


AMERICAN SENTINEL



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT: FOR I CAME NOT TO JUDGE THE WORLD, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD."

Vol. 10. No. 32.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.



ENFORCING THE "LAW" IN SPAIN—THE INQUISITION IN SESSION.

"The laws against the violation of our day of rest are unrepealed, and no matter whether just or unjust, wise or unwise, . . . they should be enforced."—*Memphis Commercial-Appeal*.

THE ENFORCEMENT OF "LAW."

"WE have a law, and by our law he ought to die,"¹ has been the justification of injustice and persecution in all ages.

It was civil "law" that cast the three Hebrews into the fiery furnace;² that consigned Daniel to the lions' den;³ that put to death the apostles; that gave to the wild beasts the early Christians; that clothed with authority the Inquisition; that burned Huss and Jerome and tortured and put to death millions of

martyrs in the Dark Ages; that whipped, banished, and hanged Quakers and Baptists in New England and Virginia, and that is today imprisoning honest men in Maryland and driving Christians in the chain-gang in Tennessee.

Except in isolated cases of mob violence, no martyr ever suffered except under the color and forms of civil "law;" and yet men are slow to learn the lesson that mercy is above statute, that justice is above "law;" that any act which contravenes the laws of nature, that attempts to alienate inalienable, God-given rights, is not law and ought

to be treated as void in practice as it is in fact.

"By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back."⁴

The measure of religious liberty which we enjoy in this favored land to-day, is due, under God, to the fact that God-fearing men violated so-called civil laws, and continued to violate them, and to suffer the penalty, until by their sufferings they brought their fellowmen to the recognition of the fact that there

¹ John 19 : 7.

² Dan. 3.

³ Dan. 6.

⁴ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

is a limit to civil authority; that human law is not supreme; that God has not abdicated the throne of moral dominion; that what other nations call religious toleration is in reality religious rights, of which "government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small;" that though "despotic power may invade those rights, Justice still confirms them."⁵

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

"Backward look across the ages and the beacon-moments see,

That, like peaks of some sunk continent, jut through Oblivion's sea;

Not an ear in court or market for the low foreboding cry

Of those Crises, God's stern winnowers, from whose feet earth's chaff must fly;

Never shows the choice momentous till the judgment hath passed by."⁶

The press of the country has spoken out nobly in denunciation of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee and elsewhere. But there are a few ignoble exceptions. The *Commercial-Appeal*, of Memphis, ridicules and slanders the persecuted men, and then says:—

The laws against the violation of our day of rest are unrepealed, and no matter whether just or unjust, wise or unwise, they should be enforced.⁷

This sentiment is worthy of an Inquisitor of the "Holy Office," and had the editor of that paper lived in the days of the Inquisition, he would, if consistent, have said: "The laws against the violation of our religion are unrepealed, and whether just or unjust, wise or unwise, they should be enforced." Yea, he would have stood by and seen the cruel, red-hot pinchers sear and tear the flesh of the tortured victim; or, perchance, he would have himself heated the instruments of torture or brutally bared the breast of the shrinking maiden or of the devoted mother to the gaze of the rabble and to the bloody work of the scarcely more cruel iron.

The *Evening Sentinel*, of Knoxville, Tenn., also says, "Enforce the law," though it does not manifest the bitterness shown by the *Commercial-Appeal*. In its issue of July 22, the *Sentinel* publishes a number of interviews with ministers at Knoxville, from which we make the following extracts:—

The [Evening] *Sentinel* man interviewed Rev. Dr. Moore, pastor of the Church Street Church, on the question, putting three questions to him, which he answered, as follows:

⁵ United States Senate, Jan. 19, 1829.

⁶ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

⁷ The utter heartlessness and hypocrisy of this utterance will be better understood when it is known that the *Commercial-Appeal* is published Sunday as on other days, in flagrant violation of the Sunday statute of Tennessee.

"Are you in favor of the strict enforcement of the laws in Tennessee against sabbath desecration?"

"As every other good citizen ought to be, I am in favor of the strict enforcement of all laws till they are repealed. If they are good laws let them be enforced, if they are bad, let them be repealed."

"What do you think of the recent imprisonment of the Seventh-day Adventists in Rhea County for working on Sunday?"

"I think Seventh-day Adventists, as well as any other people, should be punished according to law, for violations of law."

And so Dr. Moore, had he lived in the days of the Inquisition, would have gazed unmoved upon the *auto-da-fé*, and as the flames encircled their victims he would have said, if consistent: "As every other good citizen ought to be, I am in favor of the strict enforcement of the laws till they are repealed. I think these Protestants, as well as any other people, should be punished according to law, for violations of law."

To the *Evening Sentinel's* question Rev. Thomas C. Warner, D. D., replied:—

Laws are enacted with reference to the punishment

dogmas of Rome; he must, if in France or Spain, or the Netherlands, have stood by the burning pile, or by the gallows tree, and said:—

"The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books."

In view of such utterances, is it any wonder that the prophet of God, in describing the very times in which we live, said: "Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter"?*

It is true that thus far the administration of the Sunday laws of the various States has been very mild compared with the acts of the Inquisition to which reference has been made.

But this does not alter the fact that these men

have been taken from their homes for no offense against their fellowmen; they have been unjustly deprived of their liberty and been branded as criminals and worked as convicts for a purely religious offense, for acts done in accordance with the dictates of conscience and not trenching upon the rights of others. Thus the authorities have undertaken, by persecution, to coerce men in matters of religion; and "it is incumbent on the authors of persecution," says Gibbon, "previously to reflect, whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. . . . The fine which he [the persecuted] is unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law, and his contempt suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment."†

This is well illustrated in the cases of the Tennessee Adventists. Men can never fall into the hands

of more merciful officers than those into whose hands the Rhea County Adventists have fallen. Four months ago Judge Parks imposed a fine of only \$2.50 in each case, and remitted even that. He also recommended the pardon of the convicted men. At the recent term of court he fined those previously convicted three times as much as he had previously done; and in one instance where the defendant had been twice convicted previously, once before a justice of the peace, and once in the Circuit Court, Judge Parks imposed a fine of \$12.50, five times the amount of the fine imposed four months before. Thus the State of Tennessee, as represented in this thing by its courts, has entered upon a course that must end in the infliction of the death penalty; for it is not a supposable case that these men will violate their consciences even to save their lives; and certainly the temper



ENFORCING THE "LAW" IN TENNESSEE—ADVENTISTS IN THE CHAIN-GANG.

"I think Seventh-day Adventists, as well as any other people, should be punished according to law, for violations of law."—Rev. Dr. Moore.

of the evil-doer, and for the protection of society in all its rights and interests. The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books. The surest way to secure the modification or repeal of an unjust law is to illustrate its prejudice by enforcing it. Whatever may be my private opinion touching the Sunday laws of Tennessee, I am in favor of their impartial execution. Whether they interfere with a man's religious views or his business practices, so long as they are of record for the regulation of public conduct and private practice, let them be rigidly applied.

It almost passes belief that these words could fall from the lips of a professed representative of the Man of Calvary, the Prince of Peace. Had this minister lived in the days of the Inquisition, when in every country in Europe and in every civilized country in the world it was against the "law" to disbelieve the

* Isa. 59: 14.

† "Decline and Fall," chap. 37, par. 3.

of Tennessee's law-makers must change very materially before the State will recede from the position it has taken.

Expressions of sympathy and kindly regard are no new thing in cases of persecution for conscience' sake. The ecclesiastical courts of the Dark Ages frequently expressed abundant sympathy for their victims and bespoke mercy for them at the hands of the civil authorities to whom they committed them to be dealt with "ACCORDING TO LAW;" mercy which they well knew their victims would not receive; for the condemned men were then, as the Tennessee Adventists are now, self-confessed "law" breakers, and it was a maxim then as it is now: "The law must be enforced." The result then was imprisonment, confiscation, torture and death by the rope, the ax, the fagot.

The ultimate end cannot be different now. True, the extreme penalty may not be so speedily reached as in the Middle Ages, but it is none the less inevitable. The death penalty is not only in the first attempt to coerce men in matters of conscience, but it is in the assumption of the right to coerce them; and the easy stages by which it is to be reached in Tennessee only make it the more certain. Had heavy penalties been imposed upon the Rhea County Adventists for the first offense, public sympathy would have been aroused in their behalf, and the so-called law might have been swept from the statute books; but the sympathy of the judge, the kindness of the sheriff and his deputies, the pardon by the governor, all serve to create a feeling that having been treated with such marked consideration, the Adventists ought to be willing to compromise, to surrender their consciences; and the fact that they will not compromise in the least, that they remain loyal to God and to conscience, is taken by many as an evidence of contumacy, and their further punishment is regarded as well-merited.

We have little hopes of influencing the State of Tennessee in this matter, or of even lightening the persecution of the Adventists there. Forewarned by the Word of God, we have long looked for such things in this country, and we expect them to increase rather than diminish. The return to the maxims and methods of the Dark Ages has begun, and the goal is certain. We expect to save from the ruinous course upon which they have entered neither the State of Tennessee nor yet the United States, which has in many ways approved the wicked principle which Tennessee has adopted; but we do expect to save honest-hearted individuals from participation in the wrong.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light."¹
"Hast thou chosen, O my people, on whose party thou shalt stand,
[Ere the Doom from its worn sandals shakes the dust against our land?"]¹

God has ordained civil government, but he has not thereby abdicated the throne of moral dominion. Every man must give account of himself to God. As Lowell has oddly but forcibly expressed it:—

If you take a sword and dror it, and go stick a feller thru,
Gov'ment aint to answer for it; God'll send the bill to you.

¹ Lowell's "Present Crisis."



THE AUTO-DA-FE—ENFORCING THE "LAW" IN FRANCE.

"As every other good citizen ought to be, I am in favor of the strict enforcement of all laws till they are repealed."—Rev. Dr. Moore.

It is no less a moral wrong to rob a man of his natural rights than to rob him of his money or other property; and it is no less a moral wrong to do it under the forms of law than it would be to do it without law.

Government cannot make right wrong nor wrong right, and the man who does a moral wrong in obedience to what he may understand to be law, or in obedience to that which is in fact human "law," will in the end find that he is not thereby freed from responsibility to God. Judge Parks, Attorney-General Fletcher, the grand and petit jurors, and the sheriff and his deputies, must each answer to God for the wrongs done the Adventists, and that at a bar where the plea of supreme court decisions and official oaths will not avail. The law of God will be the rule of that Judgment.

As Elder Colcord so impressively said last March: "There is a time coming when there will be a change, and God, and not man, will be the Judge—and in that court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God." And in that Judgment the authorities of Tennessee will be on trial, not as belonging to a system in which their identity is lost, merged into that moral nonentity, the



WHOLESALE HANGING OF PROTESTANTS—ENFORCING THE "LAW" IN THE NETHERLANDS.

"The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. . . . If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains on the statute books."—Rev. Thomas C. Warner, D.D.

State, but as individuals, each responsible for himself to God, and each to give account for himself of the deeds done in the body.

"Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages
but record
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems
and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the
throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the
dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch
above his own."¹

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF GOVERNMENT.²

THE fundamental principle of American jurisprudence is that stated in the Declaration of Independence: that government is instituted to secure the rights of man. These rights are simply artificial divisions of the law of nature.³ Now that which is to be secured—man's rights—precedes that which secures them—civil government. They are also superior to the provisions of government. Blackstone says: "This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."

In the universal recognition (whether acknowledged or not) of this principle—that there is a superior standard of justice—lies the force of charges that certain legislative acts are unjust. For injustice is nonconformity to the law of justice—which is the natural law. If the legislature were omnipotent, if there were no superior law, if it could make right wrong and wrong right, then any law it might make could not be said to be unjust. Its own acts would be the standard of justice. Right would then be conformity to human law, and wrong, violation of human law. The absurdity of such a position is evident—the claim would be preposterous; as long as the maxim, *Humanum est errare*, is true, there must be some invariable standard by which all human acts, public as well as private, are to be judged. This standard is variously termed the law of justice, the law of nature, natural rights, etc., and has reference to those abstract principles of justice and right imprinted more or less clearly on the sense of every man.

It is this law that receives formal recognition in our declarations of rights—declarations simply of certain parts of this superior law;—not that these rights are any more sacred when thus "declared" than they were before, but they are thus rendered more susceptible of enforcement. That they are simply a part of this higher law, and are so recognized, is proved by the provision so generally inserted in declarations of rights, that "the enumeration herein of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people"—a direct acknowledgment that these rights inhere in the people, and that such declaration is simply an express acknowl-

edgment of the most important principles of this law. Theoretically, it adds no force whatever to the rights. Such declaration is not dissimilar to the frequent instances where the State Constitutions reenact certain provisions of the National Constitution. Such reenactment does not make the provision any more binding; nor would a provision to the contrary annul the superior law. The State Constitution, in so far as it contravened the provisions of the National Constitution, would simply be void. Blackstone states this principle in his commentaries: "Those rights, then, which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as are life and liberty, need not the aid of human laws to be more effectually invested in every man than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable. On the contrary, no human legislature has the power to abridge or destroy them."

It is true that when recognized in our constitutions, our rights are more easily enforced, and hence this recognition was insisted on by Jefferson and other early American statesmen. But because this recognition may not exist, one's rights cannot therefore be legitimately trampled upon. Even if the Constitution did not prohibit the taking of private property for public use without just compensation, the legislature could not therefore legitimately do it. Nor can the legislature rightfully take the property of A and give it to B. There is no court in the land that would enforce such a decree. It would violate this superior law, and therefore be absolutely void. Hence, as government is instituted to secure the natural rights of man, and as our constitutions, in their declarations of rights, recognize this law and limit the powers of government accordingly, any law which deprives an individual of his rights is unconstitutional.

In accordance with this principle, Jefferson declared: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power, that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us. . . . The idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural right." This doctrine is coeval with courts of justice, and was unequivocally asserted and re-asserted centuries ago by England's most eminent chief justices. Said the distinguished Lord Hobart: "Even an act of Parliament, made against natural equity, as to make a man judge in his own case, is void in itself; for *jura naturæ sunt immutabilia*, and they are *leges legum*."

Thus this American principle is simply that which has been declared again and again by the greatest jurists which have ever adorned the English bench. In "Elements of Right and of the Law" (Section 520), Mr. Smith says: "It is a well-established principle of the American law, that an act of Congress in excess of the constitutional powers of the Federal Government is absolutely void; and so far as the direct infringement of private rights is concerned, this principle is in fact enforced by the courts; but in questions merely political, there is in general no practical means of restraining the execution of the law. Nevertheless such a law is void, and not only affords no legal justification to any one seeking to enforce it, but every subordinate officer, and indeed every private individual, has the right to disobey it, and will be vindicated in doing so by the courts."

The individual retains his natural rights, and government is limited accordingly. And as every individual equally has the natural right to worship whom he pleases and on what day he pleases (as long as he interferes not with this same liberty in others), or to refrain

from worshiping altogether, any human law interfering with this right, is, under our constitutions, void; it matters not whether it be a Sunday law, a law to compel him to attend church, or a law requiring any other religious observance, if it interferes with the right of a single individual, it is unconstitutional and absolutely void.

It is true that our judiciary have not always had a clear conception of this principle, and numerous decisions are flatly contradictory. But this is because in some cases precedents have been followed, not principles. Law, by some, has been regarded as a bundle of previous decisions, rather than as a science founded, like other sciences, on the immutable law of nature. The erroneousness of such a view must be obvious to all who have given it reflection. "The law of England," Lord Mansfield observed, "would be an absurd science were it founded upon precedent only." And Lord Coke repeatedly declared that the law "is the perfection of reason." "Reason," said he, "is the life of the law; nay, the common law itself is nothing else but reason."

In the onward march of civilization and in the advancement of science in general, progress has also been made in our system of jurisprudence;—not that principles have changed, for the law of nature is both unchangeable and immutable, but in this advancement clearer views of the principles of justice have been obtained. Progress is especially seen in connection with religious legislation and religious decisions. In America the dogma that Christianity is a part of the common law has been repudiated. Sunday laws have been declared to be unconstitutional. Religious proclamations, too, were so held by Jefferson and Madison; and the latter also states that public chaplaincies are an illegitimate departure from American principles. And as our judges and legislators incline more to justice and reason and less to the precedents dictated by bigotry, our Government will become still more liberal, and our Sunday laws, and all other religious laws, will go the way that similar laws have gone before them. In order to fulfill the objects of government, every man must be insured "the fullest liberty to exercise his faculties compatible with the exercise of like liberty by every other man." This is the principle asserted in the Declaration of Independence, when it says, "All men are created equal;" and the repeated departures from it in our religious laws which discriminate against the sabbatarian⁴ and infidel are a standing reproach to our Government, and a constant travesty on justice.

UNDER date of July 5th, the *San Juan Times*, Farmington, N. M., contains the following editorial note:—

The authorities of Colorado Springs, after thoroughly illtreating the members of the Salvation Army, have finished up by sending Captain Blanch Cole to jail for thirty days. This is religious persecution again with a vengeance. The lady is well known as a well educated woman, and was exerting herself to the utmost to aid the fallen and comfort the distressed. Her crime is the holding of open air meetings. Her sentence is looked upon as a disgrace to Colorado Springs and to Colorado.

The SENTINEL joins with the *Times* in condemning this treatment of Captain Blanch Cole. It is but another exhibition of that bigoted tyranny which imprisons Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee. We are glad to see our contemporary striking the hydra-headed monster whenever he appears.

¹ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

² From introduction to "American State Papers Bearing on Religious Legislation," by Prof. William Addison Blakely, of the University of Chicago.

³ It [the term "law of nature"] is not used among them that be learned in the laws of England to reason what thing as commanded or prohibited by the law of nature and what not; but all the reasoning in that behalf is under this manner:—

As when anything is grounded upon the law of nature, they say that reason will that such a thing be done; and if it be prohibited by the law of nature, they say that it is against reason, or that reason will not suffer it to be done.—*St. Germain's Doctor and Student*, 11, 12.

⁴ The Jew who is forced to respect the first day of the week when his conscience requires of him the observance of the seventh also, may plausibly urge that the law discriminates against his religion, and by forcing him to keep a second sabbath in each week, unjustly, though by indirection, punishes him for his belief.—Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations," page 476.

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.

THE INTOLERANT "BLADE."

IN its issue of July 11, the *Toledo Blade* closes an editorial comment on the conviction of the Tennessee Adventists, for doing common labor on Sunday, with the following:—

There is no constraint upon the Adventists to devote the day to religious duties, or to hold it sacred. The law does not compel them to observe the Christian Sunday any more than it does the Jewish Sabbath. It merely declares that no one shall perform labor on Sunday; and there is no good reason why the Adventists should not obey that law. Their claim that it is a matter of conscience not to obey it, is absurd.

We are tempted to deal sharply with this utterance, but instead, will make the following brief comments:—

1. The commonwealth of Ohio recognizes that a statute compelling seventh-day observers to rest on Sunday, is tyrannical, and consequently exempts from its penalties "those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath." True, this is but toleration, but it is better than the oppression of Tennessee. Therefore, when the *Blade* asks that seventh-day "observers abstain from their usual avocations on Sunday, through respect for the Sunday laws," it asks a sacrifice that its own State regards as an injustice.

2. The Sunday statute of Tennessee does bring constraint to bear on the Adventists to compel them to observe Sunday in the same manner enforced by the creeds of the Sunday-observing Protestant churches. All that the creeds require is cessation from labor. They do not attempt to invade the mind to ascertain whether it employs the Sunday in holy contemplation. Outward rest is all the creeds enforce, and this outward rest is just what the Sunday statute of Tennessee attempts to enforce. And just as the three Hebrew worthies refused to bow down to Nebuchadnezzar's image and *appear* to worship, so Seventh-day Adventists refuse to bow down to the papal Sunday and *appear* to observe the statute-intrenched dogma of Sunday sacredness.

3. Seventh-day Adventists know that Sunday observance is not commanded in Scripture. They know that Sabbath observance is commanded. They know that Sunday observance is a church ordinance only, and is put forth as the sign of an opposing system,—the mark of that system which declares that "the church has power to ordain feasts and holy days and to command them under sin." Seventh-day Adventists hold to a system of doctrine diametrically opposed to this system, and while thus believing they conscientiously refuse to wear the badge of the opposing system.

4. Sunday statutes attempt to abridge the inalienable right to teach what one believes. "Action speaks louder than words." The Sunday observer works on Saturday, and by that work proclaims to all beholders that he does not believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Likewise, the seventh-day observer labors on the first day of the week, and thereby proclaims to the beholder that he does not

believe that Sunday is the Sabbath. In Tennessee, the Sunday-keeper says, "No, you don't," and hastens to invoke the law to prohibit seventh-day observers from exercising a right which he loudly demands for himself.

If there is no conscience involved in being compelled to wear the badge of a false theological system,—if there is no conscience involved in the matter of teaching one's faith, then it is absurd for seventh-day observers to assert that they cannot conscientiously obey the Sunday statute. But it is a matter of conscience for Seventh-day Adventists to rest on Saturday and work on Sunday. Nevertheless they do not thereby disturb either the public or private devotion of their neighbors. Only two of the hundreds of witnesses which have testified against them in the scores of cases that have been brought against them in the last few years have testified that they were disturbed. One of these was engaged at the same time in driving a cow home which he had gone to a neighbor, on Sunday, to procure. The other claimed to be disturbed, though he testified under oath, that he neither saw nor heard the Sunday work of his Sabbath-keeping neighbor, but was mentally disturbed by the *mere knowledge* that the work was being done. No; Seventh-day Adventists believe in practising the Golden Rule, and if their persecutors would act upon this Christian precept, all this persecution would cease.

MISSIONARIES DISREGARD CIVIL "LAW."

SOME weeks since, we referred in these columns to the passage of a statute in Florida, prohibiting the co-education of the races. Referring to this "law," the *Independent*, of July 18, says, that "it affects not only teachers, but patrons of such schools—that is, parents may be imprisoned from three to six months in the county jail." The *Independent* further says: "The American Missionary Association will receive and teach pupils, white or black, who apply for instruction at Orange Park; and there will be teachers to run the risk of imprisonment. Scholars will be fitted to teach Florida schools, white or black."

We are glad the American Missionary Association has determined to disregard this so-called law. It is clearly violative of the constitution of Florida, because it is an infringement of religious liberty, and undertakes to interfere with missionary operations in that State. The gospel commission is,—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Missionaries, everywhere, find it necessary, not only to preach the gospel in the common acceptance of the term, but to establish schools wherein a Christian education may be given. This the American Missionary Association has done at Orange Park, Florida; and it is this which the statute referred to proposes to prohibit.

When American missionaries go to foreign lands and there establish schools for the instruction of the natives, and these schools are interfered with by the authorities, our Government protests against such interference, as an invasion of natural right and of the law of civilized nations. Here, an American State is proposing to do precisely the same thing. By this statute, Florida tells the American Missionary Association how it shall not preach the gospel in Florida; that it shall not educate colored pupils in a school conducted by white people. This attempt is as great an outrage upon religious liberty, and the excuses made for it, are as disingenuous as the Sunday laws of the various States, and the so-called reasons for maintaining them. Both are alike in open

violation of natural, God-given rights, and both should be alike disregarded; and we are glad that, as the *Independent* says, "there will be teachers ready to run the risk of imprisonment," for violation of this Florida statute.

We honor the *Independent* for the stand which it has taken in this matter; and we honor the American Missionary Association for its determination to disregard this iniquitous measure, just as missionary associations have always disregarded similar so-called laws, designed to hinder their work in heathen lands; and just as Christians always have and always must everywhere disregard human enactments which trench upon the sacred rights of conscience.

FROM A MINNESOTA JUDGE.

EDITOR OF AMERICAN SENTINEL: I have received several copies of your paper, and must say that I am well pleased with it. Its short articles that "hew to the line" are sure to be read. At first I gave it but little attention, but it kept coming, and I thought I better see what it amounted to. Beyond a doubt the SENTINEL is just the paper needed for the times. It is a pity that every reader cannot have a copy every week; and I want to say to every one who may pick up a copy of the SENTINEL, don't lay it down until you have read it.

Sunday is my Sabbath, and whether the teaching that Saturday is the Sabbath, makes the people any better may be doubtful; certainly they are not made worse thereby. He who believes that Saturday is the true Sabbath should be afforded the same protection as Sunday observers. It is surprising to hear of the persecution of the seventh-day people in Tennessee and other States. That they should be imprisoned for doing what they believe to be their duty to God, is a crime, notwithstanding statutes may read otherwise.

I have noticed that Judge Parks, who committed these men to prison, has been commended for his personal views upon this question, and justly so. Did he do right? Are his acts commendable? Let us see. Many of the early settlers of this country fled from a land of religious persecution, and when this Government was established care was taken that every one should have the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Of course, such conscientious rights must not abridge the rights of others. The Sabbath was ordained by God. The observance of it is an act of worship, and is so regarded by all worshiping people. Whether Saturday or Sunday be the true Sabbath must be left to each individual according to his own conscience. It cannot be decided by legislative acts without abridging the rights of conscience.

The statutes of Tennessee do not prohibit one from keeping Saturday as the Sabbath. They in effect say you can do so, but you must forfeit one-sixth of all you could otherwise earn during the six working days; that is, you must not work Sunday. If you will keep Sunday only, you need to forfeit nothing. So if one keeps Saturday he must pay a license for the right to do so. This is so palpably in violation of the principle upon which our Government was founded, and in violation of the Constitution, that it does seem that any court, even the lowest, would be justifiable in disregarding any such legislative enactments. These persecutions, they call them prosecutions, are a disgrace to the States; yes, and to the United States, which we call the land of liberty.

If we should seek to find the cause that has

lead to these conditions, no doubt we should find it in the *inclination of churches to advance their interests by legislative enactment*. The zeal of the Catholic Church in this direction exceeds all others. In fact, this church seems more political than religious. A few years ago a celebrated Irish Catholic divine replying to Froud, the English lecturer, upon the treatment of the Irish by the English, declared that the Catholic Church ought to stand at the head of all government, because the pope was the vice-gerent of God and could do no wrong. The leaders in this church now hold to and advocate this doctrine, and are seeking to make this a Catholic country, not by force of arms, as many think they intend, but by the ballot. Their priests control the votes of their members, and the pope controls the priests. Catholic school officers must be had, if possible, and so with legislatures, judges, and all executive officers. By the signs of the times there is no mistake in this. If any one disbelieves this, he should live in a community where the Catholics dominate, and he will be soon convinced of its truth.

“EVERY HONEST MAN SHOULD PROTEST.”

THE Cincinnati *Tribune*, of July 20, contains a contribution, nearly a column long, from the pen of Thos. Clephane, of Cincinnati, under the sub-heading, “Very Vigorous Protest Against the Conviction of Seventh-day Adventists.” We extract the following from the last paragraph:—

The Sabbath is a religious, and not a civil institution, and belongs to the Church, not the State. Whatever is lawful on any other day of the week is lawful on Sunday. Every honest man should protest against such law. I do not doubt but these conscientious Adventists can, by looking out of their prison cells next Sunday, see very many working without restraint; loaded cars of excursionists passing by to places of amusement. Why do railroads work on Sunday? Why do all others that labor on that day do so without restraint, while this small band of people that have observed the day believed by them the proper one to observe are treated in this manner? Not being a Christian, but, I hope, a humanitarian, and believing that injustice has been done in this case, I hereby protest.

Mr. Clephane, though declaring himself a non-Christian, shows in this protest that he is more nearly in harmony with Christian principles than multitudes of professing Christians.

ALL HONOR TO SUCH A JUDGE.

[From the *Albion (Neb.) Weekly News*, July 9.]

THE constitution of Maryland provides “that in all criminal prosecutions every man hath a right . . . to a speedy trial by an impartial jury.” But some years since the legislature passed an act providing that in cases of vagrancy the accused might be committed to the workhouse, by a magistrate, for one year or less, without trial by jury.

A man thus committed was brought before Judge Yellott on writ of *habeas corpus*, and he was promptly discharged, on the ground that the act under which he had been committed was unconstitutional. The case was appealed by the county, and the Court of Appeals (the Supreme Court of Maryland) sustained the statute on the ground that the constitution of Maryland must be interpreted in harmony with the practice under the unwritten constitution of England, in which country the guarantee of trial by jury is not held to extend to such cases.

Reinforced by this decision, the magistrates of Maryland continued to commit to the workhouse, without jury trial, such vagrants

as were brought before them; and Judge Yellott as promptly discharged every man thus deprived of his liberty who was brought before him on writ of *habeas corpus*; and this, notwithstanding the fact that case after case was taken to the Court of Appeals, and always with the same result, namely, that the “law” was sustained. But the venerable Judge Yellott treated it as void until his retirement from the bench on account of the infirmities of old age. And we say all honor to such a judge.

A HYDRA-HEADED MONSTER.

TYRANNY is a monster that never dies. It has passed into a proverb that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; and that is because the spirit of oppression is never destroyed, and, on its part, is sleeplessly vigilant. Behold here to-day [1878], this great people, whose passion for liberty is recorded in splendid pages of history, whose resolution to build on these islands a commonwealth of justice and freedom is written on every acre of its soil in their heart's blood, and in royal blood too; and yet after all these sacrifices and heroic martyrdoms, the scratch of one man's pen can run through the achievements of centuries and turn the arm of England to a bulwark of barbarism. The cause of such recurrences is not far to seek. The fatality is not in the evil thing, but in some strange popular hallucination like that which Hercules had about the ninth hydra head. Instead of killing that he hid it under a stone; and, in the same way, whenever in history, the Anglo-Saxon has vanquished a wrong, he always spared one of its heads. He hides it away; he calls it obsolete; but, after lying still for a long time, up it starts again at the call of some ambitious partisan, all through this curious disinclination to eradicate a wrong utterly and leave no germ of it behind. The chief art of reform is to be radical. No unrepealed statute is ever obsolete. The head of every wrong lives still while its principle is spared, and though it seems antiquated one day, it may be a “spirited policy” the next. —*Moncure D. Conway*.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT.

[From the *Mail and Express*, New York, July 30, 1895.]

THE action of Vice-Chancellor Pitney, in enjoining a reporter from publishing the details of a suit involving the right of way of the Watchung Railway Company in East Orange yesterday afternoon has created a sensation in newspaper circles. It is reported that the vice-chancellor had remarked that “some street railway companies received their franchises very cheaply,” when a reporter was seen to leave the room. “Is he a reporter?” asked the vice-chancellor of a court attendant. Being told that he was, he said, “Fetch him back.” The reporter returned. “Let me see your notes,” demanded the vice-chancellor. They were produced and handed up to the bench. After looking them over, the vice-chancellor is said to have remarked: “You can now leave the room. If one line is printed in your paper about this case I will have you arrested for contempt of court.”

It is not known how the vice-chancellor became clothed with such extraordinary power. He may have had some special reasons for his action, which have not been made public, but we know of no authority by which the court can seize the papers of a private individual who may happen to be present at the hearing of a case, and demand of him any memoranda which he may have taken in the course of his

reportorial duties. Not since the abolition of the Star Chamber centuries ago has an attempt been made to establish such a censorship of the press.

Instead of previously submitting to the inspection of a tribunal created by the government for the purpose, matter which is intended to be published, and receiving a special license to print it, the custom has prevailed, both in England and in this country, of permitting the publication of anything which may be written. This, however, is done at the writer's or publisher's peril. If his article contains anything which is libelous, or which would subject him to punishment for contempt of court, he must take the consequences. In this country especially the greatest latitude has always been allowed and taken by the press in this respect.

It seems to us that it is an unwarrantable infringement upon the freedom of the press for a court to prohibit the publication of its proceedings, which have taken place in the face of day in a court of justice. It would be taking a long stride backward to have the proceedings of legal tribunals take place in secret. While there may have been no particular hardship caused in this case, still it is a precedent which, if followed, would be a dangerous and far-reaching one.

PROTEST AGAINST SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

[From the *Cape Times*, Cape Town, Cape Colony, South Africa, June 19.]

A DEPUTATION representative of the Seventh-day Adventists waited upon the Right Honorable the Prime Minister, and the Treasurer-General yesterday morning for the purpose of protesting against the proposed legislation on Sunday observance. The deputation was introduced by the Hon. J. Rose-Innes, Q.C., M. L. A., and consisted of the following gentlemen: the Rev. A. T. Robinson, the Rev. S. N. Haskell, Mr. G. D. J. Scholtz, Mr. H. P. Wessels, and Mr. H. J. Edmed.

THE CASE STATED.

The Rev. A. T. Robinson, in explaining the views of the deputation and those of whom they represented, said they were thoroughly in accord with every measure calculated to tend towards the best interests of society, but they were strongly against the legislation which was being asked for with regard to Sunday. They would strongly favor a law which would prohibit everything of an indecent and uncivil character on every day of the week, but it appeared inconsistent to them, viewing the matter as they did, to place a law on the statute book which would forbid these things on Sunday any more than on any other day of the week, thus making in the eyes of the law that which was indecent and immoral right on six days of the week. They respectfully protested against Sunday laws, because they believed that such laws were wholly unnecessary for the good of society. Legislating against what was indecent and immoral they regarded as being in the best interests of society, but with regard to the matter of Sabbath observance, that should be left for every man to do as he pleased, as that was a matter of conscience. Countries which had been most dominated by such laws were those in which the continental Sunday was observed. They further protested against Sunday laws because there was a respectable minority in Cape Colony who conscientiously believed that the divine law commanded them to keep holy the seventh day. On this point they had been met with the assurance that the State did not propose to interfere with the right of

anybody to keep the seventh day, but they would respectfully point out the command of God regarding the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. The manner in which the seventh day was to be kept holy was here very clearly defined—it was making a distinction between the six working days and the seventh day. They further held that when the State made any demand touching religion, a man as a Christian was bound to disregard such laws, but he was bound to submit to the powers that be in regard to any consequences that might follow. Another reason for protesting against Sunday legislation was that they believed that such laws were wrong in principle, and if Parliament placed such laws upon the statute book, they, as Christians, could not but regard them as religious laws, and therefore wrong in principle. Legislation against indecency and incivility did not affect them, because, as Christian citizens, they did all in their power to discountenance such things on every day of the week, but with regard to legislation as to Sunday observance they protested most strongly. In the event of the passing of such a law the only possible course left open to them as Christian citizens would be to obey God rather than men, and in consequence to suffer as did the three Hebrew worthies under similar circumstances. They would ask the government to reconsider the answer given to the deputation which waited upon them recently with regard to Sunday observance.

MORE PRESS COMMENTS CONCERNING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN TENNESSEE.

Complimentary.

[From the *Republican*, *Wanseeon, O.*, July 19.]

THAT able journal, the AMERICAN SENTINEL, has a complimentary editorial of the Baptists, who protest against the religious persecutions in Georgia and elsewhere, and concludes as follows:—

“This action does honor to the Baptist name, and shows that the spirit of soul-liberty still lives in the Baptist Church.”

Little Christianity in the World.

[From the *Northwest American*, *Sioux City, Ia.*, July 11.]

PERSECUTION of Seventh-day Adventists still continues in the South. Such work as this is almost enough to cause a thinking man to believe that there is little Christianity in this world. They are not allowed the constitutional right to “worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.” If the Southern States hope to encourage emigration to the sunny South, they are pursuing a very poor course. Northern people are too tolerant and broad-minded—generally speaking—to sanction anything of the kind, and will be slow about emigrating to a land where religious freedom is not tolerated. A complete separation of Church and State is inevitable.

An Outrage and a Disgrace.

[From *Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item*, July 19.]

THIS country is called a land of religious liberty. The Pilgrims sought a new home at Plymouth Rock that they might worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, but there are to-day in the chain-gang at work on the public highways in Tennessee eight reputable men, their only offenses being that

they set apart and keep Saturday as a day of sacred rest and worship, believing it to be the “Lord’s day.” Any law that causes the arrest and imprisonment of Christian men because they conscientiously set apart any particular day in the week to rest from their labors and worship God, is an outrage and a disgrace upon the civilization and intelligence of America.

Ought to Exercise Discretion.

[From the *Times-Star*, *Cincinnati*, July 16.]

THE arrest, conviction and punishment of those conscientious Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee is a monstrous form of legalized persecution, a twin sister to that barbarous institution which the civil war abolished from that State more than thirty years ago. It is a part of their religion to literally interpret the Bible and observe the seventh rather than the first day of the week. There ought to be intelligence enough in the courts and court officers of Tennessee to exercise a little discretion, so far as the execution of the law in regard to the observance of Sunday is concerned.

A Disgrace to the State.

[From the *Ligonier (Ind.) Banner*, July 18.]

It is a disgrace to the State of Tennessee that it still persecutes the Seventh-day Adventists and other religionists who obey their consciences by keeping holy the Sabbath or seventh day of the week, and pursuing their ordinary vocations on Sunday. A long list of new indictments have been returned by the grand jury of Rhea County, and the Adventists who had kept the biblical Sabbath and worked on Sunday have been tried and in some cases convicted and sentenced to fine and imprisonment. They had only obeyed what they believed to be the law of God, as revealed in the commandment of rest on the seventh day, and for this they are punished as criminals! Yet Tennessee is one of the States in the Union, and this is near the close of the nineteenth century.

It is a Disgrace.

[From the *Mirror*, *Brocton, N. Y.*, July 24.]

IN Rhea County, East Tennessee, is a colony of Seventh-day Adventists. A few weeks ago eight of them were put on trial for desecrating Sunday, convicted and fined. Although abundantly able to pay their fines they refused so to do and were sent to jail on work-house mittimus to work out their sentences on the county roads. One day last week they were put to work with the county convicts. The leader of the band is E. R. Gillet, a native of Batavia, N. Y., and who is nearly seventy years of age. He volunteered in the civil war and served three years. These men are persecuted for opinion’s sake. They are just as sincere in their religious convictions as any other sect can be, and they observe some other day than the so-called sabbath with as much reverence as others keep that day. It is a disgrace to any State to persecute such people for their religious views, and if the old veteran Gillett is a G. A. R. man, that body should demand his immediate release, and the State of Tennessee should see to it that his co-religionists are also liberated. Will man ever be willing to accord to his neighbor every religious and political right that is as much his as the free air of heaven?

A VOICE FROM THE CHAIN-GANG.

Spring City, Tenn., August 9, 1895.

EDITOR SENTINEL: In the last issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, the Rev. Chas. D. Blaker, pastor of the Baptist Church at Camby, Minn., asks if you know of any Baptists who have appeared as the persecutors of the Seventh-day Adventists who are now suffering persecution for conscience’ sake. For one I wish to respond, and will give the facts in the case.

I am now working in the chain-gang at Spring City, Tenn., on the public roads with seven others of my brethren, who have offended the peace and dignity of the State and the conscience of our neighbors by peaceably and quietly going about our work on Sunday as on other days of the week. My offense was unloading a wheelbarrow from my wagon and setting it over the fence of the one from whom I had borrowed it, he being also an Adventist.

The man who witnessed the awful act lives on the opposite side of the road, and is a deacon of the Baptist Church. The next day I was indicted by the grand jury, as the court was then in session. I am now paying the penalty at hard work in the chain-gang for sixty days, because I disturbed the conscience of this deacon of the Baptist Church by unloading that wheelbarrow on Sunday.

I have no right to judge the man, but I am led to inquire why I am arrested for doing what I did, while the son of this same deacon goes fishing on Sunday? also his other children picked strawberries every Sunday through the season, and are now gathering peaches on Sunday for wages, and still his conscience is not disturbed; and that, too, since I was arrested; and this Baptist father is not disturbed, at least I hear of no arrests being made. It is not possible that the deacon could fall from grace so soon, even if he believed in the doctrine. I was a member of and preacher in the Baptist Church before I became a Seventh-day Adventist, and knowing their principles then, and what they have suffered in the past for conscience’ sake, I least expected a Baptist brother to appear as my persecutor. This action impresses on my mind the fact that my Baptist brethren have backslidden on the principles of religious liberty which were once so dear to them.

BYRD TERRY.

THAT the spirit of religious liberty is by no means dead in America, is proven by the attitude of the press of the country toward religious persecution in Tennessee. We have received at this office hundreds of marked copies of papers, denouncing in vigorous terms the action of the authorities in Rhea County; and we are satisfied that we have seen comparatively few of the papers that have commented upon it. Occasionally we find a paper that defends the persecution, but the overwhelming majority denounce it in fitting terms. We are publishing extracts from the opinions expressed, as rapidly as our space will permit; and are keeping a list of the papers that make mention of it which we shall publish shortly.

POLITICAL liberty consists in the power of doing whatever does not injure another. The exercise of the natural rights of every man has no other limits than those which are necessary to secure to every other man the free exercise of the same rights.—*Declaration of the Rights of Man by the National Assembly of France.*



NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 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.

IF "Bible Reader" "one watching for truth," will send us his name and address, we will answer his question.

THE New York *Recorder*, of August 12, in an illustrated article of considerable length, adds its testimony to what the press of the country have so generally spoken in condemnation of the persecution of the Adventists in Tennessee.

ONE of the eight Seventh-day Adventists in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., has been released by the county court, because on account of poor health he was unable to work. Our illustration on another page shows some of the Adventists at work on the approach to the county bridge, near Spring City.

"ENFORCING the 'law'" against Adventists by imprisoning them or driving them in the chain-gang differs from "enforcing the 'law'" against the heretics of the Middle Ages by means of red-hot pinchers, the gallows and the fagot, only in degree. Exactly the same principle is involved in both.

SUNDAY enforcement seems to be in the very air, and from every quarter comes intelligence concerning efforts to rigidly enforce Sunday statutes. There is scarcely a State in which the question is not being agitated, and both city ordinances and State "laws" are being invoked to compel the observance of Sunday.

SEVERAL Seventh-day Adventists have been arrested recently in Chicago under circumstances which indicate very clearly that the motive is very largely religious bigotry and intolerance. The Adventists have several churches in Chicago, and if the persecution becomes general throughout the city, we may look for interesting developments there.

MR. FAUST, a Seventh-day Adventist shoemaker of Baltimore, whose arrest some time since, we noticed in these columns, was again arrested for working on Sunday, July 21st. The policeman who had previously arrested him, had been watching him, and going into his house the back way, found him at work. The circumstances of the case all indicate clearly that it is a case of religious persecution pure and simple. Mr. Faust's work is not of a nature to disturb people, except as they are annoyed by knowing that he is at work. He is a poor man and badly crippled up by rheumatism, and this persecution works a great hardship upon both him and his family.

OUR second illustration, "Enforcing the 'law' in Tennessee," shows Seventh-day Adventists working in the chain-gang for no offense against their fellowmen, but for practical dissent from a religious dogma which has been entrenched in the statutes of Tennessee. That their punishment is not death does not change the principle. The "laws" which in other ages and in other lands tortured, hanged, or burned heretics differed only in degree from the "laws" which to-day imprison Adventists. Read our illustrated article on this subject.

THERE is a conflict of authority between Oregon and Washington, concerning Sunday fishing on the Columbia River. The laws of Oregon prohibit fishing on Sunday; while the laws of Washington permit fishing on that day. Under the plea of concurrent jurisdiction over the river, the Oregon authorities have undertaken to compel Washington fishermen to cease fishing on Sunday. What the result will be we are not able to say at this writing. The effort of the Oregon authorities shows, however, the disposition which seems inherent in Sunday enforcement.

THE *Jewish Messenger* professes "much sympathy for the eight Seventh-day Baptists [Adventists] of Rhea County, Tenn., who were imprisoned for working on Sunday," but says it is idle for their friends to talk of religious persecution; that it is the first duty of citizens of all religions to obey the laws of the State, etc. Persecuted Christians have never lacked for sympathy of this kind. Pontius Pilate felt much sympathy for Christ, but nevertheless delivered him to be crucified, as the *Messenger* would deliver his followers now to the penalties of the law. Pilate's sympathy benefited neither himself nor any one else. It is as worthless in this day as it was in his.

THE manager of the *Present Truth* publishing office, London, Eng., in a recent interview with the officials having charge of the inspection of factories, was given the alternative of complying with the demands of the Sunday law until an act of Parliament could be passed exempting the Adventists as the Jews are now exempted in that country, which exemption they must secure by their own petition, or of suffering the penalty of the law, which would henceforth be rigorously applied. Of course no Christian will seek temporal ease at the expense of sacrificing principle, hence the prospect is that the property of the office there will be seized to satisfy fines imposed for Sunday labor.

THE authorities of Rhea County, Tenn., have decided not to require the Adventists now in the chain-gang in that county to serve an additional length of time because they will not work on the Sabbath. This conclusion was reached just a few days subsequent to the publication of our last-page note of the 1st inst., in which we showed clearly that any such attempt would be a flagrant violation of

the plain letter and spirit of the constitution of the State, which provides that "no person shall, in time of peace, be required to perform any service for the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest." The Rhea County authorities are to be congratulated that they have decided not to thus further outrage justice.

AMONG the few papers that have approved of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, is the *Central Methodist*, of Cattlesburg, Kentucky, which, in its issue of July 20, said: "The Tennessee Adventists, who persist in performing manual labor on the sabbath, to the annoyance of their neighbors, have again been fined and sent to jail, as they should have been."

The animus of this note is apparent, in view of the fact that none of the work complained of was done to the annoyance of anybody, and no witness testified that he was disturbed by the work done; the only annoyance felt was of the same character as that felt by the *Central Methodist*, namely, the annoyance which is always begotten by bigotry and intolerance in the bosoms of those who are not willing that others should enjoy equal rights with themselves.

To appreciate justly the nature of the times in which we live, we must look not at the men, but at the principles, which the times are bringing to the front. By these principles, the lives of other men touch our own. The fast-spreading principle of the union of Church and State brings our life in touch with that of each of the persecuted Christians now imprisoned for keeping the fourth commandment. We are not in the position of idle spectators of a play. There is something for each of us to consider and decide, and something to be done. There is a stand to be taken for or against divine truth. When Paul was brought before Felix, it was not, as it seemed, that the apostle might have a chance of regaining his liberty, but that Felix might be told of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. The martyrs were persecuted in order that, by their sufferings, they might sow the seeds of truth. And God's hand is shaping now the unfolding of events, to present his truth to all people, that they may choose whether they will be loyal to him or not. While a few men are suffering for their faith, the voice of truth is sounding in the ears of millions, among whom are we, calling us and them to stand now on the side of righteousness, and against the flood of evil that is rising to engulf the world. God is speaking to us, and the thing of most importance for us is to hear and heed.

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