



"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. 39.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 3, 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.

### SOME PRINCIPLES STATED.

God is the Creator, and therefore the rightful sovereign of this world.

Whatever he commands is to be performed by his loyal subjects, no matter if all earthly powers should combine to prevent it; and that which he forbids will not be done by them, no matter how many of earth's mighty ones require it. The divine rule is: "Obey God rather than men."

When the Lord Jesus Christ was about to leave this earth, he gave to his church a commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and from that day to this, his faithful ministers have been going and preaching.

When this commission was given, it was against human "law" to introduce any new religion into the Roman empire; and all the then known world was subject to Rome, so that in all the world it was against the "law" to preach the gospel. But Christ said "Go;" and they "went everywhere preaching the word."

Almost everywhere the disciples of Christ met opposition from earthly powers in executing this divine commission. They were persecuted in Jerusalem, were imprisoned and whipped, and some of them "were slain with the sword," but still the survivors continued to preach the gospel according to the divine command.

The opposition which the disciples met in their work did not surprise them, for the Master had told them that such would be the case. He said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." And gospel messengers found that it was even so. Wherever they went the wrath of Satan was stirred up against them; and it was only too often manifested through civil rulers. But this did not cause them to cease preaching the gospel.

When the magistrates commanded the apostles "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus," "Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

The experience of the apostles has been repeated in almost every country and in every generation from the beginning of their ministry until the present time. Everywhere the gospel has been introduced in the face of opposition from the civil authorities; but Christians have never stopped to question their duty in the premises.

The history of modern Christian missions is quite as replete with illustrations of this truth as is the history of the more early preaching of the gospel. With but few exceptions, heathen rulers have opposed the introduction of the gospel among their subjects; but without avail. Faithful men and women, counting "not their lives dear unto them," have penetrated the jungles of India, the deserts of Africa, and the solitudes of the isles of the ocean, carrying with them the gospel, which they have faithfully proclaimed, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear, and whether rulers gave their consent to its proclamation or not.

So universally has the right of the Christian missionary to obey the gospel commission been seen and admitted, that we find the governments of the principal "Christian nations" of the world insisting that Christian missionaries shall be permitted to deliver their message to as many as will listen to it. Were it not for this, Christian missions, as they are maintained to-day, would be an impossibility in many lands: Turkey, China, and some of the islands of the sea, would still be without the gospel had the civil "law" been allowed to prevail rather than that higher law—the command of God, the gospel commission.

Even to-day we find various Protestant bodies insisting upon the right to go into Roman Catholic countries, and there not only to teach but to practice contrary to the "laws" of those lands; and when they are arrested and imprisoned under the forms of "law," they call it religious persecution, as is witnessed by the following letter published in the *London Times*, of Oct. 23, 1891:—

### Religious Persecution in Portugal.

The Evangelical Alliance has often experienced your kind consideration and ready help in making publicly known cases of intolerant action and oppression against Protestant Christians in foreign countries. We are therefore encouraged to solicit again the favor of your publishing in your columns an extract from a letter from Oporto, dated the 6th inst., reporting how a Protestant named Francisco Bichao, an inhabitant of Aveiro, has been thrown into prison under a sentence of twelve months' imprisonment and a fine of £2 or in default of payment a further term of three months' imprisonment. The offense charged against him, before the civil court, was for *refusing to take off his cap to a cross carried at a funeral*. He appealed against the cruel sentence, and the letter above referred to now reports as follows:—

"The appeal to the Superior Court at Oporto was successful, inasmuch as the sentence was annulled on a technical point—viz., that it had not been clearly proved that he had wilfully treated the State Church with disrespect. His enemies, who were powerful, then carried the case to the Supreme Court at Lisbon, and here the original sentence was confirmed, on the ground that it was sufficiently proved that he committed the act wittingly. As the constitution grants liberty of conscience, provided that the State religion is respected, it is easy to see how a point can be stretched even to a year's imprisonment for not removing a cap to a passing cross (not a crucifix) carried at a funeral. The sentence hung fire for a time, but when the abortive attempt to establish a republic failed at Oporto on the 31st of January last, the government was enabled to use extraordinary restrictions of private liberties, as well as to gag the Liberal press. This was the opportunity, and Bichao was arrested on the 28th of February, and placed in Aveiro prison. He wrote to me on the 24th advising me of the fact, and adding, 'But I am happy; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

"We hoped that the usual Easter list of pardons might have included his name, but were disappointed in this, and there he lies, to the shame of popery, for it was a purely clerical persecution, and to the disgrace of Portugal, which poses as a Liberal nation, and in many respects is truly Liberal. But the Concordat with Rome still gives the priests great power when they choose to use it against the freedom of the gospel."

Yours faithfully,

J. FIELD, General, K. C. B., }  
 A. J. ARNOLD, } Secretaries.

Evangelical Alliance, 7 Adam-street, Strand,  
 London, W. C., Oct. 13, 1891.

This missionary, it will be observed, was imprisoned for not removing his cap to a cross at a funeral. He doubtless regarded such an act as idolatry and so refused to uncover his head in the presence of the passing cross; and Protestants everywhere say that he did right.

More recently, Methodist missionaries in various South American countries have been

imprisoned for circulating among the people, copies of the sacred Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. Roman Catholicism is established by statute in those countries, and the Bible is, except by the permission of the priests in special cases, a prohibited book. To circulate it among the people is a violation of the "law," and yet the Protestant world applauds the disobedience of these missionaries and styles their prosecution, religious persecution, as it certainly is.

The *Converted Catholic*, for September, edited by "Father" O'Connor, a Presbyterian minister of this city, contains a long article entitled, "The Methodist Victory over Roman Intolerance," giving a history of the petition sent to the pope by the Methodist ministers of Chicago, asking the Roman Catholic Church to use its influence in securing for Protestants in the countries of South America and elsewhere, the same liberty that is enjoyed by Roman Catholics in the United States.

It is made very clear in this article, and in the comments upon the action of the Methodist ministers, quoted from other papers, that while the laws under which Methodist colporters are imprisoned in South America for selling and giving away Bibles, are civil statutes, they are, nevertheless, begotten by religious bigotry and born of religious intolerance. The *Chicago Tribune*, in its issue of July 31, said:—

The contention of the cardinal secretary of the holy see, to the effect that the condition of things in the South American States is dependent upon the civil laws will be shown to be a technicality, since in the States named the civil laws are inspired by the Roman Catholic Church.

Commenting upon the same subject, the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, of July 3, says:—

It is well understood that laws there in force are shaped to please the dominant church. Rome can secure in South America and other papal States, whatever laws it pleases.

And to the same intent, the *Cumberland Presbyterian*, of Nashville, in its issue of July 11, says:—

It is true, also, if intolerance and persecution continue in South America it will be because the Roman Church wills it. Rome, through its bishops and priests, really shapes the laws and the policy of the government in all these papal States.

In view of the principles herein stated, and the admission of these principles by representative Protestant papers, we would venture to again suggest that the imprisonment of Methodist missionaries in Roman Catholic countries for violating "civil laws," which require them to uncover their heads in the presence of the host or the passing cross, and which forbid them to obey the gospel commission by putting in the hands of the people the Scriptures in their own language, differ not one iota in principle from the laws which in this so-called Protestant country require the observance of Sunday. In Portugal and some other Roman Catholic countries, everybody is required to show respect for the established religion by taking off his hat when a religious procession passes along the street. In this country everybody is required to show respect for a statute-intrenched dogma of the prevailing religion by abstaining from work upon Sunday, and by obeying a "law" which forbids men to testify to what they believe to be truth that they are under obligation to give to mankind, by obeying the fourth commandment. We would ask our Methodist and Presbyterian and Christian friends of other churches, how they can consistently call the arrest and imprisonment of Protestant missionaries in Roman Catholic countries, religious persecution, and at the same time insist

that the imprisonment and driving of Adventists in chain-gangs is only enforcing "civil law."

It is just as true in this country that the "laws" which imprison Adventists and drive them in chain-gangs, are inspired and maintained by the Protestant churches, as it is that the laws which imprison Methodist and other Protestant missionaries in South America, Portugal and Spain, are inspired by the Roman Catholic Church of those countries. Hence if any obligation rests upon the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to use their influence in favor of the repeal of the "laws" which imprison Protestant missionaries in Roman Catholic countries, the Protestant churches in this country are under just the same obligation to give their influence to the repeal of the "laws" which make persecution for conscience' sake possible here.

#### RELIGION IN THE CONSTITUTION.

The *Mail and Express*, in commenting upon the political situation in New York, says:—

The sabbath, as an American institution, is imbedded in Federal and State constitutions and laws. Our national Constitution has only two references to religion, one which specifically says that Sunday is not to be counted as a legislative day, and the other which declares that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. Warner Miller, the author of the Sunday plank in the Republican platform of this State, also says, as reported in the *New York World*, that "the Constitution clearly recognizes the sabbath," since "on that day no measure may become a law, no business be legally transacted, and no one elected to office may take oath on that day."

But this, as the *World* points out, is not a recognition of Sunday as the "Christian sabbath," but as a legal holiday merely. There are other legal holidays beside Sunday—the first day of January, the thirtieth day of May, the fourth of July, the first Monday in September, the last Thursday in November, and the twenty-fifth day of December—on all of which cessation from business has legal sanction.

In its effort to find "the sabbath as an American institution," in the Constitution, the *Mail and Express* overlooks that plainest of all references to religion in the Constitution, which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Perhaps there was a reason for passing this by, for this is certainly very far from being a recognition of the "American sabbath."

Of course, if the sabbath is "an American institution," it might be expected to have recognition and sanction in American laws, even that supreme law, the Constitution. But a sabbath which is an American institution cannot be God's sabbath, which he commands to be kept holy, for that was instituted by him at creation. Neither can it be the Sunday sabbath, for that is observed in all civilized countries, and was instituted in remote ages of antiquity. The simple truth is, that the Sabbath and American institutions are things wholly separate and distinct from each other.

Our forefathers who framed the Constitution evidently did not regard the Sabbath as American in its origin; and it is certainly not strange that under their wise direction neither it nor any other religious institution found recognition in that embodiment of our fundamental law.

#### THE SUNDAY LAW IN NEW YORK.

WE made brief mention in these columns last week of the action of the Republican party in adopting this as one plank of its platform: "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality." We pointed out at the time that this meant nothing so far as the suppression of the liquor traffic was concerned; for the expression, "the Sunday law," can mean nothing else than the whole body of law upon that subject. It cannot and does not mean simply a law forbidding the sale of liquor on Sunday, for as we showed a week ago, it just as much pledges the party adopting it to the enforcement of the statute forbidding the sale of ice on Sunday, as it does to the enforcement of the statute which forbids the sale of liquor upon that day.

We feel no interest, however, in this as a political question. We are interested in it only so far as it shows the temper of the people in regard to the making, sustaining, and enforcing of laws for the observance of Sunday.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is and always has been opposed to the traffic in intoxicating beverages. We believe that it is an enemy to civilized society; that it increases the burden of taxation; that it makes widows, orphans, paupers, and criminals; that it endangers life and property, and that the evils resulting from it are not limited to those who actually drink intoxicating liquors. In short, we do not believe that "whiskey hurts only those who drink it."

Being opposed to the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a whole, and believing that it is evil and only evil continually, we are, of course, opposed to any law which, by prohibiting it one day in the week, by implication legalizes it and makes it respectable upon the other six days of the week.

The Methodist General Conference of 1888, adopted this: "We are unalterably opposed to the enactment of laws that propose by license-taxing or otherwise to regulate the drink traffic." Doubtless the thought underlying this resolution was that by government license, the liquor traffic becomes a protected monopoly and a political power; and that by withholding license the monopoly would be destroyed, the political power of the traffic be broken, and that general prohibition would follow.

We are likewise "opposed to the enactment of laws that propose by license-taxing or otherwise to regulate the drink traffic;" and for this reason if there were no other we oppose all laws prohibiting liquor-selling only on Sunday. And if the Methodists meant what they said in 1888, they must likewise oppose all laws which prohibit the selling of liquor upon Sunday only. Certainly the expression, "or otherwise," is broad enough to cover such regulation of the drink traffic; so that we stand upon this question shoulder to shoulder with the great Methodist Church, so far as it stands true to the action of the General Conference of 1888.

But as we have before remarked, Sunday laws are not designed as temperance measures, but to guard from "desecration" a day held by many people to be sacred to the service of God. A few years since, the *California Prohibitionist*, published in San Francisco, said that if saloons would close on Sunday, it was about all that could be asked of them; and as we said last week, Sunday liquor-selling is not regarded by Sunday-law advocates generally, as any worse than other forms of Sunday "desecration." For instance, the *Christian Statesman* recently remarked: "Sabbath laws need enforcement against the excursion as well

as against the saloon;" and the Baptist *Examiner* said, in its issue of September 19: "Do the liquor dealers and their friends fully understand what they are doing in their efforts to keep saloon doors open on the Lord's day? Do they not see that they are forcing the issue—a clean sabbath or entire prohibition?" This is, as we said last week, saying to the liquor traffic just as plainly as words can express it, Coöperate with us in Sunday observance and your traffic is safe six days in the week; resist our efforts for general Sunday observance, and we will see to it that your traffic is prohibited every day.

The *Voice*, the great prohibition organ of this city, has in its issue of September 20, two articles, touching the Sunday-law plank, adopted by the Republican Convention at Saratoga. The *Voice* shows quite conclusively by quotations from prominent Republicans in this city, that the resolution referred to means little or nothing in respect to Sunday-liquor selling. As reported in the *Tribune*, of September 19, Mr. Warner Miller, the author of the resolution, said of it: "I do not see how any one can assert that the Republican party is a prohibition party from the resolution which I introduced."

This shows very clearly that Mr. Miller did not mean that the resolution should be understood as pledging the Republican party to oppose the liquor traffic. *The resolution is simply in the interests of general Sunday observance.*

As we said before, we have not the slightest interest in this as a political question. We do not care which party is successful in New York State this fall. There are good men in all parties, and we doubt not that for the year to come, either party would give the State a fairly decent administration; but we do want the people to understand the issue before them in regard to Sunday and its enforcement by civil statute. We want our readers to know that Sunday enforcement has become a political question.\* It has become a question upon which political parties feel bound to express themselves in their platforms; and the politicians, for the sake of gaining votes, are willing to pledge themselves to enact, maintain and enforce such laws, and this regardless of the inherent right of every man to be left perfectly free in matters of religion. We believe that the present agitation in this State for the closing of saloons on Sunday, will not result in curtailing the liquor traffic in the slightest degree, that just as much liquor will be sold and drunk as formerly; that just as many men will be drunken as formerly; and that just as many innocent persons will suffer as the result of the liquor traffic as formerly. But religious bigotry and intolerance will be increased; high-sounding professions will be made. Sunday will be honored in words, and will be exalted to some extent in the eyes of the people; and this is the great object which the master-mind that is back of all this Sunday agitation has in view.

#### "BLUE LAWS."

A WELL-KNOWN Washington pastor, Dr. B. Sunderland, has taken us severely to task for using the term "Blue Laws." He says:—

You ought never to be guilty of citing as a part of the "Blue Laws" of the colonies the part about a man's kissing his wife on Sunday, etc., because no such thing ever existed in fact; they were a compilation of a notorious Tory made out of whole cloth, to cast ridicule and contempt on the colonists; and as intelligent men you should know this and not resort

\* See the article, "New York Democrats and the Sunday Law," on this page.

to such a species of falsehood and misrepresentation to bolster up your case.

We are well aware that no such code of laws ever actually existed as that sometimes printed as the "Blue Laws of Connecticut." But we are also well aware that "laws" did exist in the New England colonies, notably in Massachusetts and Connecticut, under which the ministers and magistrates assumed authority to punish nearly all the acts said to have been forbidden by the "Blue Laws."

For instance, there was no "law" which said in so many words that a man should not kiss his wife on Sunday; but for all that, as related by Alice Morse Earle, on page 247 of "The Sabbath in Puritan New England," "Captain Kemble of Boston was in 1656 set for two hours in the public stocks for his 'lewd and unseemly behavior,' which consisted in his kissing his wife 'publicly' on the sabbath day, upon the doorstep of his house, when he had just returned from a voyage and absence of three years."

The fact is that the authorities of those days assumed to regulate nearly all the private affairs of life, and the term "Blue laws" has come to be applied by common consent and usage to all such improper and meddlesome legislation; and by using the phrase, one no more indorses all that the "Reverend" Samuel Peters, "a notorious Tory," wrote about the "laws" of Connecticut, than does one using the phrase "Siren song" indorse the mythological story of the three sea nymphs said to frequent an island near the coast of Italy, and lure mariners to destruction by their sweet songs. The term "Siren" has come to mean "something which is insidious or deceptive," just as the phrase "Blue Laws" means improper and meddlesome statutes which invade unnecessarily the private life of the citizen. It is in this sense that the AMERICAN SENTINEL has used the term, and in this sense we shall continue to use it.

#### VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION ALLEGED.

[*New York Sun*, Sept. 23.]

ALBANY, Sept. 22.—The State Department of Public Instruction has been called upon to construe section 4 of Article IX. of the amended Constitution, known as the educational article, which reads as follows.—

Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit, or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught.

The matter comes up on the appeal of Fayette B. Durant, Thomas G. Ross, James C. Covert, and Abraham Hilton to Superintendent Skinner from a decision of the West Troy Board of Education. The Board has been notified to file its answer within ten days. The appeal papers recite the fact that under chapter 881 of the laws of 1895, four commissioners of education were elected in West Troy, and that under the act they appointed four others. It is generally understood that the purpose of the act was to create a board having four Protestants and four Catholics on it, or, at least, four Republicans and four Democrats. This board accepted an offer made by the Very Rev. T. M. A. Burke, Bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese of Albany, and Rev. James A. Curtain, Pastor of St. Bridget's Church of West Troy, to lease for \$1 a month the parochial school building of St. Bridget's Church.

The Catholic authorities also agreed to pay

the salaries of a fireman and a janitor. Then a resolution was adopted by the board appointing fifteen teachers, eight of whom were for this school. All eight were Catholics, and six were sisters belonging to the Roman Catholic Convent of St. Joseph of West Troy. The six sisters were examined in a separate room, because of a rule of their sect forbidding them to appear in mixed gatherings. All received commissioners' certificates entitling them to teach in the public schools. The appellants say they do not believe that these sisters were properly examined or passed the examination. It is further alleged that as the sisters are forbidden by their rules to attend teachers' institutes, which is required of all public school teachers, they are not qualified to teach; that the rent charged is not sufficient for the care of the rooms even; that the school is wholly or partly under the control or direction of a religious, sectarian denomination, and that denominational doctrines or tenets are taught therein, and that many parents will not send their children to the school while it is under such control. They ask the superintendent to annul the action of the West Troy Board of Education in leasing the school as well as the contracts with the six teachers, and to provide a suitable building and employ duly qualified teachers irrespective of any religious denomination.

The issue of this case will be watched with much interest all over the State, as it is the first appeal of the kind made under the revised constitution.

#### NEW YORK DEMOCRATS AND THE SUNDAY "LAW."

WE have considered elsewhere in this issue the attitude of the Republican party of New York towards the Sunday statute, as expressed at their late convention, in the words, "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality."

It might naturally have been expected that the Democratic party, having always posed as the political representative and exponent of the principle of personal liberty, would take issue squarely with the former party, and stand in favor of that liberty which every Sunday "law" must necessarily invade. This, however, it has not done.

The difference between the two leading political parties of the State upon this point is not a difference in principle, but only in degree.

The one party favors the maintenance of the Sunday statute in the strict sense in which its enforcement has been recently conducted in this city, and which is demanded by the ecclesiastics who aim at securing a rigid observance of the day. The other party also favors a Sunday "law," but wants one that will secure "a proper observance" of the day, an "orderly Sunday," and that shall have the support of public opinion.

Such importance has the question of Sunday observance now attained in the Empire State, that neither of the two leading political parties dares to pass it over in silence. Neither dares to go before the people without having avowed itself to be in favor of legal Sunday observance. The only difference between them is in regard to the nature of the observance to be thus secured. The Republican party believes that it will receive popular support in standing for a strict form of Sunday observance, and the Democratic party believes that the seal of popular approval will be given to an attitude favoring a less rigid Sunday observance, such as would allow the obtaining of beer and other alcoholic drinks on that

day, and in its general aspect would be opposed to a "blue law" Sunday, but which, nevertheless, would admit of such restrictions as might be enacted without popular disapproval.

As stated elsewhere, we take no special interest in the outcome of this political contest. We stand opposed to all Sunday laws, because they all, whether strict or "liberal," invade the realm of conscience. They all, whether avowedly or not, demand a religious observance of the day, since they all demand cessation from work, which is a leading feature of that Sabbath observance which is commanded by God.

The Sunday "law" is now the leading issue between the two leading political parties of the leading State in the Union; and that issue, as we have seen, concerns only the degree of Sunday observance to be embodied in the "law." If the Republican party proves successful, as it has in recent elections, the result will doubtless be attributed to its strong Sunday attitude, and that attitude, having been thus apparently approved by the popular will, will be considered the proper one for the party in all contests, both State and National.

And thus the way is wide open for the Sunday issue to move rapidly forward to a position of supreme interest and importance in the nation. That it will do this there is not a shadow of doubt. And the presentation of that true personal liberty which is the Creator's gift to every man, cannot be left to any political party. That work must be done by those who know that perfect liberty that comes from God, through an acquaintance with the gospel of Jesus Christ.

#### NOT WILLING TO ABIDE BY THEIR OWN RULE.

[*Sabbath Recorder*, September 26.]

THE *Christian Statesman*, of Sept. 7, devotes a column or two of its massive logic to the cases of prosecution and persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week as the Sabbath. It takes such papers as the *New York Tribune* and the *Christian Intelligencer* to task for expressing sympathy for the persecuted and for objecting to the laws that require Sunday observance. In justification of existing laws which lead to so much injustice and trouble, this astute defender of Sunday legislation makes the following remark: "Sabbath laws are a necessity to protect all people in their right to a weekly rest day."

Now who are these "all people" that should be thus protected in their rights? What right is referred to? Is it the right of conscience? Is it the right of religious belief which the Constitution of the United States guards with such jealous care? True this *Statesman* says "their right to a weekly rest day." But does this right mean their own enlightened, conscientious choice of the day upon which to rest, or simply their right to submit to a pope or a priest or *Statesman* as the dictator concerning which day shall be religiously observed? Who has given the majority the "right" to lord it over the consciences, the rights of the majority?

The *Statesman* further says: "They [Sunday laws] are needed to put the nation in right relations with Christ and his law." Yes, Georgia and Tennessee are furnishing beautiful illustrations of these "right relations" for which the *Statesman* has such a keen relish! That paragraph is closed with the sage remark

that, "to enforce the law for the reasons stated above is not persecution."

Having thus disposed of the *New York Tribune* and its denunciation of the unrighteous persecutions of Sabbath keepers, the *Statesman* swoops down upon the *Christian Intelligencer*, an earnest, Christian journal of New York, which also protests against such unjust persecutions in the name of law. The *Intelligencer* calls for an immediate revision of these sabbath laws in the following language:—

We insist upon this, first, because it is right. No community should interfere with the conscientious convictions of any of its people. Secondly, such a regulation would relieve the Seventh-day Baptists. Thirdly, the proposed change would free the friends of Sunday from a burden they ought not to carry, the burden of oppressing the consciences of their weak brethren. We are friends of the sabbath laws as both right and expedient, but those laws must not be used to inflict penalties upon conscientious and God-fearing men.

To this the *Christian Statesman* makes reply in the following illogical language:—

The *Christian Intelligencer* says: "No community should interfere with the conscientious convictions of any of its people." But the laws in question do not so interfere. They do not forbid the observance of Saturday as the Sabbath. They do not require any one to observe the Sabbath religiously. They do not make a single religious act obligatory. They only restrain from doing what demoralizes, breaks down the sanctity of the Sabbath, or interferes with the right of others to a day of rest. Whether Saturday-keepers are weak or strong logically, whether conscientious or not, whether they are excellent citizens or the reverse, their course is calculated to break down the sabbath entirely. The State has interests at stake. It has its own rights to maintain as well as the rights of all the people. If the demands of these people who observe Saturday are complied with, the whole machinery of government must be operated on the first day of the week. Their logic will not stop short of this. What becomes then of the rights of those who observe the first day of the week as the sabbath? A small minority of the whole population who adopt views and practices so much at variance with the laws and customs of the country where they live must expect some inconveniences, even when those laws are modified to the full extent permissible by the rights of the masses of the people.

The Bible clearly points out the Sabbath day, and forbids work therein. It also enjoins work on the remaining six days. The law of the land changes the day which God has blessed and sanctified and requires the religious observance of another day. To this Sabbath keepers conscientiously object, and for this objection and loyalty to God's command they are arrested, fined, imprisoned, put in the chain-gang, maltreated and made subject even to death, and still this great *Statesman* insists that this is no persecution, but that "a small minority of the whole population who adopt views and practices so much at variance with the laws and customs of the country where they live must expect some inconveniences." Well, that is quite a comforting view of the situation, especially taken in connection with the *Statesman's* plea for the protection of "all people in their right to a weekly rest day." In the light of its own interpretation, such a right is simply the right to be dictated to and compelled to accept the dictum of a ruling majority regardless of conscience or religious liberty. In justification of the Sunday law, and its consequent "inconveniences" that a minority must suffer, this same logical reasoner says, "The State has interests at stake. It has its own rights to maintain as well as the rights of all the people."

This is a new theory of State rights. We had supposed hitherto that the rights of "all the people" were of supreme importance; that the State itself exists in order that it may secure the interests and the rights of the people. It is a strange view of the case that the State has rights of its own, independent of

all the people! Who is the State? How did it come into existence? For what purpose was its government established? Whence does it derive its support and its authority? Will the *Statesman* point out some of its "rights" that are independent of "all the people"?

Again it declares: "If the demands of the people who observe Saturday are complied with, the whole machinery of government must be operated on the first day of the week. What becomes then of the rights of those who observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath?" Here is a dilemma indeed! If the *Statesman's* worst fears shall be realized, the case will simply be reversed, and then the observers of Sunday being in the minority ought to be willing to abide by their own rule. But evidently they would not accept the situation with any better grace than the present minority do, as the above anxious question of the *Statesman* indicates.

But really what are the "demands" of "these people who observe Saturday"? They simply ask that they may be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, according to the commands of the Bible, and the constitutional provision of the United States by which this religious liberty is guaranteed unto all of its citizens. This only is our demand; and if this shall necessitate such a change in the machinery of government as the *Statesman* fears, it will only prove the righteousness of our cause and should be hailed with joy by all who profess to be governed by the Word of God, rather than by the traditions of men. In matters of conscience, there can be no ruling of majorities. Might does not make right; but on the other hand, right does make might. The law, as stated by Peter, is as binding to-day as it has always been, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

#### THE SUNDAY "LAWS."

[*The World*, New York, Sept. 25.]

WHAT are the Sunday laws? What do they prohibit?

The first of them (section 263 of the Penal Code) forbids "all labor on Sunday except works of necessity or charity." It therefore forbids the blacking of boots, the cooking of hot dinners where cold victuals would suffice, the driving of street-cars or the running of elevated trains, the use of cabs for the transfer of passengers and baggage, the trimming of a rose-bush, the driving of carriages, the running of elevators in office buildings, the sweeping of floors, and apparently the making of beds or the washing of dishes in houses where there are enough dishes for three meals. In brief, it forbids all work not absolutely necessary.

Section 265 prohibits "all shooting, hunting, fishing, playing, horse-racing, gaming or other public sports, exercises or shows." Under this provision the hard-worked men who take a day off on Sunday and recreate themselves by quietly fishing are all lawbreakers. So is the man who plays a game of billiards, and the one who sits down to a game of chess with his wife, or who "plays" any sort of thing with his children. This is precisely the construction that was given to the statute when it was enacted, and repeated in a late decision, and no other is possible to those who "favor the maintenance of the Sunday laws" as they stand. The man who rides a bicycle or a horse on Sunday or drives in a buggy is equally a lawbreaker. He is engaged in a "public exercise."

Section 266 prohibits "all trades, manufactures, agricultural or mechanical employments"



on Sunday, except when they are works of necessity or charity. This would put a stop to the publication of Monday morning newspapers, and would stop every steam engine and every dynamo in the State. It would forbid a farmer to bud a tree or curry a horse or pluck fruit or gather nuts or to drive for pleasure.

Section 267 forbids "all manner of public selling or offering for sale of any property upon Sunday," except articles of food before 10 o'clock in the morning, meals in restaurants or served from restaurants, newspapers, fruit, confectionery, prepared tobacco, drugs, medicines and surgical appliances. This forbids the sale of soda or mineral waters, hair-brushes, cravats or soap. It makes a law-breaker of the iceman or milkman who sends in ice or milk to a family where sickness prevails if the hour of 10 A. M. be passed. The traveller whose trunk is delayed is forbidden to buy a toothbrush or a clean collar in which to go to the hotel breakfast. The delicatessen man may not send to a customer a plate of salad for Sunday evening tea. And anybody who sells any of these things or offers them for sale on Sunday forfeits his entire stock in addition to suffering fine and imprisonment. See Section 270.

According to Section 275 and the judicial construction put upon the word "gaming" by recent court decisions, you become a double offender if you play a game at chess or billiards or checkers or dominoes within two miles of a church when a meeting is being held, on Sunday or any other day in the week.

Section 277 forbids all dramatic or operatic performances, all dancing or wrestling, all trials of strength, all juggling and everything else of the kind. You may play on the piano when your guests visit you on Sunday evening, provided your piano does not make a noise—see Section 265—but you must not let your friends dance to the music, and you must not entertain them with any imitations of actors or any tricks of legerdemain, for these things are forbidden in a private parlor as well as in a public hall.

It is not the Sunday Excise Law alone that it is proposed to maintain, but all "the Sunday laws" such as those catalogued above. They are laws enacted at a time when the State was held to be the nursery governess of all the people, and when it assumed authority to prescribe "holy time" and religious observances, upon the intolerant models of Puritanism. It is not merely proposed to prevent the poor man from getting his pitcher of beer for his Sunday dinner: they propose to regulate the conduct of all of us, even invading the sanctity of our homes by way of compelling us to observe Sunday as if it were the Mosaic Sabbath and we were seventeenth-century Puritans.

#### TO TEST THE SHEATS "LAW."

[*The Sun*, Sept. 29.]

THE American Missionary Association of Congregational Churches has obtained an opinion from one of the most eminent constitutional lawyers in Massachusetts that the so-called "Sheats law" passed by the Florida Legislature last winter, will not stand in the United States courts. This law provides for a fine of not less than \$150 nor more than \$500, or imprisonment for not less than three months, for conducting any school wherein white persons and negroes might be instructed or boarded together within the same building, or taught in the same class, at the same time, by the same teacher.

The Orange Park School, against which the law was especially aimed, will open on Tues-

day, October 1. If the law is enforced the teachers will be arrested. The Rev. T. S. Perry of Limerick, Maine, who was pastor of the church and school last year, will return there this year. Prof. B. D. Rowles, of Fulton, N. Y., last year's principal, will also return. Miss Caroline Wandell, of Phoenix, N. Y., Miss Edith Robinson, of Battle Creek, Mich., Miss Helen S. Loveland, of Newark Valley, N. Y., Mrs. Julia E. Titus, of Moravia, N. Y., Mr. Otis S. Dickinson, of Granville, Mass., and Miss Margaret A. Ball, of Orange Park, Fla., will return.

#### SOUL LIBERTY.

BY FANNIE BOLTON.

"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand." Rom. 14: 4.

God hath not made the stars of an equal magnitude,  
Nor shaped the flowers alike that grace the summer  
wood.

In infinity of fashion, and in diversity  
His matchless grace and loveliness of character we  
see.

We hear no flower of nature declaring pettishly  
Unto another flower, "You must bloom, O flower,  
like me,"

Or catch a murmur echoed from the stars in heaven's  
height,  
Because some world is fashioned to reflect another's  
light.

God uses great and small for some noble ministry,  
According to the power of their given ability.  
And shall men not learn a lesson who with finite  
wit declare

That the nations must be fashioned by a set reli-  
gious square?

That each soul must think in ruts that fulfill a cer-  
tain plan,  
And shape up to a standard that was made by finite  
man.

Does this not place the human and the finite on the  
throne,  
That God in infinite wisdom and in love should rule  
alone?

The infinite God has given the certain liberty  
That is limited alone by a kind civility,  
To think as it shall please them, and he has not  
given to others

The right to fetter thought or oppress their human  
brothers.

Hands off! then men ambitious to prescribe my very  
creed;

For God alone can feed my soul with truth of heaven  
I need.

Let Him alone have sway and control of all my  
heart

To regulate my conduct and my worship by fine art  
Beyond your poor conception; for it is only He  
Who can shape the delicate soul-flower for his vast  
eternity,

And the human touch permitted, would count me  
such a cost

That the blood of Christ for me be vain, and heaven  
itself be lost.

#### RUSSIA.

[*Ivan*, in *New York Observer*, June 13.]

It is satisfactory to hear that the Protestant movement known as Stundism, which began in the south of Russia more than thirty years ago, and which is now passing through a time of great stress and trouble, is making considerable progress in Eastern Russia and in Siberia. The dispersal of Stundist families during the persecutions of recent years, and their settlement in regions remote from their old homes is unquestionably the origin of the movement in Siberia. I hear, moreover, that on the Pacific coast of Siberia there are several flourishing communities of Baptists and Stundists full of missionary zeal. One of their leaders, Yakob Dilyakoff, is not unknown in America; indeed, I believe his son is in one of your theological training schools, preparing, let us hope, to devote his talents to the good of his countrymen who are sitting in

darkness and shadow. Your readers may like to be reminded that America has played no inconsiderable part in the Stundist movement. It was in America that Karl Bonnekemper, its founder, was educated and inspired to start the great revival.

The other day I heard a curious tale that struck me as most pathetic and as the description of an incident that could only happen in Russia. An old peasant in a village in the province of Kief, together with some of his companions, were under the impression that the local commissary of police had done them an injustice. They met together and the old man was delegated to go to St. Petersburg to present a petition to the czar for the restoration of certain rights which they alleged had been taken from them. They had no money to pay their delegate's travelling expenses, so the delegate, accompanied by his son, walked. It was early in winter when they set out on that walk of a thousand and more miles, and as they travelled ever northwards the hardships they encountered were terrible. Arrived in St. Petersburg, they were sent from one public office to another. Nobody would accept the petition, and thoroughly disheartened, they left St. Petersburg with their petition. The son died in a village in the middle of a pine forest half-way back to Kief. It was a walk for the old man of close on three thousand miles. He was absent from home over four months.

#### ARRESTED FOR VIOLATING THE SUNDAY "LAW."

[*Mail and Express*, Sept. 23.]

JULIUS WOELFLE, of No. 313 East Eighty-fifth street, was arraigned before Magistrate Kudlich, at the Harlem Court, this morning, on a charge of violating the Sunday law in repairing a bicycle yesterday afternoon.

The magistrate discharged the prisoner on the ground that the repairing of the bicycle was a work of necessity, in order to enable the rider of the wheel to proceed on his journey.

#### "A CRIME AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION."

[*Santa Paula (Cal.) Chronicle*, Aug. 9.]

THE imprisonment of eight men in Tennessee, recently, because they saw fit to work on Sunday, is a crime against the Constitution of the United States. The imprisoned men observe the seventh day of the week as their Sabbath, as they have a perfect right to do under the Constitution. Religious legislation—and all Sunday laws come under this head—is infamous and will never be sustained by enlightened public opinion.

#### GOOD IN ITS SPHERE.

[*Daily Standard*, Leavenworth, Kansas.]

SPEAKING of the Christian Endeavor movement, the *New York Sun*, edited by that far-seeing old philosopher, Charles A. Dana, says: "It is evident that a desire, if not a settled purpose, to make the organization a distinct political power has taken possession of many of its prominent members. We regret to see this, and are heartily sorry. As a strictly moral enterprise its influence would be wholesome and beneficial; as a political power it will stir up bitter religious strife and prove a curse to the country. Sectarian combinations to effect political objects are dangerous."

## THE ROLL OF HONOR.

The Press of the Country Is Loyal to Religious Liberty.

THE secular press of the country, irrespective of locality or political creed, is coming to a realization of the crimes perpetrated upon inoffensive Sabbatarians in several States, and has spoken bravely for the oppressed. Without doubt, but few of those that have condemned these modern persecutions have come to our notice, but through the kindness of their editors or other friends of religious liberty, the following papers have reached us with editorial denunciations of these antichristian, un-American acts of intolerance. We have not intentionally omitted a single paper that has spoken upon this subject:—

## ARKANSAS.

Hot Springs Weekly  
Morning Gazette, Texarkana

## ALABAMA.

Universalist Herald

## CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco Examiner  
Public Opinion, San Francisco  
Coast Advocate, Half Moon Bay  
Dixon Tribune  
Four Corners, Wheatland  
Long Beach Breaker  
Berkeley Herald  
Chronicle, San Francisco  
Daily Standard, Eureka  
Riverside Enterprise  
Sentinel (Kings County)  
Saturday Review  
Republican Press  
Fresno Morning Republican  
Oceanside Blade  
Santa Paula Chronicle  
San Jose Daily Mercury  
Citrograph  
Santa Ana Standard

## COLORADO.

Rocky Mountain News, Denver  
Pitkin Miner, Pitkin  
Pick Drill, Spencer  
Indicator, Pueblo  
Lamar Sparks

## CONNECTICUT.

Mystic Press  
Norwich Bulletin

## DELAWARE.

Sunday Star, Wilmington

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Washington Chronicle  
United American  
Kate Field's Washington

## FLORIDA.

Tampa Daily News

## GEORGIA.

Atlanta Constitution  
Alpharetta Free Press

## ILLINOIS.

Chicago Inter-Ocean  
Chicago Tribune  
Chicago Times  
Chicago Daily Globe  
South Chicago Daily Calumet  
Warren Sentinel  
Courier, Gibson City  
Cuba Journal  
Chicago World  
Clay County Advocate  
Stark County Republican  
Flora Democrat  
Brown County Republican, Mt. Sterling  
Every Saturday, Elgin  
Weekly Tribune, Hebron  
Rushville Times  
Philosophical Journal

## INDIANA.

Indianapolis Sentinel  
Evening News, Michigan City  
Noblesville Ledger  
New Haven News  
The Echo, Darlington  
Hebron Leader, Hebron  
The Press, Lawrenceburg

## INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mildrow Register

## IOWA.

Iowa State Register, Des Moines  
Lawler Dispatch  
Sigourney Review  
New Era, Grand Junction  
Spokane Falls Review  
Mills County Journal, Glenwood  
Lester Record  
Ithuriel, Des Moines  
Clinton Age  
Davenport Leader  
Free Press, Mt. Pleasant  
Independent American  
Semi-Weekly Tribune  
Dubuque Trade Journal  
Diagonal Progress  
Globe, Council Bluffs  
Cedar Rapids Gazette  
Wheatland Gazette  
Freemont County Herald  
Tribune, Eddyville

## KANSAS.

Liberator, Norton  
Wamego Times  
Greeley News  
Kansas Democrat, Bennington  
Touganoxie Sentinel

## KENTUCKY.

Louisville Courier Journal  
Carrollton Commercial  
New Era, Hopkinsville  
Louisville Times

## LOUISIANA.

Times-Democrat, New Orleans  
Lafayette Gazette  
Roseland Herald  
Jewish Spectator

## MAINE.

Portland Transcript  
Odd Moments, Bangor

## MARYLAND.

Baltimore News

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston Traveller  
Arena, Boston  
Boston Daily Globe  
Springfield Republican  
Martha's Vineyard Herald  
Malden City Press  
Dedham Transcript  
Taunton Gazette  
West Roxbury News

## MICHIGAN.

Battle Creek Journal  
Kalamazoo Morning News  
Midland Republican  
Morrison's Town Talk, Bay City  
Ypsilanti Commercial  
Charlotte Tribune  
Rockford Register  
Morning Patriot, Jackson  
Caro Democrat  
Industrial News  
L'Anis Sentinel  
Odd Fellow, Owosso  
Carson City Gazette  
Detroit Free Press  
Lewiston Journal

## MONTANA.

The Age, Boulder  
The Butte Bystander

## MINNESOTA.

The Progress, Minneapolis  
Independent, Leroy  
Pioneer Press, St. Paul  
Red Wing Argus  
Republican, Fulda  
Minneapolis Journal  
The McIntosh Times  
Pine Island Record  
The Hills Crescent  
Daily Globe, St. Paul  
Anaconda Standard, St. Paul  
Nicolett County Independent  
The Appeal, St. Paul

## MISSOURI.

St. Louis Republic  
Iron County Register, Ironton  
Press Spectator, Salisbury  
Rosenwood Gazette  
Clearmont News  
Buzz-Saw, Williamsville

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Portsmouth Times  
Nashua Telegraph

## NEW JERSEY.

Bayonne Democrat  
Daily State Gazette  
Plainfield Press  
Plainfield Courier-News

## NEBRASKA.

Silver Creek Times  
Antelope Tribune, Neligh  
Oakdale Sentinel  
Reference, Cambridge  
Ashland Gazette  
Pawnee County Times, Burchard  
Minden Courier, Minden  
Tribune, Neligh, Antelope County  
Democrat, Central City  
Clay County Journal

## NEW MEXICO.

San Juan Times, Farmington

## NEW YORK.

New York World  
New York Sun  
New York Commercial Advertiser  
Rome Daily Sentinel  
Truth Seeker  
Democrat Register, Sing Sing  
New York Weekly Tribune  
Morning Sun, Norwich  
Brooklyn Daily Eagle  
Elmira Telegram  
Elmira Evening Star  
Kingston Daily Freeman

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Union Republican

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Times-Record

## OHIO.

Columbus Evening Press-Post  
Galion Inquirer, Galion  
The Register  
Ohio Soldier, Chillicothe  
Farm News  
Milo Advance  
Green Spring Times  
Democrat, Pomeroy  
Times, Cincinnati

## OREGON.

Milton Eagle  
Portland Transcript  
Plainedealer, Roseberg

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Daily Herald, Morristown  
Daily Telegraph, Sharon  
South Bethlehem Star  
Manayunk Sentinel, Philadelphia  
Sunbury Daily, Sunbury  
Kane Republican  
Evening News, Erie  
Pennsylvania Grit, Williamsport  
The Conservator  
Mt. Jewitt Herald  
Roscoe Forum

## RHODE ISLAND.

Hope Valley Advertiser  
Naragansett Times, Wakefield

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Laurensville Herald

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Lake County Independent  
Sioux Valley News  
Clarke County Republic

## TEXAS.

Weekly Star, Marshall  
Sunday Gazette, Denison  
Floyd County Times  
Gillespie County News, Fredericksburg  
Farm & Stock Record  
Farmers' Review, Bonham  
Yoakum Weekly Times

## TENNESSEE.

Nashville Banner  
Nashville American  
Chattanooga Times  
Dayton Republican  
Dayton Leader  
Daily Times, Dayton  
Clinton Gazette  
Maynardsville Eagle  
South Pittsburg Republican  
Jamestown Gazette  
Huntsville Chronicle  
Enterprise, Deer Lodge

Dispatch, Sunbright  
Dixie Reporter, Nashville  
Camden Chronicle  
Daily Progress  
Free Press  
Martin Mail  
Roan County Republican  
Sunday Times  
Daily Times, Chattanooga  
Patriotic Herald, Nashville

## UTAH.

Evening Press, Ogden  
Herald, Salt Lake City

## VERMONT.

Messenger, St. Albans  
Phoenix, Brattleboro

## VIRGINIA.

Hilloville News  
Echo, Broadway

## WASHINGTON.

Medical Lake Ledger  
Advertiser, Sprague  
White River Journal  
Milton Eagle

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Mountain State Gavel, New Martinsville  
Fairmont Free Press

## WISCONSIN.

Reedsburg Free Press  
Centralia Enterprise  
Antigo Herald  
Wisconsin Tobacco Reporter  
Motor, Madison  
Milwaukee Daily News  
Lodi Valley News  
Stevens Point Journal

## WYOMING.

Laramie Times

## Religious Press.

Of the religious press, the following journals have spoken against the persecution of seventh-day observers:—

Sabbath Recorder, Plainfield, N. J.  
Sabbath Outlook, ..  
Independent, New York  
Examiner (Baptist), New York  
Outlook (Congregational), New York  
Christian Register (Unitarian), Boston  
Unity (Unitarian), Chicago  
Church Bulletin (Baptist), South Chicago  
Watchman (Baptist), Boston  
Indiana Baptist, Indianapolis  
Die Rundschau (Lutheran), Chicago  
Monitor (Catholic), San Francisco  
Catholic Mirror, Baltimore  
Hebrew World, New York  
Chicago Israelite  
American Hebrew, New York  
Jewish Spectator, Nashville  
Jewish Criterion, Pittsburg  
American Israelite, Cincinnati  
Western Watchman, Mo.  
Christian Intelligencer, New York  
Primitive Catholic (Rel.)  
Christian Leader, Ohio  
Jewish Spectator, Memphis

## Favor the Persecution.

The following papers have attempted to justify the imprisonment of the Adventists:—

## SECULAR.

Atlanta Constitution  
Pulaski (Tenn.) Citizen  
Heartsville (Mo.) Press  
Toledo Blade, Ohio  
Hartsville Press, Mo.  
California Voice, San Francisco  
Macdenny Sentinel, Fla.  
Ottawa Semi-Weekly Journal, Canada  
Kankakee Daily Times, Ill.

## RELIGIOUS.

Canadian Baptist, Toronto, Ontario  
Nashville Baptist  
Texas Baptist Standard  
Alabama Baptist  
Messenger and Visitor (Baptist), St. Johns, N. B.  
Central Methodist, Ky.  
East Tennessee Baptist, Tenn.  
Omaha Christian Advocate  
Kentucky Baptist, Waco, Texas  
Nashville Christian Advocate, Tenn.  
Baptist Reaper, Martin, Tenn.  
Christian Statesman, Allegheny, Pa.  
Christian Reformer, Pittsburg, Pa.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

THE "Rights of the People," or "Civil Government and Religion," is the latest number of the *Religious Liberty Library* issued. It is an illustrated pamphlet of 378 pages, by Alonzo T. Jones.

The "Rights of the People," is the well-known pamphlet, "Civil Government and Religion," revised and greatly enlarged. This is in the opinion of many the best thing that Mr. Jones has ever written; and it ought not only to be read, but studied by every lover of liberty, either civil or religious.

It will be especially valuable for those who expect to study the Sabbath-school lessons in the "International Sabbath-school Quarterly," for the fourth quarter of the current year. Numerous references are made in these lessons to this pamphlet, and everyone who expects to master the lessons will need the pamphlet.

This book treats of live issues which are now before the people, and everyone should read it, whether interested in religion or not, because it discusses principles that are vital in a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Price, 40 cents. Usual discount given to dealers. Address the publishers, Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York.

## THE "ARENA" FOR OCTOBER.

This number of the *Arena* contains much interesting matter; but perhaps that which will most interest the readers of this paper is, "Cruel Persecution of Christians by Christians in Tennessee." This comes under "Current Notes on Vital Problems," by the editor. Mr. Flower is an exceedingly able writer, and his sympathies have been fully enlisted in behalf of those who are suffering religious persecution. These facts are a sufficient guarantee that anything he says upon the subject will be of surpassing interest. The price of the *Arena* is 50 cents, and may be ordered direct from the publishers, Boston, Mass.

"THE Duty to Obey Civil Rulers," is the title of the April issue of the *Religious Liberty Library*. The subject is considered from the standpoint of the Christian, and the limitations imposed by man's duty to his Creator are pointed out, as set forth by the declarations of Scripture. The bearing of expediency, and of the doctrine of natural rights, upon the question, are also considered. The propositions laid down are clear, logical, scriptural, and in harmony with the principles maintained by eminent and well-known men of our own times. As the question of obedience to civil rulers is becoming more and more a practical one for every person, by reason of movements set on foot which, under the sanction of "law," invade the realm of conscience, a clear understanding of the limits within which duty commands obedience to civil rulers, is a matter of prime importance to each individual; hence all should feel an interest to read this publication. Sixteen pages, price, 2 cents. Address the International Tract Society, Battle Creek, Mich.

presented from the Scriptures, in contrast with those sought from tradition and custom for "the venerable day of the sun." The arguments are drawn from a wide range of Scripture texts, and are forcibly presented. Address the author.

**JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga**—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People**—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary**—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger**—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.**—Why Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

## PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,

43 Bond St., New York.  
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

## PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Catalogue of religious publications sent free. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street  
New York City.

Oakland Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

"KEEP the Commandments," is the title of a sixty-four page pamphlet, published by Charles E. Buell, Plainfield, N. J. The author makes a strong and able plea for the observance of all of God's ten precepts, with especial reference to that one which is, in the name of religion, so generally disregarded. The claims of the seventh-day Sabbath are





NEW YORK, OCTOBER 3, 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.

ONE of the ceremonies observed by Jews in the celebration of Yom Kippur, or the Great Day of Atonement (Lev. 23:27-32), is the sacrifice of a live chicken by each household.

The head of the house, it is said, swings a live chicken over the head of each member of his family, after which the fowl is *killed by the rabbi* and eaten by the family.

New York has an ordinance against the sale of live fowls, and it has been the custom of the police to raid the Jewish quarter every year at the Atonement season and arrest all dealers found with live chickens in their shops.

This year the Jews got an injunction restraining the health authorities from making the customary arrests, but for some reason it proved to be invalid, and the authorities manifested a special zeal in making the raid. About fifty arrests were made on the 27th ult.

The Jews declare the raid an outrage; and so it was. No sanitary code or other code that interfered similarly with a Roman Catholic festival or with the rites of popular Protestantism could survive a week in New York; and neither should this senseless regulation. It may be wise to restrict to some extent the sale of live fowls in a large city, but to apply such a rule so strictly as to prevent the Jews from observing a time-honored, though it must be confessed a very foolish religious custom, is an exhibition of despotism more worthy of Russia than it is of an American city.

ROBERT T. NASH, of Amory, Miss., who was arrested and tried last May for working in his garden on Sunday, has been indicted by the grand jury for work said to have been done on the 12th day of May.

Mr. Nash was arrested on the 16th of September, about 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The officer who made the arrest was riding a mule, and was at first disposed to require his prisoner to walk fifteen miles to Aberdeen, the county seat. Mr. Nash told him that he was very tired, having already walked a long distance, that his feet were sore, and that he had been up the previous night with a sick child, that he was not able to walk so great a distance. The officer finally consented to allow him to go to the county seat by rail. There the officer met him and escorted him to jail, where he was locked up. The next day he was taken to the court-room and required to plead to an indictment which charged him with working on Sunday, the 12th day of May, in the field hoeing corn. He refused to plead, saying that he could not remember what he did on the 12th day of May. The

judge decided that this was equivalent to a plea of not guilty, and it was so entered. Mr. Nash said he was not ready for trial, and would like to have the case postponed. This request was denied, but upon calling the State's witnesses it was found that they were not present, and as it was the last day of the term, the case was necessarily postponed until the next term of court, which comes next spring. Mr. Nash was enabled to secure bondsmen the next day, and is again at liberty.

SEPTEMBER 25, there was a demonstration in this city in favor of "liberal Sunday laws." The phrase, "liberal Sunday laws," means laws that will prohibit honest labor and permit the sale of beer; laws that will close barber shops and open saloons.

About fifteen thousand men are said to have taken part in the parade on this occasion. President Roosevelt of the Police Board reviewed the parade, and Rev. A. H. Grant of Newburg made a speech, and said some good things. He is reported in the daily papers to have declared that the State has no right to say how a man shall spend his Sunday so long as he does not interfere with the liberties of others. "Just so long as the Church," added Mr. Grant, "in its effort to win man, leans upon the arm of the State, it will deservedly fail of its object and be despised. But just as soon as it recognizes its own strength as a great source of supply to the natural and universal spiritual needs and wants of men, breaks off its unholy alliance with the State, and relies wholly upon God, just as soon will it become at once efficient and powerful. Men will flock to it as soon as it can be easily said, 'Come unto me, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will rest your weary heads and weary hands.'

"The Church can adjust itself to modern civilization, and in so doing it need not, must not, lower its ideals one iota; but it must reduce its demands, and make up for this reduction by such intelligent advance in methods and such embodiment of the Spirit of Jesus as shall draw men to its ideals, and so to itself."

This is sound doctrine, but it had small place in a demonstration in the interests of "liberal Sunday laws." Why any *Sunday* law at all? Men have no right to interfere with the rights of others upon any day; then why any special law providing that they shall not do so on Sunday?

The fact is that the expression "liberal Sunday laws" is a misnomer. Any law that prevents any man from doing on any day any act that he might properly do at any other time, is illiberal toward that man, and is just as bad in principle though not in degree as a "law" which curtails the freedom of a thousand men. And that is just the reason why we should have no more law for Sunday than for the fourth of July, Christmas or Thanksgiving. When the State has declared Sunday to be *dies non* it has reached the limit of its right-

ful authority and enacted the only really liberal Sunday law.

The trouble is that too many men in that "liberal Sunday law" parade had forfeited their right to protest on principle against Sunday "laws" by themselves selfishly favoring at some time or other legislation that would require somebody else to close business on that day.

PROBABLY most of our readers will remember that in November, 1893, Eld. W. A. McCutchen, an Adventist minister, and Prof. E. C. Keck, an Adventist teacher, were arrested in Gainesville, Ga., for working in the back part of the Adventist church building on Sunday. The city of Gainesville, having no ordinance against Sunday work, these men were fined \$50 each, by the mayor, with the alternative of ninety days in the chain-gang for "disturbing the peace," though it was shown that the only possible disturbance that there was to anybody, was the mental annoyance of knowing that the work was being done. One witness testified that he was disturbed, though in another part of the city, when he was told that they were working.

The case was appealed from the Police Court to the Superior Court, and it was the general opinion of lawyers that when it came up on appeal, the Superior Court would reverse the decision of the mayor; but that functionary happened to be foreman of the next grand jury, and secured indictments against McCutchen and Keck for violation of the State Sunday statute.

The cases were tried together in the Superior Court, April 22, 1894. The jury failed to agree and both cases went over to another term, when the prosecuting attorney entered a *nolle* and they were dismissed.

In the meantime no decision was rendered on the appeal from the mayor, and it was supposed by the defendants that the prosecution had abandoned the case. About this time the judge before whom the State case was tried was superseded by a newly elected judge, who had formerly been a Baptist minister. The retiring judge is said to have expressed the opinion that the mayor had no jurisdiction; but the new judge recently decided that the fine was properly imposed by the mayor and that it must be paid, or the defendants must either forfeit their bonds or go into the chain-gang. But Messrs. McCutchen and Keck have elected to do neither, and have appealed to the Supreme Court, where the cases are now pending.

#### 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.

In clubs of 5 and under 25 copies to one address, 1 year	- 75c
" " 25 and under 50 " " " 1 " "	- 60c
" " 50 and under 100 " " " 1 " "	- 55c
" " 100 or more " " " 1 " "	- 50c
To foreign countries in Postal Union, - - - 1 " "	- 5s

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