run Sunday concerts and Sunday lectures with the view of making them pay expenses, but not for their own profit.

In the years 1200 and 1201 one Eustace, abbot of Flaye, preached throughout England the observance of the Lord's day. He enjoined that no kind of work should be done after the ninth hour on Saturday until sunrise on Monday.

According to the manner of the times his preaching was backed up by miracles. At Beverly a carpenter persisting in finishing a wedge after the ninth hour fell down in paralysis. In the same town a woman went on with her weaving after the ninth hour. Result, paralysis, with loss of voice.

At Rafferton a man made a loaf and baked it on Saturday evening. When he broke it on Sunday morning, blood started from it. At Wakefield a miller, grinding after hours, ground out blood instead of flour.

In Lincolnshire a woman made a loaf and

put it in the oven. It remained dough! In the same county a pious woman, finding it was the ninth hour, set aside her loaves. Lo! on Sunday morning the loaves were beautifully baked without any fire at all.

And yet, the chronicler adds, in spite of these miracles the people have returned to the holding of markets on the Sunday!

"DEAD TO THE LAW."

BY J. F. BALLENGER.

AMONG the opposers of the Seventh-day Sabbath, those who are the most desperate in their efforts to get rid of the fourth commandment, seize upon the expression in Rom. 7:4: "Ye also are become dead to the law," and a few other similar expressions, to prove that the law enforcing the seventh day is dead, and therefore all are released from its observance. I freely admit that if the Sabbath command is dead, no person is under any obligation to keep it. But the reader will notice that the apostle is talking about the law *as a whole*; hence, if one command is dead, then all are dead, and, consequently, no one is required to obey any one of the ten commandments.

But let us examine the character of the law. In verse 7, Paul says, "Is the law sin? God forbid." If it is not sin it must be righteousness. Surely, there could be no call for the abolition of a righteous law; and in verse 12, he says, "Wherefore the law (as a whole) is holy, and the commandment (the tenth commandment which slew the apostle, see verse 7) holy, and just, and good;" and in verse 14, he says, "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." Reader, can you see any reason why a law that is righteous, holy, just, good and spiritual, should be slain? Further, if the law was abolished because it bore the above characteristics, then it was abrogated in order to legalize the opposites,—unrighteousness, unholiness, injustice, evil and carnality.

How any person outside the realm of darkness could ever argue for a moment that the law of Romans 7 could ever have been killed is a mystery only explained in the light of such texts as Matt. 6:23: "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"

How, then, shall we understand the expression, "dead to the law"? The reader will notice that the apostle adds, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law *by the body of Christ.*" Then it is through the death of Christ our substitute that we become dead to the law. When the Saviour's body was slain on the cross it was to make satisfaction to the divine law; and every child of Adam was included in that sacrifice. "Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6). He gave his flesh for "the life of the world" (John 6:51). "He is the propitiation (or satisfaction) . . . for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2). So that when Christ "bare our sins in his own body on the tree" (1 Peter 2:24), every sinner was included in that death.

Herein is seen the grace or favor of God which bringeth salvation, that hath appeared to all men (Titus 2:11). But all men will not accept the favor of God; many of them may change the truth of God into a lie, and worship the creature more than the Creator (Rom. 1:25); or they may turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ (Jude 4). Yet, notwithstanding all their sins and unbelief, no person will ever die a natural death or the death entailed by the sin of Adam as a *penalty* for the violation of the divine law.

The penalty is inflicted in the "second death," and as this death cannot hurt the believer who has overcome through faith in the death of Christ (Rev. 2:11), therefore no one who is "dead with Christ" will ever suffer the penalty of the law. He has already done this in the person of Christ, his substitute. Christ was made sin for us, "made under the law." The law had dominion over him and demanded his life; and when he died "the just for the unjust," we died in him; as he died to the law, so we being in him are dead to the law by virtue of his death; and as he was raised to life freed from the condemnation of the law, so we by faith are raised with him to live a spiritual life, free from the condemnation of the law. The carnal mind, which is not subject to the law (Rom. 8:7), is taken away, and in its place the Spirit of God writes the law in the heart (Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10), and as the law is spiritual, therefore the believer walks in the Spirit and not in the flesh. The law witnesses to his righteousness (Rom. 3:21), and is established by his faith (verse 31). He delights in the law after the inward man (chap. 7:22). His experience is: "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day" (Ps. 119:97). He calls the Sabbath a delight: the holy of the Lord, and honors God in keeping it (Isa. 58:13).

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

[R. S. Owen, in *Atlanta Constitution*, June 8.]

Editor Constitution: Having read your reply to the *New Orleans Times-Democrat* on the "Georgia Sunday laws," I beg to present through your columns a plea in behalf of religious liberty. There are principles involved in this question which I believe should be more clearly understood, principles upon which are based the dearest rights of every American citizen—the limit of civil authority and the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

An honest, conscientious Christian has been sentenced to twelve months in the chain-gang in this State with the possibility of his being put to death for refusing to violate his conscience by working in that chain-gang on the seventh day of the week, and it is no fault of the law that this extreme penalty has not been inflicted. Had it not been that some unknown friend had paid Mr. Allison's fine, he would have now been toiling in the chain-gang, or, perhaps had forfeited his life rather than be disloyal to his God.

For what dark deed was he made subject to such an ordeal? He had defrauded no one, he had harmed no one, he had molested no one, no other man's rights had been invaded in the slightest degree. This he proposed to prove during his trial, but the court informed him that molesting others had nothing to do with his case. His only offense was that he had not practiced the religion of his neighbors. He had not observed the first day of the week as the Sabbath, after keeping the seventh day which he believed God required him to observe.

We shall not here discuss the question of which day is the Sabbath—that is a point on which many men differ, and every man has a right to his own opinion. But what we wish to call attention to is the injustice of the law that decides a religious question and then provides that such hardships may be inflicted upon those who differ from that decision in faith and practice. We have been wont to boast of the religious freedom which is guaranteed to all the inhabitants of this fair land. We have looked with horror upon the religious intolerances of some of the governments of the

Old World under which Christians have suffered in past ages such cruel persecutions, because they differed from the prevailing sentiment of those times. We have thanked God that the founders of our Republic, seeing the evils of religious legislation, sought to place in the Constitution a safeguard against it in the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." We have taken pride in the noble sentiment expressed in the constitution of the State of Georgia—"Perfect freedom of religious sentiment shall be and the same is hereby secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property or prohibited from holding any office or trust on account of his religious opinion." The only limit to this freedom is that "the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the people."

And now, in the face of all the advancement that has been made in this land of liberty, to behold an honest, inoffensive Christian man sentenced to the chain-gang to toil with common criminals for twelve long, weary months, for no other offense than that of exercising his God-given right to the convictions of his own conscience in regard to a religious observance, brings a shock to our sensibilities and seems to us like a dark blot on the last decade of the nineteenth century and a stain of reproach on the fair fame of the New South.

That Sabbath-keeping is a religious observance is evident not only from the testimony of Scripture and the ministers of all religious sects; but the law of Georgia itself recognizes it as such in declaring it to be the Lord's day. The Lord himself instituted the Sabbath, and calls it a sign between him and his people. Those who observe the seventh day keep it as a memorial of the creation of the world, while those who regard the first day as the Sabbath keep it in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, so that in either case the Sabbath is as truly a religious memorial day as the Lord's supper and baptism are religious memorials. If the State may decide one religious question, why may it not decide all? And if it may enforce one religious institution, why may it not on the same principle enforce all? Those questions have been answered by the United States Senate, in replying to a request for a Sunday law. The committee said, "If a solemn act of legislation shall in one point define the law of God or point out to the citizens one religious duty, it may, with equal propriety, proceed to define every part of divine revelation and enforce every religious obligation." (*American State Papers*, page 111.) So if this course of religious legislation were pursued to its logical end, we should have a revival of the terrible scenes of the Dark Ages, and our Government would be turned into an engine of persecution as truly as was Rome in the days of Nero.

If we would avoid the worst results in the line of religious persecution, let us beware of the first steps in that direction. Massachusetts once required all parents to have their children sprinkled. The Baptists, who did not believe in sprinkling as the proper mode of baptism, refused to practice contrary to their faith, and were punished for violating the law. John Painter, of those days, was whipped, and like Mr. Allison of to-day, his only offense was that he refused to conform to a religious service which he believed to be contrary to the will of God. The experiences of the Baptist people, in suffering for their faith, lead them to appreciate the situation when other Christians are brought under similar circumstances.

At the sixty-third anniversary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, held at Saratoga, N. Y., June 1, 1895, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"WHEREAS, It has been widely reported that in some portions of the United States, professing Christians who have conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week as a day of religious rest and worship, and who thereafter on the first day of the week have conscientiously engaged in labor which in no wise disturbed their fellow-citizens who desire to observe the first day, have, for this act, been arrested and fined and imprisoned and sent to the chain-gang; therefore,

"Resolved, That (assuming the facts to be as reported) we earnestly and solemnly protest against this violation of the right of religious liberty, a right for which our fathers suffered imprisonment, the spoiling of their goods, stripes, exile and death itself."

ALLISON AT HOME.

BY R. S. OWEN.

SINCE the arrest and imprisonment of J. Q. Allison for working on Sunday has become so widely known, the public will be interested in his present situation.

I recently visited his neighborhood, and found him enjoying again his happy home, made more cheering than ever by the fact that his wife, who heretofore had felt unreconciled to his being a Seventh-day Adventist, is now united with him in that faith. Thus it is with persecution: it will drive more into the truth than it will from the truth.

As we walked back with Mr. Allison upon the farm, which is almost wholly surrounded by native forest, until we came to the little patch of ground where the work was done, for which he was sentenced to twelve long months of hard labor in the chain-gang; as we stood upon that sequestered spot back of a thick growth of pine woods, far away not only from any house of worship, but from any dwelling or public road, we could but sense the injustice of the Atlanta Constitution in upholding Allison's conviction on the ground of "Christians having their devotions interrupted." Upon inquiry, we find it to be the universal testimony of his neighbors that they had never been disturbed by his Sunday work.

The two witnesses, Mr. Allison's nearest neighbors, who had been obliged to testify to his working on Sunday, are deeply mortified over one statement in the report of the trial in the SENTINEL; not that it is incorrect, but that they fear the public will draw a wrong conclusion from it. The statement is this:—

Both the witnesses testified, on direct examination, that they would not have seen Mr. Allison at work had they not gone to the place where he was on purpose to see him.

Now, they fear that the public will suppose that the object of their visit was that they might have him brought before the court, which was not the case. They went there for another purpose. They did not want him arrested, nor did they want to testify against him. This they wish the public to understand. Their feelings upon this point reminded me of an experience I once heard of a temperance speaker. To illustrate a certain point he said to a man in the audience: "Now, suppose that you should go and get drunk." "But," said the man, "I don't get drunk." "I know you don't get drunk," said the speaker, "I was only supposing the case." "Now, suppose that you should get drunk, and ——" "Sir," interrupted the

man, "I never get drunk; and I regard it as a disgrace upon me for you to suppose that I do."

So it is with these neighbors of Mr. Allison. They would not interfere with his religious liberty, and they consider that it would be a disgrace upon them for the public to suppose that they would.

It is evident that the one who did enter the complaint is ashamed of his actions, for he keeps his identity concealed from the public. But there are always enough unprincipled men to take advantage of an unjust law, and the probability is that while this Sunday law is on the statute books of Georgia, the State will be used as an engine of persecution.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS.

A YOUNG man sends us the following from Atlanta, Ga., and asks for it a place in our columns:—

Why is it that the law of Mississippi and the law of Georgia can punish a man for hoeing in his field on Sunday, and does not punish men for running a railroad engine or street car, or for driving a horse? Is not this all work? and are not those who do it breaking the commandments of God, and will they not be punished for it? If the law punishes a man for hoeing his garden, why not punish him for working at anything else? Jesus Christ said, if an ox fall into the ditch on Sunday, to help him out, but is an engine helping an ox out of a ditch? Is a motor-man helping an ox out of a ditch? Is a man that takes a pleasure ride on Sunday afternoon helping an ox out of a ditch?

Now, if the code of Georgia or Mississippi or of any other State is going to punish one man for work of one kind, why not punish all other men for all other kinds of work?

Please read Exodus 20:8-11: "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."

The writer of the foregoing seems to think that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that the fourth commandment applies to that day. A little investigation will, we think, satisfy him that such is not the case; that Sunday is not the Sabbath, and that not only does the fourth commandment have no reference to it except as one of "the six working days," but that there is absolutely no scriptural authority for Sunday observance. However, compulsory Sunday observance would be no better if that day were the true Sabbath instead of a mere counterfeit.

PRESS COMMENTS ON SOUTHERN PERSECUTION.

[From the Pine Island (Minn.) Record, May 24.]

FROM Georgia comes the news that J. Q. Allison has been sentenced to the "chain-gang" for laboring on Sunday. Mississippi is also in for persecution, and arrests are being made. A singular fact in these cases is that only those who observe Saturday as a Sabbath according to the Bible are being prosecuted for violation of a bad law. And yet we are told that the world is getting better.

[From the Republican, Springfield, Mass., May 31.]

THE Sunday observance laws of Georgia deal as harshly with those who believe in the observance of some other day as do the laws of Tennessee, and Seventh-day Adventists find prisons and chain-gangs waiting for them if they obey their consciences instead of the statutes made and provided. . . .

Public sentiment in Georgia is grossly misrepresented by the laws of that State, or else it classes Seventh-day Adventists, who think that they are commanded by the Bible to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath and to work on the other six, with criminals of all sorts, black and white, thieves, drunkards and vagabonds. If it does not so class them, why permit them to be sentenced to herd and suffer with such criminals in the chain-gang?—the most humiliating of all punishments to such a man as Judge Janes said Allison was, honest, moral, and law-abiding in all respects save in this one particular where his conscience and the law ran at cross purposes. It does not seem possible that zeal for Sunday observance is so fierce as these laws indicate in Georgia or in Tennessee, or anywhere else; if it was, there would be no Sunday newspaper, no Sunday trains, no Sunday street cars and no trafficking of any kind, nothing but the Puritan Sabbath. The truth is that such laws are anachronisms, and do not represent the sentiment of the people of any State; not even of Christian people and Sunday-keepers.

Sunday Fanaticism.

[From the American Israelite, Cincinnati, April 25.]

NOTHING is ever settled in this country until it is settled right. These wise words of the immortal Lincoln are of great comfort to all patriots. Settled right undoubtedly means in accordance with justice, with reason, with common sense. Therefore it is to be hoped that at no distant day the so-called Sunday question will be settled right. In the meantime there will be much persecution, much folly and much suffering. The innocent will suffer with the guilty; the clergy will prove unworthy of the cloth, and the holier-than-thou man will strut abroad so wrapt in the mantle of narrowmindedness and shortsightedness as to be unable to perceive the signs of the times. . . .

In Tennessee there is a law which forbids "doing or exercising any of the common vocations of life on the Lord's day, commonly called the Sabbath." The courts of that State have construed the law to mean that no work may be done on Sunday. Recently one, Wm. S. Burchard, was convicted and sentenced to jail because he had pulled fodder (that is, stripping the blades off the standing corn), out of sight of the public road or any public place, on Sunday, and because he had dug a well on Sunday.

It is impossible to find language adequate enough to condemn and ridicule such a proceeding. Such procedure is a disgrace to Tennessee and to the country at large; and one marvels that the law has not been repealed.

In the Nashville American of April 14, Mr. Wm. P. Tolley, one of the most zealous opponents of the iniquitous law, published an eloquent petition which was presented to the General Assembly of Tennessee for the repeal of the law. It is hoped that the petition will be favorably acted upon.*

In Cincinnati the agitation for the strict enforcement of the Sunday law is renewed again. Charges were recently preferred against a lieutenant of police because he refused to stop a baseball game, etc. . . . What the outcome will be it is impossible to say. But this much is true, to wit: that the attendance at church will not be affected one way or the other. Those who wish to attend services will go irrespective of Sunday opening or Sunday closing.

* So far was the Tennessee Legislature from favorable action on this petition, that a proposition merely to amend the law was defeated by a vote of 57 to 24.—EDS. SENTINEL.

The trouble with the Sunday fanatics, as with all fanatics, lies in this, that they refuse to study the question historically. The *Literary Digest*, in an article, "How Primitive Christians Observed Sunday," says: "A growing discussion on the proper character of Sabbath observance seems to be one of the features of recent magazine and newspaper literature. The Sunday question is always a live one, not only in theological but in political circles as well, and a contribution recently made to it by Prof. Zahn, of the University of Erlangen, Bavaria, is one of importance. Prof. Zahn is accounted the leading conservative specialist in Germany in the department of early Christian research, his only rival, Harnack, being classed among the Liberals. Zahn's conclusions will not, however, bring strength to the Sabbatarian side of the controversy, as he holds that there is nothing in the earliest Christian literature to support the views of the Sabbatarians. The results of his research are set forth in the sixth of a series of historical studies published together under the title, 'Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche' (Sketches from the Life of the Primitive Church)."

He speaks of the differences between the early Christians of the St. James type and those of the Pauline type in matters of Jewish ceremonials, but says that they were a unit regarding the Lord's day as entirely distinct from the Jewish Sabbath. Sometimes both days were observed, "but the Christians of the first three centuries," he says, citing Justin Martyr also in proof, "never thought of regarding the Sunday as the continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, or even to call this day 'Sabbath'"—the Day of the Lord, referring to Christ, being the name uniformly used. Prof. Zahn then continues as follows:—

"If we ask the Christians of the earliest centuries, the oldest witnesses as to the idea of Sunday, for the reason which they had in marking this one day above all the rest, they will with one voice declare, 'We celebrate this day because Christ on this day arose from the dead.' The Sunday was for them a weekly recurrence of the Easter festival. Throughout Sunday was regarded as a day of joy. While the Christians were accustomed on other days to pray kneeling, the resurrection of Christ of which this day was the memorial, gave them courage to stand upright on their feet before their God, and to forget their unworthiness, which has been buried by Christ in death, the memory of which has been celebrated on the preceding days on the knees. On Sunday the early Christians prayed standing. Already at a very early day the custom of celebrating Wednesday and Friday in addition to Sunday had been introduced into the church, and this brought out all the more sharply the characteristic idea of the Sunday worship. Those other days were days of fasting and humiliation; Sunday was a day of joyful and glad worship. On this day only did the services culminate in the memorial feast of the Saviour, the last supper, which belonged exclusively to the 'Day of the Lord.' To fast on Sunday was regarded as unseemly, and later even as a sin. And even apart from the services the Sunday was regarded as a day of rejoicing. Even the rigorous Tertullian, at the close of the second century, again and again emphasizes this. . . .

"That on this day the ordinary business and work of life were laid aside as much as possible, was regarded as a matter of course; but it is characteristic of the original character of Sunday observance that in the oldest Christian literature there is practically not a word about this matter. The negative idea of rest from daily labor did not act as a prime

factor in the conception of proper observance of this day. Christians are indeed rebuked for allowing their business to keep them away from the services; but not Sunday work itself but the overestimation of worldly work and indifference therein shown to God's Word and services, is pronounced as a grievous sin. Even as late as the fourth century, when writers warn against the celebration of the (Jewish) Sabbath by abstaining from work, a similar demand is not made as conditional for the Sunday.

"We see that this original conception of Sunday observance departs widely from that idea which zealous friends of Sunday observance are apt to emphasize in our day. It has not been my purpose to present a theory of the Sunday or to oppose false ideas. But history is a great teacher, and by repeating what she teaches, erroneous views of themselves fall to the ground."

Hence it would seem that Sunday, as has always been contended by the Jewish authorities and the Adventists and the like, is not a divine institution, but one merely established by man.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

[From the Lafayette (La.) Gazette, June 8.]

A FEW days ago that broad-minded journal, the *Times-Democrat*, commented upon a fresh case of religious persecution reported from Monroe County, Miss. With a few more papers like the *T.-D.*, religious fanaticism and puritanism would soon be at a discount in this country. It never misses an opportunity to speak words of condemnation of the fanatic's work, thereby calling the attention of fair-minded people to the outrages which are committed in the sacred names of religion and of law. The following is the special which called forth the timely editorial from the *Times-Democrat*:—

ABERDEEN, MISS., May 29.—Mr. R. T. Nash, a Seventh-day Adventist, was yesterday arraigned in Justice Rye's court, at Amory, in this (Monroe) county, on the charge of working in his field on Sunday. Nash pleaded guilty, and undertook the management of his own case, using the Bible for his law book. He keeps Saturday as religiously as a priest keeps Sunday. The case was continued until the second Saturday in June.

The Mississippi statute bearing upon the subject, in Section 1291, provides that "Any one who shall labor on the Sabbath day at any other than household duties, works of necessity or charity, or on railroads or steamboats, shall, on conviction, be fined not more than \$20 for every such offense.

By working in his field on Sunday, R. T. Nash has invited the deadly enmity of a few sanctimonious fools who have a peculiar style of serving the Lord. It will hardly meet with the approval of sensible people who are Christians at heart as well as in name. If the Seventh-day Adventists choose to keep Saturday as the Sabbath and do their farm work on Sunday, in what way do they interfere with the rights of the other creeds? Things have reached a pretty pass when a man cannot hoe his corn or plant peanuts on Sunday without being dragged before the courts as a common criminal by a lot of religious cranks.

We do not know any of the people who are persecuting the Seventh-day Adventists in Mississippi, but we will venture to say that they have not half as much religion as the victims of their hell-born hatred. The man who persecutes his neighbor on account of religion is more dangerous than the anarchist. The latter is an open enemy to society and is an outlaw, while the former pretends to be a meek follower of Christ when in reality he is an emissary of the devil.

AN ATTRACTIVE BOOK.

ONE of the most interesting and attractive books of travel which has come under our notice is "By Land and Sea Through Five Continents." It is published by the International Tract Society, but is not a religious book, though its author, G. C. Tenney, a minister of the gospel, has interwoven with his entertaining descriptions of foreign life and character, many important moral and religious truths. To the author's vivid word-pictures the publishers have added 144 beautiful illustrations, which, together with beautiful binding, make the book very attractive. It is sold by subscription, and will doubtless be popular with agents as it will certainly sell well. For particulars and terms to agents, address, International Tract Society, Battle Creek, Mich.

FACTS : FOR : THE : TIMES,

—CONTAINING—

Historical Extracts, Candid Admissions from Authors, ancient and modern, on the live questions of the present hour, political and religious.

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

A compilation of facts that are astounding, by Students of Biblical and Historical Research.

340 pages. Wine-colored cloth binding.

PRICE, Post-paid, - - - 75 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street
New York City.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.

BIBLES

We have on hand GENUINE OXFORD TEACHERS' BIBLES bound in Fine Brown Levant Morocco, Divinity Circuit, Calf Lined, Silk Sewed, Round Corners, Gold Edges. Size 5 x 7 3/4 inches.

Specimen of type.

An exhortation	DEUTERONOMY, XI.	to obedience.
Before CHRIST 1451.	CHAPTER XI. 1 An exhortation to obedience, 2 by their own experience of God's great works, 3 by promise of God's great blessings, 16 and by threatenings, 18 A careful study is required to God's words. 28 The blessing and curse is set before them.	Before CHRIST 1451.
a ch. 13. 12. d 30. 16. 20. 2 Zech. 3. 7.	T HEREFORE thou shalt love the LORD thy God, and keep his charge, and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments, always. 2 And know ye this day: for I speak not with your children which have not known, and which have not seen the chastisement of the LORD your God, d his greatness, e his mighty hand, and his stretched out arm, 3 And his miracles, and his acts, which he did in the midst of Egypt	14 That I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, u the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. 15 And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full. 16 Take heed to yourselves, s that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and a serve other gods, and worship them; 17 And then b the LORD's wrath be kindled against you, and he c shut up the heaven, that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit; and lest d ye perish quickly from off the
a ch. 8. 5. d ch. 5. 24. e ch. 7. 19. y Ps. 78. 12. d 133. 9.		t Lev. 26. 4. ch. 28. 12. u Joel 2. 23. Jan. 5. 7. s Ps. 104. 14. 2 Heb. give. y ch. 6. 11. Joel 2. 19. e ch. 29. 18. Job 31. 27. a ch. 8. 19. s 30. 17. b ch. 6. 15. c 1 Kin. 8. 35. 2 Chr. 6. 26. & 7. 13. d ch. 4. 26.

WE WILL MARK THE NAME OF ANY PERSON designated by the purchaser upon the outside or inside of the cover, IN GOLD LETTERS, if it is desired, WITHOUT EXTRA CHARGE, and send post-paid for only **\$5.85.** Address, **PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond St., New York.**

OAKLAND, CAL.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

FREE RAILROAD FARE

To - Bona - Fide - Home-Seekers - and - Locators.

FREE MOVING of all your Household Effects, Farm Implements, Live Stock, etc., from the time you reach the Line of the

AUGUSTA SOUTHERN R. R., in Georgia,

THE CAROLINA MIDLAND R. R., in South Carolina.

The Very Best Fruit, Garden and Farm Lands, Prices and Terms to suit—Climate Unsurpassed.

VERY LITTLE CAPITAL REQUIRED.

For all particulars, printed matter, etc., call or write to

F. S. MORDAUNT, GENERAL NORTHERN AGENT,
AUGUSTA SOUTHERN R. R.
CAROLINA MIDLAND R. R.

WALTER M. JACKSON,
COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION,
AUGUSTA GA.

225 DEARBORN ST. CHICAGO ILL



NEW YORK, JULY 4, 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.

MORE seventh-day observers are threatened with arrest in Georgia.

No further attempt has been made to prevent SENTINEL employes from working on Sunday.

THE Sunday-closing crusade has reached St. John, New Brunswick, and arrests for keeping open store have been made.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL says "amen" to the noble words of the *Primitive Catholic*, reprinted on this page; and let all the people say amen.

THE decision in the case of Robert Watt, the Seventh-day Adventist of Darrell, Ont., charged with laboring on Sunday, which was to be rendered June 24, has been postponed. Evidently the judge is perplexed. It is to be hoped that justice will prevail.

THE first-page article from the *Dayton* (Tenn.) *Republican* was written by the editor, W. O. Thomas, who held a consulship under President Harrison. Although Mr. Thomas must be writing dollars out of his pocket in defending the little body of seventh-day observers in his county, he continues the fight with increased zeal.

ROBERT R. WHALEY, of Church Hill, Md., has served out his sentence of thirty days in the county jail, inflicted upon him for setting out plants in his garden on Sunday, and has returned to his wife and children. It is to be hoped that the hearts of his persecuting Methodist neighbors have been touched by this his second imprisonment at their hands, and that they will now cease to harass him.

THE SENTINEL has vacated its pulpit this week in favor of the *Dayton* (Tenn.) *Republican*. This is not because we lack for something to say, but because we want our readers to listen to a new champion of religious freedom. The AMERICAN SENTINEL for nine years fought the battle comparatively alone, but within the last six months other champions have arisen to speak for the oppressed. God bless them all.

THIS number of the SENTINEL was held several hours to get the result of the trials of the Tennessee Adventists. One of our editors who was in attendance furnished the dispatch printed on this page. Next week we expect to publish a full account of the trials, with appropriate illustrations, secured with that

faithful delineator, the kodak. Extra copies will be furnished in any quantity. Price, \$1 per hundred; \$8 per thousand.

THE TENNESSEE TRIALS.

We stop the press to insert the following special telegram from Dayton, Tenn.

"Leach guilty, one case. Burchard and Hall guilty. England not guilty, two cases. Oscar England not guilty. Abbott, two disagreements. Dodson not guilty. Other cases follow. C. P. BOLLMAN."

There are six more cases yet to be tried besides the Abbott case. The telegram indicates that the trials are most interesting, and the reader may look forward to our next issue for important news.

By the time this paper reaches our readers the Dayton jail will contain not only the persons named in the telegram as "found guilty" but others not yet tried. Let all friends of religious liberty awaken and arouse the country to a realization of this cruel injustice.

THE PEDIGREE.

AND Satan begat paganism.

And Satan and paganism begat sun-worship.

And Satan and sun-worship begat the "venerable day of the sun."

And Satan and the "venerable day of the sun" begat the "Christian Sunday."

And Satan and the "Christian Sunday" and the paganizing bishops begat Sunday laws.

And Satan, the Sunday laws and the bishops begat the union of Church and State, papal Rome.

And Satan and papal union of Church and State begat the English union of Church and State.

And Satan and the English union of Church and State begat the Sunday laws of Charles Second.

And Satan, the English union of Church and State, and the Sunday law of Charles Second begat the colonial union of Church and State and the colonial Sunday laws.

And Satan, the colonial union of Church and State and colonial Sunday laws begat State union of Church and State and State Sunday laws.

And Satan, State Sunday laws and religious bigots begat the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia and other States.

WE understand that the superintendent of the House of Refuge in St. Louis has forbidden Catholic priests to perform their rites in that institution, although he admits the ministers of Protestant denominations. The superintendent attempts to justify his action on the ground that the Catholic mass is "idolatry." But on what authority does this public official pronounce this rite idolatry? Has the State of Missouri legally defined idolatry? If not, what business has this city official to permit the performance of certain religious rites as orthodox and prohibit others as idolatrous? Roman Catholic officials in Spain and South America have as much right to pronounce the worship of Protestants idolatry

and prohibit it, as has a Protestant official in the United States to pronounce the Roman Catholic mass "idolatry," and exclude its priests from public institutions.

It is such inconsistencies as these that hurt the cause of religious liberty and show that much of the agitation against papal domination is based on passion and prejudice, and not on principle. Our religious liberties are as much in danger from these "Protestants" as from the most aggressive Roman Catholics.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION UN-AMERICAN.

[From the *Primitive Catholic*, New York, June 15.]

It is with great interest we have followed the trial of the Sabbatarian, Mr. J. Q. Allison, of Douglasville, Ga. This gentleman is a member of a Christian denomination that holds that the seventh instead of the first day of the week should be the day of rest.

He observes like the orthodox Jew the Sabbath and works on Sunday. Mind you, he does not deprive anybody on Sunday of his rest, he interferes in no way whatever with the Sunday practice of any other citizen. Yet through the chicanery of some men, members of other Christian organizations, he is brought under the law for working in his own fields on Sunday. He is found guilty of having violated a statute of the State, he is condemned to one year of labor in the chain-gang. And, gentlemen, this is Christian America!

Down in Baltimore, a Mr. Whaley, formerly a member of a Methodist Church, with his family left Methodism and joined the Seventh-day Adventists. Some of his former co-religionists, good Methodist brothers, see him fixing his garden on Sunday. Their righteousness is shocked, they enter a complaint against him, though they knew that this man conscientiously had observed his "Lord's day," that he was not making himself a public nuisance, but quietly worked in his own private garden. Consequence: Mr. Whaley, who is a journeyman carpenter, has to go to jail for thirty days; he was locked in a cell May 27th to serve out his sentence.

This is Christianity? Gentlemen, where is your consistency? You yell yourselves hoarse sometimes over the persecutions your missionaries have to undergo in foreign lands by the Romish authorities and laws prevailing in those lands. We all cry with you, shame! and are ready to agitate with you to change this state of affairs. But, look around, lo! what are you doing to your brother in America? Next time you go into your class-meetings open your Bible at the 14th chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans and have it all talked over with the brothers and sisters. For shame's sake let us be consistent, let us have more of the sweet Spirit of Him whom Paul really represents in his writings.

Verily we believe if the Spirit of Jesus Christ were not acutely alive in the hearts of the laity of our churches, some of them with their array of talent and head-religion, as represented by the doctors and the greater than such, would become as despotic and tyrannizing as Rome.

Oh, for more of the Holy Ghost to even matters and smooth them over.

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.