



"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. 46.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 21, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAW.

FOR a number of months past New York has been greatly agitated by a crusade for the "enforcement of law."

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, the president of the Board of Police Commissioners, in an article in the *Sunday School Times*, of November 9, says:—

If there is one plain duty for the average citizen, it is to obey the law; and if there is one paramount duty for public officials, it is to enforce the law.

Of the duty of public officials to enforce the "law," Mr. Roosevelt says:—

More important than even the question of what a law is, is the question of the honest enforcement of the law.

It is evident that by "law" President Roosevelt means statute. His entire course of action in this city shows that such is his meaning. It is undoubtedly the plain duty not only of the "average citizen," but of every citizen to obey the law; but all statute is not LAW.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

The Declaration of Independence makes the securing of human rights the object of government; hence anything which defeats this object and denies rights instead of securing them is not just government; it is not legitimate authority but usurpation. It follows necessarily that the paramount duty of the officials who administer governments instituted for the securing of inalienable rights is the conservation of such rights, not the enforcement of "law" whether right or wrong. Just government does not defeat the very ob-

ject of its existence by making it the duty of the officials who administer it to trample upon natural rights. Human rights are above all so-called "law," for law exists only to secure the free exercise of inalienable rights.

Natural, inalienable human rights are self-evident because they exist in the very nature of things. They are not created by human enactment, but are inherent in the individual, and are self-evident because they exist in harmony with the law of nature. "This law of nature," says Blackstone, "being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding all over the globe in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to these; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."

Such being the true definition of law, it is of course the duty not only of the average citizen, but of every citizen to obey the law, and it is also the duty of public officials to enforce the law, because the law simply safeguards human rights. But statutes which invade inalienable rights are void in the very nature of things, and it is the duty of every official to so treat them.

There is probably not a country, nor State, nor municipality in the world that has not upon its statute books acts which have become inoperative simply by being allowed to fall into disuse. For the most part such statutes have been found to be not in keeping with human rights, the spirit of free institutions or with advancing civilization. In fact, much of the progress which has been made in the world in the development of civil liberty, has been in this way: meddling and mischievous statutes are not enforced, they become "dead letters," and are subsequently eliminated from the codes.

It is true that such "laws" are liable to be revived at any time so long as they remain upon the statute books. New York State and City have a number of such acts which nobody feels under obligation to enforce. There is an ordinance in this city which forbids, under penalty, any person to either get on or off a street car while in motion. Anyone transgressing this ordinance, and it is done by thousands every day, might be legally arrested and fined; but nobody seems to feel under

any obligation to enforce this mischievous and obsolete ordinance passed wholly in the interests of monopoly.

There is also a statute in force in this State which forbids the sale of any article on Sunday except food before ten o'clock in the morning, manufactured tobacco, fruits, confectionery, surgical appliances, and newspapers. But for years this "law" has been virtually a dead letter in this city. Many articles have been sold on Sunday, and arrests have been made only occasionally; but now the police commissioners profess to believe it to be their sworn duty to enforce this "law," and so even the florists have been notified that they must cease selling or delivering flowers on Sunday. And only a few days ago an itinerant vender of button-hole bouquets was arrested in Harlem, this city, for selling a bunch of violets on Sunday. Of course he was technically guilty, but the police judge discharged him nevertheless; and certainly such arrest ought never to have been made. Such "law" is not for the conservation of human rights, but is an invasion of such rights, and ought to be ignored by everyone whether citizen or official.

The law of New York permits the sale of confectionery, fruit and manufactured tobacco on Sunday, but prohibits the sale of a bunch of violets! Such a statute is utterly indefensible. Two persons may stand side by side on a street corner on Sunday, the one selling button-hole bouquets and the other cigars. The "law" makes it the "duty" of the policeman to arrest the one, but forbids him to molest the other. Such "law" is absolutely without either rhyme or reason; and worse than that, it is absolutely an invasion of human rights, as is likewise the "law" which forbids the sale of soda and mineral waters on Sunday.

One Sunday the past summer, the writer was on a street in New York City, at some distance from his home, and being thirsty wished to secure a glass of mineral water. He stepped into a restaurant on Broadway, where there was a soda-fountain, and called for a glass of vichy, and was told that as it was Sunday the fountain was not in operation. The sale of tobacco was, however, going on, and a cigar might have been purchased at the same counter where soda-water could not be served without violating the "law."

It requires no argument whatever to show that such so-called laws are violative of human rights. There is no reason whatever why the person who wishes to purchase any legitimate article of trade upon Sunday should not have the privilege of doing so. And there is just as little reason why anyone who wishes to sell such an article should not be permitted to sell it. There is absolutely no reason except the supposed religious character of the day, for prohibiting the selling of anything on Sunday. Judge Kent, of this State, held in 1811 that "the statute considers the violation of the first day of the week as immoral."¹ In 1877 it was held as a doctrine that might be considered as settled that by legislative act "Sunday may be protected from desecration."² While Judge Kent, in the same case previously referred to, held that the Sunday statute of New York "is only a continuation in substance of the law of the colony, which declared that the profanation of the Lord's day was a great scandal of the Christian faith." So that in New York State, as in most other States, the statute forbidding labor and business upon the first day of the week, rests upon a distinctly religious basis.

Now it is clearly either the duty of the State to protect religion as such, or it is not the duty of the State to protect it. If it be the duty of the State to protect religion and religious institutions, what possible justification can there be for permitting the sale of manufactured tobacco and confectionery upon Sunday, or even of fruits? None whatever. On the other hand, if it is not the duty of the State to protect Sunday as a religious institution, upon what possible grounds can the sale of any legitimate article of trade be prohibited on Sunday? And in any event what possible ground can there be for prohibiting the sale of soda water and other like drinks while the sale of confectionery and manufactured tobacco is permitted? For instance, many druggists sell both cigars and soda-water. Under the law of New York, as it stands at the present time, a druggist could legally sell drugs, surgical appliances, and manufactured tobacco, but he would be liable to arrest and fine if he sold a glass of soda-water or mineral water, or any other harmless drink.

These facts are cited simply to show that the Sunday "law" of New York, which is no worse than the Sunday "laws" of other States, is unnatural and illogical, and invades inalienable rights instead of protecting them. This so-called law is therefore no law at all in fact, for it rests not upon the law of nature, but its enactment and enforcement are alike dangerous usurpations of power which ought not to be countenanced by a free people.

THE "AUTHORITY" FOR SUNDAY.

THE *Independent* (New York), of Nov. 7, contains a symposium on the Sunday question, in which prominent writers of various denominations participate. It will be interesting to one candidly seeking for information on the question of the authority for Sunday as a day of rest, to note the divergent and contradictory positions taken by those thus selected to speak for Christendom in the matter of Sunday observance; each one speaking, as he does, for the church of which he is an adherent. It would seem that in the face of such a divergence of opinion respecting the nature and claims of the Sunday institution on the part of those supposed to be the best informed in the matter, and the most capable

of judging correctly, if for no other reason, some latitude might be allowed people in shaping their own conduct in the matter of Sunday observance. Such, however, is not the case, so far as the "law" is concerned; that prescribes how each and every one shall act on Sunday (no matter how he may think) in order to show a due regard for the day. If he has any latitude in the matter, it is that which he takes himself, in disregard of the "law."

We will note briefly some of the statements made by these different contributors to the fund of general information concerning the authority for Sunday observance.

Cardinal Gibbons states the Roman Catholic position, which is that Sunday as a religious day rests on the authority of "the church." He says: "The church desires us on that day to be cheerful, without dissipation, grave and religious without sadness and melancholy. She forbids, indeed, all unnecessary servile work on that day; but as 'the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,' she allows such work whenever charity or necessity may demand it. And as it is a day consecrated not only to religion, but also to relaxation of mind and body, she permits us to spend a portion of it in innocent recreation."

Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., attempts to find a scriptural foundation for observing the day as the Sabbath. He says that the Scriptures nowhere teach the abolition of that law of which the Sabbath is a part, or the abolition of the Sabbath alone; that the institution still rests, therefore, upon the authority of the fourth commandment; but that "the change of the day leaves the fourth commandment unimpaired," so "that the precept will be found to apply to our day as well as to the old economy." As to the authority for the change, he admits that "there is no direct precept," but says that "we hold that there is a clear implication of divine authority in the fact that on the day of his resurrection our Lord appeared five different times to his disciples, that precisely a week afterward he appeared again to the eleven, that Pentecost occurred on the first day of the week, that the church at Troas assembled for worship on the first day (Acts 20:7), that Paul enjoined the Galatian and Corinthian churches to 'lay by in store' on that day for charitable purposes (1 Cor. 16:2), and the Apostle John received the wondrous visions of the Apocalypse on 'the Lord's day' (Rev. 1:10), which could have been no other than the Christian rest-day."

But the "implication" which rests upon these seemingly substantial grounds is far from "clear," even were such an implication a sufficient basis for faith, which it is not. For,—

1. It was but natural that the risen Saviour in his love and pity for his grief-stricken and bewildered followers, should show himself to them immediately after his resurrection. There could be no reason for leaving them in their despair even for a day, and there is no hint that the Saviour had any other purpose in this than that of reviving their joy and their faith.

2. There is no scripture which states that "precisely a week" afterward he appeared again to the eleven; the record is that his appearance was "after eight days." As there are but seven days in a week, how it was that he appeared *after* eight days from the day on which he rose, and still precisely one week from that day, is a mystery which only the necessity of finding proof where there is none can enable any mind to comprehend.

3. Pentecost did not occur on the first day of the week, but on the seventh, being the

fiftieth day from the Passover (Lev. 23:5, 10, 15, 16), which in the year of Christ's crucifixion came on Friday. The Passover lamb was a type of the "Lamb of God." Horatio B. Hackett, D. D., LL. D., an eminent Baptist scholar and author on biblical subjects, says that "it is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signalized by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday."*

4. The fact that the church at Troas assembled on the first day of the week to break bread, furnishes no proof of the sanctity of that day, for the early Christians engaged very frequently in this ordinance.

5. There is no scriptural connection between the act of regularly laying by money for the poor and the observance of the Sabbath. Both are Christian acts, but the former is appropriate on any day of the week.

6. The "Lord's day" is, by the authority of Scripture, the seventh day of the week,—the Sabbath.†

Following this attempt by Mr. Chambers to find the institution of Sunday rest established upon the fourth commandment, or a "clear implication" of such a thing, Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D. D., of Harvard University Divinity School, sets forth that "the Sabbath is an integral and distinctive part of Judaism; and Judaism for the Christian is 'antiquated and abrogated' by Christianity;" and that consequently there is no Sabbath law for Christians. "For a Christian man," he says, "there is no 'law of Sabbath;' (1) because the Sabbath is a Jewish institution; (2) because the Christian is free from the obligations of the Jewish law; and (3) because the teaching and practice of the Christian Church for centuries indisputably and abundantly substantiates these positions." But it is a question whether those whose teaching and practice "substantiated" such positions, were at any time during those centuries more harmonious or scriptural in their Sabbath views than are the theologians of the present day.

Thus we are told (1) that the first-day sabbath rests upon the authority of "the [Catholic] church;" (2) that it rests upon the authority of the fourth commandment; and (3) that the fourth commandment and all the rest have passed away with Judaism, and that there is no law of the Sabbath for Christians, since they are "not under the law." Prof. Th. Lahn, of the University of Erlangen, is equally positive that Sunday cannot be regarded as a continuation of the "Jewish Sabbath," and says that "it never entered the minds of the Christians of the first three centuries . . . to call it [Sunday] the Sabbath. Not until the fourth and fifth centuries do we find the beginnings of this way of regarding the subject."

From other contributors we learn how far the modern practice of various countries of Europe is in harmony with these conceptions of the day; also what legislation there has been on the subject in the United States, and what (in the view of some) we ought to have both in legislation and practice at the present time. The one writer whose statements regarding the nature and foundation of the Sabbath are sustained by scripture and by reason, is A. H. Lewis, D. D., Seventh-day Baptist, whose argument is not for Sunday at all, but for the seventh day.

If from all this there is anything clear, it is that any scheme to compel all persons to act alike in the matter of Sabbath observance, is contrary to justice and common sense, and can only succeed in making hypocrites. And

¹ People vs. Ruggles, 8 Johns 290.

² Neuendorff vs. Duryea, 69 N. Y. 557.

* See his "Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts," pp. 50, 51.

See Ex. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13; Mark 2:27, 28.

since a law of the land must be for all alike, and from all human standpoints anything like harmony of thought or of conscientious action in the matter is out of the question, it is plain that reason does not call for any human legislation on the subject of Sabbath observance.

There is, however, plenty of good and harmonious and reasonable authority for the Sabbath instituted by God at creation, and legislation which fully covers the subject of Sabbath observance is in force to-day, and to which no difference of human opinions on the subject offers any objection. And that authority and legislation are found in the Word of God. But the administration of that law is in the hands alone of its divine Author, and of its violation human governments have no jurisdiction.

THE AUTHORITY FOR THE SABBATH.

HAVING considered the "authority" for Sunday as the weekly day of rest, and having noted the confusing and conflicting theories and assumptions of which that "authority" consists, it is well to take at least a brief view of the authority for the seventh-day Sabbath, designated in Scripture as the "Sabbath of the Lord." Otherwise it might be thought that there is no well-defined authority with regard to the Sabbath and Sabbath observance.

The authority for the seventh-day Sabbath rests on no assumption on the part of "the church" of power to set apart and command a day of rest, nor of any mere "implication" of divine warrant, but upon the clear and explicit command of God. While the ancient people of God were assembled in vast and solemn audience around the base of Sinai, from the top of the smoking, quaking mountain, while the whole earth shook, God spoke these words:—

Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but *the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. Ex. 20:8-11.

In this clear and simple language, consisting largely of words of one syllable, and suited to the comprehension of a child, God has set forth to the world the divine nature, authority, and obligation of his day of rest.

Why is it, then, that men are in such confusion and disagreement upon this subject? There can be no other reason than that they have turned aside from this plain word of the Lord and attempted to establish a different day upon God's foundation, or upon some foundation of their own. When people cut loose from the word of God, they can do nothing but drift, without chart or compass, upon the wide sea of human fancy and speculation.

The seventh-day Sabbath is the memorial of creation, and creation is the visible token of the power of the true God. "All the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." Ps. 96:5. The Sabbath commandment stands in the bosom of the Decalogue, as that which points out the true God, and the keeping of it is the visible sign to the world of those who are worshipers of the true God. It is their own evidence of their relation to the true God. For God has said: "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may

know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:20.

Is it possible, then, that this memorial of creation, this sign of the true God among so many false gods, could pass away while the Creator still maintained his sovereignty in human affairs? Is it not evident that this memorial is an absolutely essential part of God's plan for making himself known to mankind, and leading them to trust in him for salvation?

Redemption itself, which is secured to man by the gospel, is nothing else than creation,—making the sinner new in Christ, causing him to be "born again." Ps. 51:10; Eph. 2:10; Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17. Hence the memorial of creation,—the seventh-day Sabbath,—is an appropriate and necessary feature of the gospel plan which saves men from their sins.

In the light of these truths, we see the force and propriety of the Saviour's statement that "the Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. It was as much a necessity for man as the knowledge of the true God was a necessity. If the Sabbath had been kept by all, there could never have been any idolatry.

Such being the nature and purpose of the Sabbath, it is seen to be totally distinct from those ceremonies and ordinances which in the days of "Moses and the prophets" pointed forward to Christ, the coming sacrifice,—the shadows, as it were, cast by his body. It could no more pass away than God's eternal purpose could pass away. It has in it no elements of a temporal nature. And nowhere in the Word of God can a text be found which releases any man from its obligation.

It is true that Christians are "not under the law, but under grace," and have been called "unto liberty." But what is liberty? David said, "I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45. And James pronounces a blessing upon the one who looks into "the perfect law of liberty," and continueth therein; and we know that the "perfect law" is the law of God. Ps. 19:7.

The liberty that comes through Christ is not liberty to break the law or disregard it, but liberty to keep it; for men cannot keep it until they receive the grace of God. While they desire to do right, they find themselves in the bondage of sin, so that they cannot do the things that they would do. As Paul has so graphically expressed it, "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. . . . I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?*" I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 7:19-25.

This deliverance from the bondage of sin, so that an individual can do the good that he would do,—in other words, can keep that law which is the standard of goodness, is the liberty that is obtained through Christ. In Christ we are no longer under the condemnation of the law, but are created new and made in harmony with the law of God, as was Adam when he was created in Eden.

The trouble is not with the law, but with man, who is fallen. Not the abolition of the law, but the regeneration of man, is the purpose of God in the gospel. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the

likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the *righteousness of the law* might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

Thus the law of God has not passed away, nor the Sabbath commandment which was set in its bosom. The Sabbath of the Lord rests to-day, as it ever has rested, upon the authority of God's word, and that word is as clear and plain to-day, as solemn and as binding, as it was when spoken from Sinai.

THE PURITAN SUNDAY.

WHILE so much sighing is being done in our land by zealous Sunday "law" advocates for "a breath of the Puritan," it is of interest to look upon a picture of the Puritan sabbath as exemplified in the lives of the Puritans of colonial New England. This we find in an article which forms part of a symposium on the Sunday question in the *Independent*, of Nov. 7, entitled, "The Sunday of the Puritan Colonies," by Alice Morse Earle, from which we quote:—

The strict observance of the daylight hours of the sabbath was carefully cherished and protected by colonial law. The act of the Massachusetts Court in 1649 that "whosoever shall prophane the Lords daye by doeing any seruill work or such like abuses shall forfeite for euery such defaulte ten shillings or be whipt," was no dead letter. The New Haven code of laws, sterner still, ordered that profanation of the Lord's day should be punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporal punishment, "and if proudly, and with a high hand against the authority of God, *with death.*" Everywhere throughout the colonies "Wanton Gospellers," who profaned the sabbath, were caged and labeled and fined and imprisoned; but none were put to death.

The so-called "Blue Laws" of Connecticut, while false and belittling in wording, afford, after all, in spirit true exemplification of the old Puritan laws of sabbath observance which existed and were regarded throughout New England in colonial times. People were fined, reprimanded and punished for traveling, for riding, for unnecessary walking, for doing housework and farmwork on the sabbath. In the colonial court records scores, almost hundreds, of examples can be found of offenders and offenses of this class. For shooting wild fowl, for fishing, for driving cows, for grinding corn, for raking hay, for wringing and hanging out a washing, for gathering vegetables, for pulling flax, and many similar and more simple offenses the punishments were most mortifying and relatively severe. Some of these offenses were so natural as to appear to us to-day thoroughly harmless—such as sitting under an apple tree in an orchard, for which illegality and sabbath profanation two innocent New London lovers, John Lewis and Sarah Chapman, were tried in 1670. Let their names be posthumously honored as an expression of regard for their romantic and bold sentiment.

Not only were the colonists fined and punished for active disregard and violation of the sabbath, but they could not passively neglect the day. The church records throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries show prompt censure and action in the church against persons of all ranks and stations in life who failed to attend public worship. As matters of Church and State were never widely separated in early New England, the action of the court promptly supplemented that of the church. It was one of the duties of the ubiquitous tithing man to report "all sons of Belial, lyeing at home, strutting about, setting on fences, or otherwise desecrating the day."

In 1760 the legislature of Massachusetts passed afresh the law that "any person able of body who shall absent themselves from publick worship of God on the Lords day shall pay ten shillings fine." In Connecticut a similar law was not suspended till 1770. Strictly were these laws enforced in the seventeenth century. No petty excuses served to exonerate or permit escape from punishment. Often even sickness in the family

* See margin.

was deemed an insufficient reason for church absence. Not only the Puritans themselves, but those of other denominations, such as Episcopalians and Quakers, were fined for non-attendance on public worship in the Puritan meeting-house. The Quakers were fined and set in the stocks and caged and whipped for refusing to attend the meetings of the church they hated, and where numbers hated them. And as they were whipped if they came within the Puritan meeting-house and expressed dissatisfaction by word or demeanor, and whipped if they stayed away, it was truly well for them to fly to Rhode Island's welcoming arms as "a place for their setting down satisfied."

It would not seem to us to-day that the church services of the Puritans could always have proved attractive to church-goers. The meeting houses were barren, uncomfortable edifices; unheated in winter, unshaded in summer. The seats therein were usually hard and narrow. The services were over-long. Interminable prayers were followed by still longer sermons, the reading of which to-day seems to us well-nigh impossible not only through the bewilderment of mind occasioned by the use of obsolete doctrinal and symbolical phrases, but also through the depth of chilling dullness into which the reader sinks through the absence of spirituality of theme and treatment. As Carlyle said: "By human volition they may be read to-day, but not by human volition remembered." Let us have faith that in the original delivery of these sermons, the earnestness and Christian endeavor of the preacher gave a purport and interest to the words that we lose to day in the manuscript or printed pages. They were certainly deeply beloved of the original hearers, and cherished as powerful exponents of God's Word, as were also the hour-long prayers, and even the tuneless psalm-singing which survived a century of singing by ear, of leadership through memory only, with no sustaining instrumental accompaniment, no recruit of new music, no positive knowledge of the old, and above all with the odious custom of "lining" or "deaconing" the words. Truly, nothing but absolute religious faith could have preserved that cacophonous remnant of music a century and made it the source of spiritual inspiration which it proved to the Puritan then and ever after in its renovated life.

The distance from the home to the meeting house was often great, and often obstructed. The roads were poor, the means of conveyance inadequate; but all this proved no hindrance to church-going. We must remember, throughout the recounting of the many obstacles to church attendance, the many drawbacks, inconveniences and failings of the church services that the true Puritan loved the sabbath, and all it represented to him, with a devotion so intense that he gloried in the obstacles and clung to the drawbacks. He was, like Elijah, jealous for his Lord of hosts. But there was also an element of tenderness in their devotion which found some expression in the quiet and orderliness of the day.

Dear to the children of the Puritans and the Pilgrims was the descending hush of their sabbath eve, and the tranquil rigidity of their sabbath day; true token it seemed to them, not only of the rest decreed in the creation of the world, but of the eternal rest of the hereafter. The universal quiet of the day showed also a pure and unquesting faith which knew no compromise in religion, no halfway obedience to God's law, but rested absolutely on the Lord's day, as was commanded.

This implicit obedience to the letter as well as the spirit of the Word was one of the typical traits of the character of the Puritans, and was to them a vital point of their belief. To this day, among those of Puritan descent, and of faith in the truth and value of the lives of their Puritan ancestors, there still clings a somewhat Puritanic regard of the sabbath; and it is certainly true that in many communities, if a meeting were held, as of old, to get the "Town's Mind" with regard to sabbath observance, that if orderliness and quiet and religious respect to the day could not be enforced by law through fine or imprisonment, there would at least be expressed with force the old-time sentiment of the town of Belfast as to sabbath-breaking and sabbath-breakers—"that all who work or make unnecessary Vizits on the Sabbath, they shall be Look't on with Contempt."

One may be pardoned for doubting that

the "sabbath" described in these paragraphs was indeed "dear to the children of the Puritans and the Pilgrims." The Puritan "sabbath" resembled too much the "sabbath" of the Pharisees, which, though occurring on the divinely-appointed day, was made burdensome by human regulations. The true Sabbath—the Sabbath of the Lord—our Lord kept, as he himself had made it; but the sabbath of the Jews, as they had made it, he violated by doing upon it acts of mercy which their law, or traditions rather, forbade.

In the light of the plain statement of the Scripture that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," it seems strange to read that "implicit obedience to the latter as well as the spirit of the Word was one of the typical traits of the character of the Puritans." Where in all the Word of God is anybody directed to keep the day held sacred by the Puritans?

THE AMERICAN INQUISITION.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL—*Dear Sir*: The illustrated number of your valuable paper of Aug. 15, 1895, lies before me, and language fails me to give expression to my feelings as I hear of my fellow-creatures being thus persecuted for conscience' sake. I have read with horror of the inhuman deeds of the ecclesiastical butchers who did the bidding of that sacrilegious tribunal, the Roman Inquisition, where prisoners were, by the "mother of harlots," immured in filthy dungeons without light, without air, where they suffered with cold, were covered with vermin; with no sound to break the sombre silence of their dismal dwelling-place, other than the creaking of the machinery with which their immolators applied the torture, mingled with the sobs and moans of the maimed and dying.

I had hoped that the inquisitorial fires of the past having gone out, the blackened ruins which remain as a mark of the infamous work of that dread tribunal would serve as a sufficient warning to succeeding ages. But with sadness I see that America, from whose shores I am now absent as a missionary, though once the "home of the free," is following the example of the nations of the Dark Ages, by becoming a persecutor. And liberty, the most priceless boon of God to man, and that for which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, is no more. The parallel between the present and the dark past is complete.

Torres de Castilla, in his work entitled, "History of Political and Religious Persecutions," Vol. 1, p. 787, speaking of the Roman Inquisition, says:—

The criminals are there confounded together; not only are there those condemned for *cases of conscience*, but also malefactors judged by the ordinary tribunals, and it is not a rare thing to see bound to the same chain an *honorable man*, condemned for suspicion of Judaism, because he was never seen to eat pork, and a *brigand* or a *robber* on the *public roads*.

That the Tennessee Inquisition is a reproduction of this, and is, therefore, a disgrace to American civilization and jurisprudence, is clear. Then criminals, and those condemned for "cases of conscience" were confounded together. So are they in Tennessee. Then some were criminals, and some were those who dared to worship the Lord of hosts as their conscience dictated. Then an "honorable man" and the perpetrator of some outrage were chained together. So in Tennessee; the Adventists are honorable men. This was admitted by the judge who sentenced them. Their sole crime(?) consisted in practising what their persecutors call a kind of

"Judaism," viz., keeping the commandments of God as they read. This in the Dark Ages sent then to work in chains. It does the same in Tennessee. That *was* the Inquisition, and this in Tennessee *is* the the Inquisition. Was there ever a more complete parallel? Never. That iniquitous institution which was the scourge of past ages, has lifted its head in "free(?) America," and persecution stalks through the land.

Here in this part of the earth are many in whose minds the gospel shines but dimly, and who bow down to wood and stone, and commit many deeds of cruelty. Yet these deeds have been rivalled by many committed in the name of Him who on Calvary prayed for his murderers. And as I scan in vain the map of civilization, from the frozen regions of Siberia to the sunny slopes of California, for a place where religious freedom is the perfect guarantee of every man, involuntarily the query arises in my mind, Will the aborigines of the Dark Continent become the conservators of religious liberty, and offer an asylum to the oppressed, as did the red man of the New England forests in the days of Roger Williams?

With the persecuted, as a friend and brother, I can, and do, sincerely sympathize. Yet they do not need it, for no greater honor can fall to the lot of mortal man, than to be "counted worthy to suffer shame for His name." It is their persecutors who are in need of pity. When they stand before the last tribunal, where God, and not man, shall be the Judge, and from whose decision there will be no appeal, then their work will appear as it is. It is to be hoped that "blindness in part" only has happened unto them, and that they, like the Pharisees of old, will go and "learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice."

Yours truly,

G. B. THOMPSON,

Grahamstown, S. Africa,
Sept. 30, 1895.

EXPENSIVE PERSECUTION.

[*The Leader, Dayton, Tenn. Nov. 8.*]

LAST Tuesday disposed of the remaining cases against the Seventh-day Adventists in this county. Hon. H. C. Snodgrass, of this city, and Col. Shepherd, of Chattanooga, defended the accused Adventists, verdicts of not guilty being returned in every case but one, and that was dismissed by the attorney general. Thus ends a series of religious persecutions that were a disgrace, as as well as an injury, to the county, and ought not to have been commenced.

We say religious persecution, because the facts show nothing else. There are hundreds of men within sight of the courthouse, and elsewhere in the county, who labor at their usual avocations every Sunday and they were not molested, for no reason under heaven only that they were not Adventists. But the bigoted grand jurors of the last November and March terms, with a spirit of fanaticism and intolerance worthy of the dark ages, shut their eyes to the Sunday lawlessness that is being carried on openly under their very noses here in Dayton and elsewhere in the county, while they raised their hands in holy horror over the alleged wickedness of a little band of Seventh-day Adventists down at Graysville, five miles away! And it is a fact that cannot be controverted that there was scarcely a man on those two grand juries who is not violating the Sunday laws of the State, either in spirit or in letter, at least fifty-two days in the year. Why, it is a notorious fact that some of the members of those grand juries who found in-

dictments against the Adventists, openly defied the law by compelling their hired help to pick berries on Sunday during the berry season of last summer. And it is such holier-than-thou hypocrites as these, who wantonly put some of our most honorable and industrious citizens to needless humiliation and trouble, besides plunging the county into a heavy bill of expense. It is estimated that the persecution of the Adventists cost Rhea County, directly and indirectly, at least \$2,000, and we have nothing to show for it only the gratified malice of a few fanatics.

We want it distinctly understood that the LEADER does not advocate lawlessness of any kind; but we believe in even-handed justice. We do not believe in singling out any particular class of our citizens for persecution, because of alleged offenses thousands of other citizens are permitted to carry on with impunity. Let us have a fair deal, with the law enforced impartially and no more persecution because of religious belief.

NO SPECIAL LAW FOR SUNDAY.

[*The Sentinel, Kings County, Cal., Aug. 1.*]

THE only Sunday law that we need is to see that everybody behaves himself on Sunday as well as he does on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. We are tired of this "Sunday law" clatter. . . . As long as we are peaceful and obey the civil laws on Sunday we don't want any religionist to question or to dictate what we shall do on Sunday, or any other day, in a religious way. "Freedom to worship God" was one of the first songs of the Pilgrims, and why are people in this nineteenth century so little, so niggardly, so narrow-headed as to make or seek to make laws of religious force?

THE SUNDAY "LAW" IN CHICAGO.

THE friends of religious liberty in Chicago have scored several victories against the Sunday closers in that city, and bid fair to completely rout the forces that have been combining during the past few months to bring Chicago under a despotic régime. In every contest, so far, the friends of freedom have come out ahead, and their repeated successes have made for them warm and influential friends throughout the city.

On the 15th of July last the City Council passed an ordinance making it "unlawful for any person or persons to keep open any barber shop or carry on the business of shaving, hair-cutting, or tonsorial work on Sunday within the city of Chicago;" and, as a penalty for the violation of the foregoing provision, the ordinance declared that "any person, by himself, agent, or employé, violating the provisions of Section 1 of this ordinance shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined in any sum not exceeding two hundred (\$200) dollars for each and every offense." The "law" passed by a vote of 48 to 15.

Upon the passage of this ordinance, an association of barbers and friends of religious liberty was formed and incorporated, and began a popular crusade against the so-called "law" on the ground that it was unconstitutional and void, and that therefore it had no proper place in the city code of law.

For some weeks each of the opposing sides was strengthening its forces, and no open conflict other than arrests by the Sunday forces was discernable. But as October was drawing to a close, and failure of the Sunday cause appeared imminent, pressure was brought to bear upon the mayor of the city, who there-

upon issued an order that the police of the city should see that all tonsorial work should cease on the venerable day of the sun. This brought things to a crisis. A committee of religious liberty advocates waited upon his honor and asked him to withdraw his order. He, as is usual in such cases, replied that he would not, that the "law" was there, and that it was his "duty to enforce the law as it stands upon the statute book," etc.

The association opposing the Sunday "laws" then decided to go to the fountain-head of the evil, and to undertake its repeal. The attorney and counsel for the association, Mr. Addison Blakely, Lecturer on Constitutional Law in the University of Chicago, drafted a repeal ordinance, as follows:—

AN ORDINANCE

Repealing an ordinance making it unlawful for any person or persons to keep open any barber shop, or carry on the business of shaving, hair-cutting, or tonsorial work on Sunday, in the city of Chicago (passed July 14, 1895).

Be it ordained by the City Council of the city of Chicago:

Section 1. That the ordinance making it unlawful for any person or persons to keep open any barber shop or carry on the business of shaving, hair-cutting, or tonsorial work on Sunday within the city of Chicago, passed July 15, 1895, be and the same is hereby repealed.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in force from and after its passage.

Within two weeks every alderman was interviewed, the situation explained, the nature and meaning of Sunday "laws" set forth, and their character as revealed in their workings shown. When the council met, the petitions were presented, the rules were suspended, and the ordinance drafted by Attorney Blakely was passed by the astonishing vote of 57 to 5. After showing up the real character of Sunday "laws," only five aldermen voted for the retention of the Sunday-closing ordinance.

The Sunday forces now saw that they were fast losing ground and redoubled their efforts to keep the shops closed on Sundays. The president of the closing association said that they welcomed the hotter fight, and that they were never in such good fighting trim. "The fight is to be hotter than ever," he said to the newspapers, "and we expect many shops will open next Sunday. But the State law is all we need, and with the help of our friends we shall make the anti-closers weary of the fight. And while the repeal does not affect us, we will try to have the mayor veto it. That would strengthen our position."

But the mayor did not veto it. He saw the direction that the wind was blowing and took in his sails. The Sunday forces then tried to have the vote reconsidered, but failed as signally in this as they had failed before, and they, then, perforce, succumbed temporarily to the inevitable. But they by no means did it gracefully. Threats of assault and battery were openly made, and personal violence was evidently determined upon. A burly fellow, rough and uncouth, followed a representative of the religious liberty party down the elevator at the suggestion to "throw him down the elevator," "smash him in the neck," "put him to sleep," and kept close behind him for several blocks from the city hall until the man boarded an electric car for his home.

The *Chicago Record*, which has befriended the Sunday cause from the beginning, gives the following report of the events following the final defeat in the council:—

As soon as the mayor announced that the motion had been lost, Alderman Lawler tried to have the petition presented by the barbers referred to a committee, but he was opposed by Alderman Madden and the pe-

tion was ordered printed. Then the barbers left the council chamber and gathered in the corridor.

"It was all the mayor's fault," shouted one. "It was Alderman Madden—we'll remember Madden," shouted another.

And when one of the opposition barbers who had occupied a seat in the gallery passed, some one suggested that he be thrown down the elevator shaft.

"Now we know who we've got to fight, and we're ready to go at it," said President Hoy. "We'll begin to-morrow and get up a monster petition and have it signed by all the barbers, grocery clerks, salesmen, butchers, and other clerks in the city who now have to work seven days in the week. Then we'll hold a big mass meeting in Central Music Hall, and when we've got the people thoroughly worked up we'll go before the City Council again and demand that an ordinance be passed under which the police will be compelled to close Sunday shops. Of course this action does not hurt the State law. That is still in force, and we propose to enforce it."

At this juncture in the history of the controversy, several religious organizations which had been all the while lending their assistance to the work, came out openly in its support and raised contributions to help on the Sunday-closing movement. Even a labor organization has come to their support and passed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Chicago Labor Congress, in regular session assembled, denounces in unmeasured terms the efforts of certain factions and individuals who are straining every nerve to make the Cody law inoperative.

The whole interest will now center upon the controversy going on in the courts. The State's attorney is with the religious liberty party, and has ordered the prosecutions stopped. Both sides are sanguine of success. A representative of the *Chronicle* asked Attorney Blakely how the decision would go. "It [the statute] will undoubtedly be declared unconstitutional," was the reply.

"But the other side tell me that there is not a shadow of doubt that the law will be upheld," was the rejoinder.

"Under the circumstances," the attorney said with a laugh, "I presume we will have to leave the decision of the question to the Judge."

HOW ARE THE POWERS THAT BE ORDAINED? *

How are the "powers that be," ordained of God? Are they directly and miraculously ordained, or are they providentially so? Did God send a prophet or a priest to anoint Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, or did he send a heavenly messenger, as he did to Moses and Gideon? Neither. Nebuchadnezzar was king because he was the son of his father, who had been king. How did his father become king?

In 625 B. C. Babylonia was but a province of the empire of Assyria; Media was another. Both revolted, and at the same time. The king of Assyria gave Nabopolassar command of a large force, and sent him to Babylonia to quell the revolt, while he himself led other forces into Media, to put down the insurrection there. Nabopolassar did his work so well in Babylonia that the king of Assyria rewarded him with the command of that province, with the title of King of Babylon.

Thus we see that Nabopolassar received his power from the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria received his from his father, Arshur-bani-pal; Arshur-bani-pal received his from his father, Esar-haddon; Esar-haddon received his from his father, Sennacherib; Sennacherib received his from his father, Sargon; and Sargon received his from the troops in the field, that is, from the people. Thus we see that the power of the kingdom of Babylon, and of Nebuchad-

* From Part I, "Rights of the People, or Civil Government and Religion."

nezzar the king, and of his son, and of his son's son, was simply providential, and came from the people.

Take, for example, Victoria, queen of Great Britain. How did she receive her power? Simply by the fact that she was the first in the line of succession when William the Fourth died. Through one line she traces her royal lineage to William the Conqueror. But who was William the Conqueror? He was a Norman chief who led his forces into England in 1066, and established his power there. How did he become a chief of the Normans? The Normans made him so, and in that line it is clear that the power of Queen Victoria sprang only from the people.

Following the other line: The house that now rules Britain, represented in Victoria, is the house of Hanover. Hanover is a province of Germany. How came the house of Hanover to reign in England? When Queen Anne died, the next in the line of succession was George of Hanover, who became king of England, under the title of George the First. How did he receive his princely dignity? Through his lineage, from Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, who received the duchy of Saxony from Frederick Barbarossa, in 1156. Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, was a prince of the house of Guelph, of Swabia. The father of the house of Guelph was a prince of the house of the Allemanni, who invaded the Roman Empire and established their power in what is now Southern Germany, and were the origin of what is now the German nation and empire. But who made this man a prince? The savage tribes of Germany. So in this line also the royal dignity of Queen Victoria sprang from the people.

And besides all this, the imperial power of Queen Victoria as she now reigns is circumscribed—limited—by the people. It has been related, and has appeared in print, that on one occasion, Gladstone, while prime minister and head of the House of Commons, took a certain paper to the queen to be signed. She did not exactly approve of it, and said she would not sign it. Gladstone spoke of the merit of the act, but the queen still declared she would not sign it. Gladstone replied, "Your Majesty *must* sign it." "*Must* sign!" exclaimed the queen; "*must* sign! Do you know who I am? I am the queen of England." Gladstone calmly replied, "Yes, Your Majesty, but I am the PEOPLE of England;" and she had to sign it.

The people of England can command the queen of England; the power of the people of England is above that of the queen of England. She, as queen, is simply the representative of their power. And if the people of England should choose to dispense with their expensive luxury of royalty, and turn their form of government into that of a republic, it would be but the legitimate exercise of their right; and the government thus formed, the power thus established, would be ordained of God as much as that which now is, or as any could be.

Personal sovereigns in themselves are not those referred to in the words, "The powers that be are ordained of God." It is the governmental power, of which the sovereign is the representative, and that sovereign receives his power from the people. Outside of the theocracy of Israel, there never has been a ruler on earth whose authority was not, primarily or ultimately, expressly or permissively, derived from the people. It is not particular sovereigns whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. *It is the genius of government itself.* The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But says the Scrip-

ture, "God is not the author of confusion." God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and he has put within man himself that idea of government, of self-protection, which is the first law of nature, and which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth. And it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they shall dwell. One people has one form; another has another.

The genius of civil order springs from God; its exercise within its legitimate sphere is ordained of God; and the Declaration of Independence simply asserted the eternal truth of God when it said, governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." It matters not whether they be exercised in one form of government or in another, the governmental power and order thus exercised are ordained of God. If the people choose to change their form of government, it is still the same power; it is to be respected still, because it is still ordained of God in its legitimate exercise,—in things pertaining to men and their relation to their fellowmen; but no power, whether exercised through one form or another, is ordained of God to act in things pertaining to God; nor has it anything whatever to do with man's relations toward God.

Except in the nation of Israel, it is not, and never has been, personal sovereigns in themselves that have been referred to in the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." It is not the persons that be in power, but the powers that be in the person, that are ordained of God. The inquiry of Rom. 13:3 is not, Wilt thou then be afraid of the person? but it is, "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power?" It is not the person, therefore, but the power that is represented in the person, that is under consideration here. *And that person derives his power from the people*, as is clearly proved by the scriptural examples and references given. "To the people we come sooner or later; it is upon their wisdom and self-restraint that the most cunningly devised scheme of government will in the last resort depend."*

THROUGH A FIERY ORDEAL.

[Republican, Dayton, Tenn., Nov. 8.]

TUESDAY the remaining cases against the Seventh-day Adventists were quickly disposed of, and for the first time in twelve months this religious sect in Rhea County can enjoy the sweets of perfect religious and civil liberty. These people have gone through a fiery ordeal. They have, many of them, literally been imprisoned and made bond-slaves to the State for opinion's sake. But through it all they have maintained an evenness of faith and a serenity of temper that has challenged and won for them the admiration and respect of all classes of people. At this time we do not intend to point a moral or preach a homily on the evil affects of religious prosecution. We believe, however, that the people of Rhea County have received a great light on the question. Certainly a liberal sentiment has been awakened on behalf of religious freedom; and we hope and believe that never again will the Adventists of Rhea County be disturbed in their inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. All methods of honest worship are acceptable to God, so long as they do not conflict with His spiritual and moral laws. Conscientious differences of opinion on how to attain heaven should not set men to fighting one another.

* Bryce, American Commonwealth, chap. 24, last sentence.

SPEECH OF JUDGE LEWIS SHEPHERD AT THE ADVENTIST TRIALS IN DAYTON, TENN.

THE subject covered in this indictment is one of great importance to the people of this community.

Inasmuch as the Attorney-General said seriously that he was going to insist upon conviction, and chose to treat the matter seriously, I must beg the indulgence of the honorable court and the gentlemen of the jury to offer a few remarks.

Now, may it please your honor, Mr. Snodgrass and myself have volunteered our services to assist the defendant in his defense before the court and the jury of the county, on the grounds that we believe that he is not guilty; he has violated no law, and that he ought not to be subject to any of the penalties.

The law provides that should a man pursue any of the ordinary vocations of life on Sunday, erroneously called "Sabbath," he can be proceeded against, before a justice of the peace, and the fine be covered by three dollars, I believe. That particular act set forth by the statute does not constitute an indictable offense; though if these offenses are continuous in their nature, and so conducted as to become a common nuisance to all, they may be indicted upon common law principles; but there is no statutory law involved in the case.

Now in this particular case there is a gentleman who followed the vocation of a student. ('Tis a pity that Mr. Flitcher did not follow the vocation of a student in that college, and spell the words better than they are spelled in this indictment. Now he ought to quit his vocation of attorney-general, and go to some Adventist school and learn how to spell.)

Now, may it please your honor and the gentleman of the jury, the act which is sought to be converted into an act of public nuisance, is not an act of publicity, but of charity. How do we know the circumstances around that house where he was nailing on those boards? There might have been circumstances that demanded this labor, the neglect of which would have endangered the health of his family. It is sufficient to state, and this honorable court will charge you, that works of necessity are of course excluded.

Now, gentlemen, I did not know that a religious question was involved in this case until I heard Mr. Snodgrass; he is quite well posted, as he quotes quite fluently. Reasoning from the proof, one would not know that sort of a question was in this case at all. But as a matter of public concern, *that is just what it is.*

These people worked on Sunday because they conscientiously believe it is right to so do. Yet it is a matter of such notoriety and concern that we take judicial note of it.

I have been a student of the Scriptures of the Almighty ever since my early infancy. We have heard it every day and Sunday too. Before we retired to our beds at night we read a chapter in the Bible. And Sunday after Sunday, from the time we came into this world, we have gone out to the house of God and heard some minister preach, taking the Bible as the light of the world. And we know one thing, that the Almighty established one thing in this world, and that is our Sabbath. Man has no power to establish any thing of that sort, but God has. And the record that we have in the Scriptures is that God made the world in six days, and when it came to the seventh day, it is said that God looked out on this beautiful world that he had made and he saw that it was good. Then he rested from all his works. And God said that six days of the week thou shalt work and

on the seventh thou shalt rest from all thy works.

And this Sabbath was kept by the people of God all along up to the time when Christ and the apostles passed through the wheat field and shelled some wheat to eat, and were unjustly accused of breaking the Sabbath. Now that was a religious question with those people in those days. They were keeping that commandment of our God, to work on the six days of the week and rest on the seventh, as a memorial of the fact that God had worked six days of the week and rested on the seventh. It was a memorial of the rest of God, just like the ordinance of the Lord's supper is a memorial of Christ's death for sinners.

With reference to the moral law in this, the Adventists believe that if they discharge their conscientious duty to God, it is their duty to rest on the Sabbath. Now, in my town, we do not speak of a Sabbath school, but it is a Sunday school. So we do not refer to this Sunday as a sabbath at all; it is simply Sunday. Do you know how Sunday as the Sabbath came about? Why the emperor Constantine said that the Almighty did not know what he did when he established the seventh-day Sabbath, and said he, I shall pass an edict to worship on the first day, Sunday. The pope of Rome, after Constantine had issued that proclamation, addressed to the world an edict establishing the first day of the week as the sabbath.

So they said, We are going to have a new sabbath here. God says, You must keep the seventh day that I rested on; you must rest on that day as a memorial of my rest from my labors; but Constantine says, We will keep another day, and the pope of Rome says, We will keep another.

That is the simple and brief origin of Sunday as a sabbath. We have conformed to this Catholic precedent and joined in and keep the first day of the week instead of the seventh. But how about a man who has conscientious scruples on this subject?

What would you think of a man that pretended to be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, who, if there was a law in the State in which he lived that says, "Thou shalt commit adultery," though the moral law says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," would in compliance with the State law commit adultery? What would you think of a man who pretended to be a follower of God, and who thought it was his duty to keep the seventh day, and because he thought the law required it, would go and violate the law of his God in obedience to the State law?

A man who cannot defend his conscientious belief any more than that, is not a good American citizen. These people believe that the seventh day is the one upon which they should rest, and in which they must worship God, and then they go along and labor six days and do it so as not to disturb anybody. What sort of a nuisance was it to go in there and nail those planks on his house to keep out the cold? This fellow who is witness in this case is over-particular. He is exactly like the Pharisee who shouted out for to crucify the Saviour because he had violated the Sabbath day.

Supposing some fellows should pass a law in this part of the country to the effect that you shall not any more break bread nor drink wine in the commemoration of the death of our Saviour. Would not every earnest Christian disregard that law and go along celebrating the ordinances in the same way, and keep that memorial service? Why, gentlemen, this Sabbath memorial is like the monuments that mark the places of heroic deeds on the battle field of Chickamauga; a stone that marks the

place of some still loved dead. It is sacred in the bosom of those who honestly believe in the seventh-day Sabbath.

Now, gentlemen of the jury, in this free America, the home of the oppressed of all the earth, where a man can come under the glorious protection of the Constitution, and worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, where there can be no religious tests required; in this free America, are you prepared to say that when these men have simply exercised what they believed to be their conscientious duty, and have conscientiously kept the commanded law of the Lord Almighty, that they have committed a nuisance?

Gentlemen of the jury, I know a great many of you, and those that I do not know, I can see honesty and intelligence beaming out of your countenances; and I have too much confidence in you to believe that you will pronounce a verdict other than "not guilty."

SHALL RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION CONTINUE?

[Rev. E. T. Hiscox, D. D., in the Examiner, Nov. 7.]

No man who deserves the name of Baptist, and is worthy to share the honorable history of the fathers who suffered in New England, Virginia and elsewhere, two and a half centuries ago, not to mention earlier times, but will protest against the application of civil tests to matters of faith, or the infliction of civil penalties for dissent in matters of religion, no matter who may be the sufferers. Every man has equal rights with every other man in concerns of conscience and religion. Baptist and Pedobaptist, Protestant and Romanist, Mormon and Pagan, all stand on common ground as to the rights of faith and worship, so long as no one else is wronged, or his rights invaded by their means.

The recent cases of prosecution—persecution, it has very properly been called—have been aimed almost exclusively at the Seventh-day Baptists, for engaging in secular employment on Sunday, they observing Saturday as their Sabbath. The Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists are separate and distinct denominations. With the former I have been familiarly acquainted from my childhood. More quiet, orderly and industrious people can nowhere be found than they, nor better citizens. And as Christians, none are more consistent, devout or loyal to their convictions and their creeds. As to the Adventists, I have no personal knowledge. But in the numerous cases in which they have been before the courts, as law-breakers, for working on Sundays, the testimony of witnesses, lawyers, and even of the judges, has almost uniformly been that, except in that one thing, they were good citizens, kind neighbors, and men of most praise-worthy character and upright conduct. The Sunday work for which they have been prosecuted, fined and imprisoned has usually been some trivial matter, like cutting wood for the fire, or hoeing in the garden, and seldom, if ever, in sight of a place of Sunday worship, and very seldom even in sight of a human habitation. Those who have informed against them have usually discovered them at work by accident, or spied them out for the purpose of having them arrested. These facts appear on their trials, and are as dishonorable to those who inform against them as they are to the States which enact and maintain statutes so detestable, and so capable of being made instruments of oppression to persons innocent of all crime save differences of religious opinion.

These shameful transactions have been going

on up to this year of grace, 1895. They are going on now. Religious persecution did not cease with the Dark Ages, nor confine itself to barbarous lands. . . . The base work goes on, and religious tests continue to be enforced against good citizens and otherwise blameless Christian men.

"IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS."

WE are pleased to receive orders for that beautiful and interesting book, "In the Heart of the Sierras, or Yosemite Valley," and to make a present of a year's subscription to the AMERICAN SENTINEL to each purchaser of the book, at the following reduced prices:—

In cloth, plain edges,	-	\$2.75
" " gold "	-	3.25
" Sheep, marbled "	-	3.75
" Half morocco, gold edges,	-	5.00
" Full " " " very fine,	-	6.00

This book makes a most acceptable holiday present. Sent to any address postpaid, on receipt of price. The book may be ordered to one address, the SENTINEL to another.



THE "CYCLONE" STILL WHIRLS!

SWEEPING EVERYTHING CLEAN BEFORE IT.

SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY!

We are having splendid success selling the "Cyclone." The last shipment came this morning, and had not been here an hour before they were all at work, and every one is giving satisfaction. One test was on clothes worn by men who work in the Twist Drill works, and they were full of grease and iron, but the "Cyclone" was equal to it, and the people were well pleased with the work.

A. S. GARMON & SONS, AKRON, OHIO.

MESSRS COON BROS., Battle Creek, Mich.,

Gentlemen: The "Cyclone" far surpassed our expectation. We were afraid to risk a trial order as you said so little about it in your "ad," but after using it we think that like the glory of Solomon, "the half has not been told." I would like the agency for this county.

CHAS. GRIM, Coal City, Ind.

The Law of God as Changed by the Papacy

Is the title of a large Chart just issued, which shows in a striking manner the blasphemous pretensions of the Papal power. The testimony of the Best Catholic Authorities is given, and shows, by quoting their own words, that Sunday is a child of the Catholic Church. These quotations, together with admissions from standard Catholic works, are arranged in parallel columns on either side of this Chart, while the center column contains the Ten Commandments as taught by the Catholic Church. The whole forms a collection of extracts of incalculable value for every Bible student.

The Charts are three by four feet in size, and are printed on heavy map cloth in bold type, easily read across the largest room.

Price, Post-paid, \$1.00.

A fac-simile edition on thin paper, size 5½ x 7½ inches, suitable for missionary distribution, has been prepared, and will be sent post-paid at 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND STREET, New York City.

Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

CHOICE APPLES AND POTATOES

In Barrel or Car-load Lots . . .

AT REASONABLE FIGURES.

CHESTNUTS AND MAPLE SYRUP

Write, F. W. BARTLE, Norwich, N. Y. Wholesaler of Fruits and Health Foods.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 21, 1895.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

THE *Independent* says: "Efforts are being made to bring about a union between the Prohibition, Populistic and Socialist parties in a single National Reform party."

It is stated that "two colored men, both Protestants, one an alumnus of Oberlin, and the other of Amherst, have entered as students in the Catholic University at Washington."

THE friends of religious liberty everywhere will hold in high esteem Ex-Congressman H. C. Snodgrass, of Sparta, Tenn., and Ex-Judge Lewis Shepherd, of Chattanooga, for their able and unselfish defense of the persecuted Adventists of Rhea County, that State.

THE papers of Dayton, Tenn., especially the *Republican* and the *Leader*, are entitled to great credit for the decided stand they took from the very first against the persecution of the Adventists in that community. All honor to them for their outspoken advocacy of human rights.

THE persecution of Seventh-day Adventists, under color of the unjust Factory Act, still continues in London, Eng. November 1, the publishers of *Present Truth*, were, for the third time, summoned before the Police Court for Sunday work done by certain of their employes. They were fined forty-two pounds (\$204) and the costs will be about ten pounds additional. The manager of the office writes us: "We do not see how we can avoid being closed up in our manufacturing department by the seizure as they will be sure to remove more than one hundred pounds' worth of goods to satisfy the fine, and our small plant will be crippled by such a loss."

THE Sunday-law contest has been going on in this city for almost a year past and the end is not yet.

At first this contest was ostensibly a fight against the Sunday saloon, but it has been all the while in reality a determined and persistent effort to advance the interests of the so-called "Christian sabbath."

It is true that the saloons are more generally closed on Sunday than formerly, but the enforcement of the "law" has not stopped there. Numerous arrests have been made for the most trivial causes. Police spies have repeatedly, by lying to them, induced small dealers to violate the "law" by selling some small article such as a paper of pins, a pair of stockings, three cents' worth of stationery, a clean collar, or something of that nature, and have then arrested them. Only a few days since an itinerant flower vender was arrested

in Harlem, this city, for selling a bunch of violets on Sunday, and the regular florists have been notified that they will be arrested if they either sell or deliver flowers on Sunday hereafter.

As before remarked, the leaders in this movement profess that their object is simply to enforce the "law" and to close the saloons on Sunday. But one of the leading clergymen of this city announced from his pulpit a few weeks hence, that the real object was to secure the observance of the "Christian sabbath;" so that the issue is no longer an obscure one, and every man, woman and child has opportunity to act intelligently in the matter. The question is, Shall the power of the State continue to be used to enforce a religious dogma?

Of the acquittal of the indicted Seventh-day Adventists at Dayton, Tenn., on the 5th inst., the *Chattanooga Times* says: "This ends, for the time being at least, one of the most celebrated struggles for religious liberty ever waged on American soil. It has been a valuable object lesson to the people of Rhea County. The scenes and incidents attending the trial of these people, their submission to what has seemed the harsh and arbitrary operations of the law, the speeches made, the literature produced—all of these things have tended to throw light upon the dark places, and a perceptible spirit of liberality and tolerance for other people's rights is now seen and felt."

ILLINOIS SUNDAY LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

[Special Dispatch to the American Sentinel.]

CHICAGO, NOV. 17.—The case of Manager Eden, of the Great Northern Hotel, who was arrested here some weeks ago and fined for the violation of the Cody Sunday Law, passed at the last session of the legislature, came up for final hearing in the Circuit Court yesterday. The closing remarks were made by the counsel on each side, and the venerable judge then gave his decision upon the law, pronouncing the statute *unconstitutional and void*. He held that the pretended law was a flagrant violation of the plain provisions of the constitution of this State which declares positively that "in all cases when a general law can be made applicable, no special law can be enacted." The Judge held that the purpose of law is to enforce justice, not to be used as an instrument of persecution and damage to the private business of any citizen. Special and inequitable legislation is entirely without the delegated powers of the law-making body.

The decision is eminently satisfactory to the friends of personal liberty and is a stinging defeat for the Sunday advocates who have been arresting the barbers by the score almost every week, for a long time past. These arrested men, by the advice of Attorney Blakely, have refused to pay either fines or costs, on the ground that they violated no law; and

now this decision will prevent the Sunday-closers from collecting the money. They will have to pay it over themselves, or the justices go without their pay. The latter is the most probable course, however, as it is understood that some of the justices were in league with the association on a division of profits. Their great respect for this particular "law" was augmented by an expected harvest. But the decision has thrown them into confusion, and they will be under the necessity hereafter of sympathizing with each other in the "mass" meetings, one of which the Sunday-closers have called for this afternoon.

An appeal to the Supreme Court was at once taken by the Barbers' Sunday-closing Association. The Chicago barbers are greatly at variance on the subject of Sunday-closing, a majority of the owners of shops being against the "law," while the men who do the actual work are equally divided over the matter.

Pending the appeal the prosecutions are to be stopped and the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago are again without a Sunday "law" of any value to the Puritanical Sunday closers.

Judge Gibbons, who presided, held court in one of the largest court rooms in the city, and still there was too little room. At every Sunday-law hearing there is an immense audience which evidently shows the interest that the public takes in this decision. In Chicago, at least, Sundayism is the great question of the hour. It has occupied more space in the *Chicago Record* the past few weeks than any other question. The interest in the agitation is difficult of explanation on any other hypothesis than that the Sunday controversy is the coming great political question of the times.

A TENNESSEE paper, the *Jewish Spectator*, of Memphis, in its issue of the 8th inst., notes the victory gained for religious liberty in Rhea County, that State, and says:—

We congratulate the AMERICAN SENTINEL and all secular and religious papers, who championed the cause of those conscientious Sabbatarians. We believe firmly that the influence of the press contributed much to this victory of right over wrong, of justice over bigotry, because but a few months ago several Advents were sent to prison for the same offense by a verdict of the same court.

The press has indeed done good service in the struggle of the Tennessee Adventists for equal rights, but those Tennessee papers that have spoken out fearlessly for liberty are entitled to even greater credit than their contemporaries of other States.

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
Lo foreign countries in Postal Union, - - - 1 " "	- 5c

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