



"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. 11, No. 40.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 8, 1896.

Entered at the N. Y. Post-Office.

American Sentinel,

Published Weekly in Defense of Religious Liberty.

For Further Particulars and Terms see Last Page.

EDITOR, C. P. BOLLMAN.
ASST. EDITOR, L. A. SMITH.

PERSECUTION AND "THE LAW."

It has been the custom of religious intolerance in all times of which history speaks, to seek to hide itself under the cloak of regard for "the law of the land." "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die," said the Jews, when they accused Christ before Pilate; and as religious phariseism dealt with the Master, so has it dealt with his servants. They have been accused, tried and condemned as violators of "the law."

It is maintained—and very truthfully—that a prime requisite of good and stable government is a popular respect for the law. No one will more readily and heartily indorse this proposition than does the Christian—he who, in the midst of the world's iniquity, maintains allegiance to the government of heaven. He must stand for law—the law of heaven—in the face of the opposition of multitudes who neither respect nor obey it. The Christian will set an example before all, of obedience to the highest authority in the land.

Respect for law can never properly lead to the prosecution of any person for an act performed in obedience to the dictates of conscience; provided of course that the act in question does not constitute an invasion of the rights of other persons.

Injustice Not Law.

It is often the case that "the law" in some section of the country, is—either designedly

or accidentally—in conflict with a course of action to which certain ones believe themselves to be morally bound. In such a case it is a mistake to proceed against these persons with physical force simply because they are condemned by the statute. To say that it is not a mistake, is to justify nearly every persecution of Christians which history records. But must not the law be enforced? it may be asked. Yes; law ought to be enforced always and in every place; but injustice ought

and no human assembly has the power to manufacture justice. If the statute is against justice, it is by that very fact divested of all rightful authority and power, for justice is the law, and must prevail.

Might Have Escaped by Promising Obedience.

As we have stated, it was by means of unjust "laws" that most if not all of those persecutions were carried on which stain the record of human history. The victims of those persecutions might in very many instances have escaped the fate which overtook them by simply promising obedience to "the law." Because they would not do this they were counted obstinate and unreasonable, disturbers of the peace, etc., whose example was seditious and pestilential. The magistrates appeared to deal with them in a manner characterized by much leniency and patience; and after the rejection of all inducements to surrender what was deemed their unreasonable notions, they were regarded as entitled to but scant sympathy.

The purpose of this article can be best served, however, by quoting from the language of one whose experience was that of a hated and persecuted dissenter from the Church of England during his adult life, but whose name is now held in honor by all the Protestant world. We refer to John Bunyan. In his life



Cobb Remonstrating With Bunyan.

COBB.—"The king commands you that you should not have private meetings, because it is against his law, and he is ordained of God, therefore you should not have any."

BUNYAN.—"Paul did own the powers that were in his day to be of God; and yet he was often in prison under them for all that. And also, though Jesus Christ told Pilate that he had no power against him, but of God, yet he died under the same Pilate; and yet I hope you will not say that either Paul or Christ were such as did deny magistracy, and so sinned against God in slighting the ordinance."

not to be enforced at any time or place. Injustice is not law, even though it be embodied in a statute.

Law is not created by the fiat of man; for law is justice, and as such was ordained by the Creator. The province of man in legislation is to discover and define the law of justice in those relations between men which involve the maintenance of civil rights. No man, or assembly of men,—not even the legislature—has the right to perpetrate injustice;

narrative Bunyan relates his experience as a "criminal" in the hands of the civil authorities, for having preached the gospel to "unlawful" assemblies of the people, and in other ways expressed dissent from certain doctrines of the established Church. After Bunyan had lain seven weeks in Bedford jail, the time of the "quarter sessions" of court having arrived, he was brought before the justices, under the following indictment: "That John Bunyan, of the town of

Bedford, laborer, being a person of such and such conditions, he hath (since such a time) devilishly and perniciously abstained from coming to church to hear divine service, and is a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the great disturbance and distraction of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our sovereign lord the king," etc.

The Sentence Against Bunyan.

He was examined by Justice Keeling, who, after Bunyan had in a manner confessed the charges of the indictment and refused to discontinue his preaching, pronounced this sentence: "You must be had back to prison, and there lie for three months following; and at three months' end, if you do not submit to go to church to hear divine service, and leave your preaching, you must be banished the realm; and if, after such a day as shall be appointed you to be gone, you shall be found in this realm, &c., or be found to come over again without special license from the king, &c., you must stretch by the neck for it, I tell you plainly."

At the end of twelve more weeks the clerk, Mr. Cobb, came to interview Bunyan, in the hope of persuading him to submit to the terms imposed by the court. The substance of this interview, as related by Bunyan, is as follows:—

COBB.—Saith he, I come to tell you, that it is desired, you would submit yourself to the laws of the land, or else at the next session it will go worse with you, even to be sent away out of the nation, or else worse than that.

BUNYAN.—I said, that I did desire to demean myself in the world, both as becometh a man and a Christian.

COBB.—But, saith he, you must submit to the laws of the land, and leave off those meetings which you was wont to have; for the statute law is directly against it; and I am sent to you by the justice to tell you, that they do intend to prosecute the law against you, if you submit not.

BUN.—I said: Sir, I conceive that the law by which I am in prison at this time, doth not reach or condemn, either me or the meetings which I do frequent; that law was made against those that being designed to do evil in their meetings, make the exercise of religion their pretence to cover their wickedness. It doth not forbid the private meetings of those that plainly and simply make it their only end to worship the Lord, and to exhort one another to edification. My end in meeting with others is simply to do as much good as I can, by exhortation and counsel, according to that small measure of light which God hath given me, and not to disturb the peace of the nation.

COBB.—Every one will say the same, said he; you see the late insurrection at London, under what glorious pretences they went, and yet indeed they intended no less than the ruin of the kingdom and commonwealth.

BUN.—That practice of theirs, I abhor, said I; yet it doth not follow, that because they did so, therefore all others will do so. I look upon it as my duty to behave myself under the king's government, both as becomes a man and a Christian, and if an occasion were offered me, I should willingly manifest my loyalty to my prince, both by word and deed.

COBB.—Well, said he, I do not profess myself to be a man that can dispute; but this I say truly, neighbor Bunyan, I would have you consider this matter seriously, and submit yourself; you may have your liberty to exhort your neighbor in private discourse, so be you do not call together an assembly of people; and truly you may do much good to the Church of Christ, if you would go this way; and this you may do, and the law not abridge you of it. It is your private meetings that the law is against.

BUN.—Sir, said I, if I may do good to one by my discourse, why may I not do good to two? And if to two, why not to four, and so to eight?

COBB.—I, saith he, and to a hundred, I warrant you.

BUN.—Yes, sir, said I, I think I should not be forbid to do as much good as I can.

COBB.—But, saith he, you may but pretend to do good and instead, notwithstanding do harm, by seducing the people; you are therefore denied your meeting so many together, lest you should do harm.

BUN.—And yet, said I, you say the law tolerates me to discourse with my neighbor; surely there is no law tolerates me to seduce any one; therefore if I may

by the law discourse with one, surely it is to do him good; and if I by discoursing may do good to one, surely by the same law I may do good to many.

COBB.—The law, saith he, doth expressly forbid your private meetings, therefore they are not to be tolerated.

BUN.—I told him that I would not entertain so much uncharitableness of that parliament in the 35th of Elizabeth, or of the queen herself, as to think they did by that law intend the oppressing of any of God's ordinances, or the interrupting any in the way of God; but men may, in the wresting of it, turn it against the way of God; but take the law in itself, and it only fighteth against those that drive at mischief in their hearts, and meeting, making religion only their cloak, color, or pretence; for so are the words of the statute, "If any meetings, under color or pretence of religion," &c.

COBB.—Very good; therefore the king seeing that pretences are usually in and among people, so as to make religion their pretence only; therefore, he and the law before him doth forbid such private meetings, and tolerates only public; you may meet in public.

BUN.— . . . I bless the Lord that my heart is at that point, that if any man can lay anything to my charge, either in doctrine or in practice, in this particular, that can be proved error or heresy, I am willing to disown it, even in the market-place. But if it be truth, then to stand to it to the last drop of my blood. And, Sir, said I, you ought to commend me for so doing. To err, and to be a heretic, are two things; I am no heretic, because I will not stand refractorily to defend any one thing that is contrary to the word: prove anything which I hold to be an error, and I will recant it.

COBB.—But good man Bunyan, said he, methinks you need not stand so strictly upon this one thing, as to have meetings of such public assemblies. Cannot you submit, and, notwithstanding do as much good as you can, in a neighborly way, without having such meetings?

BUN.—Truly Sir, said I, I do not desire to commend myself, but to think meanly of myself; yet when I do most despise myself, I cannot help taking notice of that small measure of light which God hath given me, also that the people of the Lord (by their own saying) are edified thereby; besides, when I see that the Lord, through grace, hath in some measure blessed my labor, I dare not but exercise that gift which God hath given me, for the good of the people. And I said further, that I would willingly speak in public if I might.

COBB.—He said, that I might come to the public assemblies and hear. What though you do not preach? you may hear: Do not think yourself so well enlightened, and that you have received a gift so far above others, but that you may hear other men preach, or to that purpose.

BUN.—I told him I was as willing to be taught as to give instruction, and I looked upon it as my duty to do both; for, said I, a man that is a teacher, he himself may learn also from another that teacheth; as the apostle saith, "*We may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn.*" That is, every man that hath received a gift from God, he may dispense it, that others may be comforted; and when he hath done, he may hear, and learn, and be comforted, himself of others.

COBB.—But, said he, what if you should forbear awhile, and sit still, till you see further, how things will go.

BUN.—Sir, said I, Wickliff saith, that he which leaveth off preaching and hearing of the word of God for fear of excommunication of men, he is already excommunicated of God, and shall in the day of judgment be counted a traitor to Christ.

COBB.—I, saith he, they that do not hear shall be so counted; do you therefore hear.

BUN.—But, Sir, said I, he saith, he that shall leave off either preaching or hearing, &c. That is, if he hath received a gift for education, it is his sin if he doth not lay it out in a way of exhortation and counsel, according to the portion of his gift, as well as to spend his time altogether in hearing others preach.

COBB.—But, said he, how shall we know that you have received a gift?

BUN.—Said I, let any man hear and search, prove the doctrine by the Bible.

COBB.—But will you be willing, said he, that two indifferent persons shall determine the case, and will you stand by their judgment?

BUN.—I said, are they infallible?

COBB.—He said, no.

BUN.—Then said I, it is possible my judgment may be as good as theirs, but yet I will pass by either, and in this matter be judged by the Scriptures; I am sure that is infallible and cannot err.

COBB.—But, said he, who shall be judge between you, for you take the Scripture one way, and they another.

BUN.—I said the Scripture should, and that by comparing one scripture with another, for that will open itself, if it be rightly compared.

COBB.—But are you willing, said he, to stand to the judgment of the church?

BUN.—Yes, Sir, said I, to the approbation of the Church of God (the Church's judgment is best expressed in Scripture). We had much other discourse which I cannot well remember, about the laws of the nation, and submission to governors: after which I told him that I did look upon myself as bound in conscience to walk according to all righteous laws, and that whether there were a king or not; and if I did anything that was contrary, I did hold it my duty to bear patiently the penalty of the law that was provided against such offenders, with many more words to the like effect. And said moreover, that to cut off all occasion of suspicion from any as touching the harmlessness of my doctrine in private, I would willingly take the pains to give any one the notes of all my sermons; for I do sincerely desire to live quietly in my country, and to submit to the present authority.

COBB.—Well, neighbor Bunyan, said he, but indeed I would wish you seriously to consider these things, between this and the quarter session, and to submit yourself. You may do much good if you continue still in the land; but alas, what benefit will it be to your friends, or what good can you do them, if you should be sent away beyond the seas into Spain, or Constantinople, or some other remote part of the world? Pray be ruled.

JAILOR.—Indeed, Sir, I hope he will be ruled.

BUN.—I shall desire, said I, in all godliness and honesty, to behave myself in the nation, whilst I am in it. And if I must be so dealt withal, as you say, I hope God will help me to bear what they shall lay upon me. I know no evil that I have done in this matter, to be used. I speak in the presence of God.

COBB.—You know, saith he, that the Scripture saith, *the powers that be, are ordained of God.*

BUN.—I said yes, and that I was to submit to the king as supreme, and also to the governors, as to them who are sent by him.

COBB.—Well then, said he, the king then commands you that you should not have any private meetings, because it is against his law, and he is ordained of God, therefore you should not have any.

BUN.—I told him that Paul did own the powers that were in his day to be of God; and yet he was often in prison under them for all that. And also, though Jesus Christ told Pilate that he had no power against him, but of God, yet he died under the same Pilate; and yet, said I, I hope you will not say that either Paul or Christ were such as did deny magistracy, and so sinned against God in slighting the ordinance. Sir, said I, the law hath provided two ways of obeying: the one to do that which I in my conscience do believe that I am bound to do, actively; and where I cannot obey actively, there am I willing to lie down and to suffer what they shall do unto me. At this he sat still and said no more; which when he had done, I did thank him for his civil and meek discoursing with me; and so we parted.

John Bunyan was a Baptist. To be a Baptist in his day evidently meant more than is realized by many Baptists at the present time. Since his day the Baptists have grown numerous and powerful, and some have forgotten that popular odium and persecution were the lot of Baptists two centuries ago. They have forgotten that "the law of the land" once outlawed their own religious faith and practice; otherwise they would not be so ready to invoke the "law" against conscientious Christians in this day whose religious practice does not conform to the accepted customs and traditions of the people.

Let it be remembered that respect for law means always respect for right and justice; that in no way can this respect be so quickly and surely lost as by allowing the mere fiat of man to clothe itself with that authority which inheres in justice alone; and that regard for justice, as the law, demands that nothing contrary thereto be placed by human hands upon its throne.

S.

BAPTISTS DEFEND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.*

It [the State] has no right to forbid any one pursuing, on a Sunday, any vocation which shall not disturb his fellowmen, nor

* Extract from editorial in the *Examiner and National Baptist* (New York) May 30, 1895. The editorial was called out by a chain-gang sentence pronounced against a Seventh-day Adventist, of Douglasville, Ga., for plowing in his field on Sunday.

interfere with their rights. If a man, on a Sunday, chooses to hoe in his garden, or to engage in any other peaceful occupation which disturbs no one, he is within his right.

Religious liberty is violated if he is molested by the law. This holds good, whatever faith he professes, or if he professes no faith at all. But the case is still stronger when the man is a conscientious follower of a faith which holds sacred the seventh day, and when he attests his conscientiousness by abstaining from labor on that day, and by engaging in public worship.

These, the principles of religious liberty, were held dear by our Baptist fathers, who suffered for their maintenance. The Baptists of Georgia are a great host, numbering 161,000 white and 206,000 colored people, probably exceeding in number any other denomination. The principles of religious liberty have been firmly and intelligently held by leading Baptists of the State, eminently by Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D., a native of Georgia, now secretary of the Peabody Fund, a distinguished Baptist, than whom no one in the Southern States has a more potent voice.

We respectfully and earnestly urge upon Dr. Curry and upon ex-Governor Northen, of Georgia, and other Georgia Baptists, laymen and ministers, to protest against these violations of religious liberty, and to plead with their fellow-citizens to do away with laws which belong to the Dark Ages. To the men who are suffering for conscience' sake we extend our most sincere sympathy, as we extend it to the Stundists and to all others of the noble army of men who are enduring hardship for following out their religious convictions.

SOME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

It is a fundamental principle recognized by all Christians that "we ought to obey God rather than men,"¹ and that civil government cannot of right have any jurisdiction over the conscience.

In a memorial to the General Assembly of Virginia in 1776, the Presbytery of Hanover together with the Baptists and Quakers of the colony, said:—

The duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the Universal Judge.

Statesmen too have recognized this principle. Said that noble Kentuckian, Hon. Richard M. Johnson:—

The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of Conscience inalienable.²

Even unbelievers in the Christian religion recognize the same great truth. Said Paine:—

Who art thou, by whatever name thou art called, whether a king, a bishop, a State, a parliament, or anything else, vain dust and ashes, that obtrudest thine insignificance between the soul of man and his Maker? Mind thine own concerns. If he believest not as thou believest, it is a proof that thou believest not as he believest, and there is no earthly power can determine between you.³

Almost every American constitution, both State and national, recognizes this right, not only conceded but insisted upon by both believer and skeptic. The constitution of Ten-

nessee provides that "no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship."

The Georgia Declaration of Fundamental Rights says: "Perfect freedom of religious sentiment shall be, and the same is hereby, secured."

The Maryland Declaration of Rights provides that, "No person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice."

Other similar provisions might be quoted, for, as before remarked, almost every American constitution contains similar guarantees of freedom of conscience.

But how much do these provisions mean? Do they guarantee freedom of belief merely? or are they designed also to insure freedom of action? If only the former they are meaningless. Protestants, Catholics and Liberals, with one voice declare that liberty of conscience implies liberty of action. Says the *A. P. A. Magazine* for October:—

Freedom of worship is not enjoyed while those who come out from Rome are hounded, persecuted, and mobbed. . . Freedom of worship is not enjoyed when men and women are coerced into believing *and doing certain things* which they otherwise would not.

In like manner Priest Lambert, in his "Notes on Ingersoll, says:—

The right to give an honest thought implies the right to realize that thought in action and habit. If it means less than this, it means simply the right to gabble like an idiot.

To the same purpose is the testimony of Mill, who, in discussing this subject, says that from liberty of thought it is impossible to separate liberty of action.⁴

The Principle Violated.

But though so generally recognized in theory, the principle of religious liberty is frequently violated in practice. This is particularly true of laws requiring the observance of Sunday. In Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland, Tennessee, Georgia, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Florida, honest, God-fearing men, good neighbors, and worthy citizens, have been haled before courts, and in several of the States named have been fined, imprisoned, and worked in chain-gangs for refusing to do a thing not in accordance with their faith, namely, for refusing to keep Sunday after having rested on the previous day, according to the letter and spirit of the fourth commandment, as they sincerely believed. (See pages 316, 317.)

It is of course claimed by some that these men were imprisoned only for violating the civil law; they were not victims of religious persecution, but of their own temerity in deliberately transgressing the laws of the land. In deciding one of these cases carried to the United States Circuit Court on writ of *habeas corpus*, Judge Hammond said, in Memphis, August, 1891:—

Sectarian freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the constitution [of Tennessee], not in the sense argued here, that King as a Seventh day Adventist, or some other as a Jew, or yet another as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the matter of Sunday observance, but only in the sense that he should not himself be disturbed in the practices of his creed.

But is it not evident that this comes far short of the guarantee contained in the Tennessee Bill of Rights, and of even the popular conception of religious liberty? As we have already seen, the *A. P. A. Magazine*

says freedom of worship is not enjoyed when men and women are "coerced into" doing certain things "which they would not otherwise." In his opinion, Judge Hammond assumes that the constitution of Tennessee does not contain any guarantee against such compulsion, but only assures the citizen against interference with the practices of his own creed. He may be required to conform in some measure to the creeds of others, but this is held to be no interference with his religious liberty so long as he is permitted to practice his own creed!

How They Regard the Sabbath.

But as a matter of fact it is a part of the creed of the Seventh-day Adventists not only to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, but not to so observe any other day. Seventh-day Adventists do not hold that the fourth commandment requires that a man shall actually work six days of each week whether he has anything to do or not; but they do believe that the fourth commandment establishes a difference between days, that it separates the seventh day from all other days of the week—just as the stamp of the Government upon a piece of gold or silver, or other metal, separates and distinguishes that piece of metal from all other pieces of metal, not similarly stamped by the same authority—and that a Christian is required to respect that distinction; and that just as it would be a crime for anyone to place a similar stamp to that of the Government upon another piece of metal, making it resemble a United States' coin, or to use such a piece of metal after it has been stamped by another, so it is sin to make another day resemble the Sabbath, or to use such a counterfeit after it has been made by another.

But it may be said that the line must be drawn somewhere, that it is evident that a man cannot be permitted to do whatever his conscience tells him is right for him to do. What rule, then, can be adopted which will preserve the authority of the State and yet not trench upon the rights of conscience?

The question thus raised is well answered by the words of Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." It is also answered by a clause in the constitution of the State of Maryland: "No person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, . . . or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights." In this the line is drawn just where it should be, namely, *at the equal rights of others*. Under this provision the courts are not called upon to judge any man's conscience, but only to judge whether or not his conscience leads him to infringe the equal rights of his fellowmen. That a man's conscience is just what he says it is, no man has either right or occasion to deny. A man's statement of his conscience is an end of controversy; but it does not follow that one has a right to do whatever his conscience tells him is right for him to do. There is a difference between conscience and the *rights* of conscience. No man, however conscientious, has any right to infringe the equal rights of another; and at this point civil government has a right to take cognizance, not of any man's conscience, but of the relation of his acts to the rights of others.

The principle, briefly stated, is this: No man should be either required or forbidden to do any act contrary to conscience, however erroneous that conscience may be, *unless the*

¹ Acts 5: 29.

² Sunday Mail Report, submitted to the House of Representatives, March 4, 1830.

³ Paine's "Rights of Man," p. 48.

⁴ "Essay on Liberty," p. 28.

doing or forbearing to do that act trenches on the equal rights of others. This rule would (1) abrogate all civil laws requiring the observance of Sunday or of any other day; and (2) it would leave the courts free, not to judge men's consciences, but to protect all men against wrong in the name of conscience. But this is only saying in other words that which we have said many times before, namely, that civil governments are instituted not to create or to "grant" rights, but to guarantee the free and untrammelled exercise of equal, natural, God-given, inalienable rights, and that of these the highest and most sacred is perfect freedom in matters of religious belief and practice.

troubleth Israel?" has been repeated in various forms in every country and in every age from that time until the present.

When Daniel was accused to the king because he prayed three times a day contrary to a royal mandate, the accusation was in these words: "Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed." His violation of the law of the realm was held to be subversive of social order, and his example to be pernicious in the extreme.

The Son of God was accused "as one that perverteth the people," and the prevailing argument with Pilate for his condemnation

because their craft was endangered by the preaching of the apostles. Nor were their fears groundless. The danger which they saw threatening their business really existed; so close was the relation between the prevailing faith and the social and commercial customs of the people. Thus they plausibly argued that there existed a substantial civil basis for the legal prohibition of the preaching of the doctrine of Christ.

In our own day similar arguments are urged in justification of intolerance. As shown by one of our illustrations and the accompanying quotation from Mr. Botkine, Russia affords an excellent example of practical application of the logic of intolerance; and even



ENFORCING "LAW" IN RUSSIA—Stundists and Jews Exiled to Siberia as Enemies of the Empire.

"The Orthodox Church is the State Church in Russia; and . . . the strength and might of the empire . . . depend to a great degree upon the faith of the people in its doctrines and discipline. . . . It is therefore natural that our government cherishes and supports the Orthodox religion, and tries to prevent the members of that church or their children from going off into other communions."—*Pierre Botkine, Secretary of the Russian Legation at Washington, 1893.*

CIVIL BASIS OF RELIGIOUS LAWS.

As is so forcibly shown by the accompanying illustrations, modern dissenters from the prevailing religious faith and practice of the people, whether in Russia, or in our own country, are not punished ostensibly for their faith, but as violators of civil law and enemies of stable government.

Nor is this peculiar to modern times. "Heretics" have ever been stigmatized as enemies of the State, subverters of social order, and disturbers of the public peace.

Ahab's wicked accusation, contained in the question to Elijah: "Art thou he that

was, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." Religious bigotry simply invoked against Christ the penalties of the civil law. He suffered ostensibly, not as a heretic, not as a defamer of religion, but as an enemy of the State.

The apostles were also accused of being disturbers of the peace. At Thessalonica the cry was, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received; and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." And at Ephesus, the silversmiths raised a tumult

in our own country the attempt has been made to justify various measures of religious legislation and the enforcement of religious laws, on the ground that the stability of our institutions and even of the Government itself depends upon the maintenance of our religion. This is especially true of Sunday laws. In a tract, "The American Sabbath," published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Rev. Robert Patterson, D. D., says of Sunday:—

It is the right of the State to protect by law such a fundamental support of government. This attack on the sabbath is treason against the very foundation of government. As such, let it be resisted by every

American citizen. The American sabbath is essential to American liberty, to our Republic, and to God's religion.

To the same import is the quotation from Dr. Crafts under one of our illustrations. But such "argument," however plausible it may seem, would justify all the persecutions of the past, as well as the intolerance of Russia, and revive the bloody scenes of the Dark Ages.

It is in harmony with this theory that in several of the States of this Union, God-fearing Sabbatarians have been arrested, tried, convicted, and punished by fines, imprisonment, and chain-gangs, for no other reason than because they could not conscientiously observe as the Sabbath the day regarded by their neighbors as sacred.

One of our illustrations shows a gang of Seventh-day Adventist "convicts" at work on one of the abutments of a bridge near Spring City, Rhea County, Tenn., July, 1895. In passing sentence upon these men, some of whom had just been convicted for the second time within six months, Judge Parks, before whom they were tried, said:—

I will take occasion to express again my sincere personal regret that the necessity exists for inflicting punishment upon these people, for it must be patent to even the most casual observer that they are good citizens, who are thoroughly conscientious in the course they have taken.

Members of this same communion have been prosecuted—persecuted we might say—by means of the Sunday statutes of several different States, though most of these cases have arisen in Tennessee and Maryland. And at the present time, B. A. Philpot, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Rutherford County, Tenn., is under indictment at Murfreesborough, and will be tried on the 19th inst., for quiet Sunday work which in no way interfered with his neighbors, except it may have been by offending against their ideas of religious propriety respecting proper Sunday observance.

We are sure that our readers will agree with us that these things ought not so to be and that any system of reasoning which justifies such things is misleading, and therefore wrong.

PERTINENT FACTS AND QUESTIONS BY A TENNESSEE JUDGE.

THE following extract from the opinion of Judge Parks, rendered in the cases of the Seventh-day Adventists, convicted in March, 1895, at Dayton, Tenn., for doing common labor on Sunday, presents the injustice of compulsory Sunday observance so forcibly that we wish to keep it prominently before the public:—

"Here we have a very respectable element of Christian believers who are honest, inoffensive, law-abiding people in all matters not conflicting with their sense of duty, who believe they are under divine command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. As a matter of abstract, individual right can they be required to observe another day also? Their position is not that of a person who claims that as a matter of personal liberty he has the right, if he chooses, to run an open saloon on Sunday, or to do any like act. That is not a matter of conscience—this is. They claim that it is not only their right, but their duty under divine command, to observe the seventh day. Calling them 'cranks' is no argument and has nothing to do with the question. If there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest

belief, but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors. A man cannot kill another and excuse himself on the ground that he believed he was carrying out God's will in so doing, because this would deprive his victim of a natural right, viz.: the enjoyment of life.

"Do the defendants in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? Or is it an artificial right created by human law? Has any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as the Sabbath? If the day has been appointed by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly and conscientiously differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment? And shall one be given rights which are denied the other? Does might make right, and have the majority the right to dictate in matters purely of conscience?"

The Creator has given to his human creatures the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" but he has also given to certain of them the commission, "Go ye . . . into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" and in the execution of this it has often been necessary to surrender earthly comforts, liberty, and even life itself. It was right under such circumstances that the surrender should be made. Jesus Christ himself set the example in this respect. He surrendered all that was his by right for the sake of that cause which embodied right in the form of righteousness; and his followers must not turn back in their devotion to the same cause because the pathway may lead to the loss of property, liberty, or life here. Their natural, inalienable right to these things cannot afford them justification in refusing under all circumstances to give them up.

The rights of God are as much higher and more sacred than those of the human individ-



ENFORCING "LAW" IN THE UNITED STATES.—Seventh-day Adventists Compelled to Work on the Public Roads in Tennessee.

It is the conviction of the majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the sabbath, nor the sabbath without laws; therefore sabbath laws are enacted by the right of self-preservation, not in violation of liberty, but for its protection.—Rev. W. F. Crafts, in "The Sabbath for Man," p. 248.

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.

It is the purpose of the civil government to preserve inviolate to the people under it those inalienable rights with which all men have been endowed by their Creator. This being so, it is the right of every individual to demand the protection of the civil government whenever his rights are threatened with invasion. This is right from a civil standpoint; but the Christian standpoint commands a higher and wider view of truth, and from this standpoint what is right within the sphere of civil things may be found contrary to right within the higher sphere of Christian duty. There are higher rights than the rights of man. Civil government conserves the latter, but Christianity conserves the rights of God.

ual, as the Creator is higher and greater than his human creature, or as the interests and welfare of the universe surpass in importance the temporal interests and welfare of one soul. God has a right to the love and worship of the beings he has created. And this is not for his own benefit, but for that of the universe which he upholds; for God needs nothing from his creatures, but maintains and provides for them all. "God is love," and there is in him no taint of selfishness. It is not right that any person should place his own temporal interests—even his inalienable rights—before interests which are infinitely higher and more sacred. The Christian will make it his first object in all things to advance the interests of the cause of Christ. When these interests come in conflict with those pertaining to his worldly prosperity, the latter

are always made to yield the ground. Thus it is sometimes right that an individual should surrender rights.

But let each one take care what and whose rights he surrenders. When he sees that he can advance the cause of righteousness by yielding his right to some temporal interest or possession, it is right that he should do so. But not every right can be surrendered. Religious despotism demands that men should surrender the right to think for themselves. But the surrender of this means the surrender of the right to exercise faith in Jesus Christ, and therefore of the right to eternal life which that faith secures.

The same despotism demands that men should surrender God's right to their worship and obedience. No such demand can be honored by one who would maintain his Christian allegiance. The dividing line is to be drawn between temporal and eternal interests—between the civil rights of man and the rights of God. The Christian should ever be careful not to be tenacious of a civil right at the expense of the prosperity of that cause which stands for the rights of God. s.

A CHAPTER FROM VIRGINIA HISTORY.

BY ALLEN MOON.

THE historian informs us that "finding that argument availed them little, the friends of the Episcopacy [in Virginia] drew the sword of persecution. It is believed that at this period (1768) no express statute of Virginia authorized the imprisonment of any man for preaching without being ordained or being licensed according to the Act of Toleration; but pretexts have never been wanting for religious cruelty.

"In June, 1768, John Waller, Lewis Craig, and James Childs, all zealous Baptists, were seized by the sheriff in the county of Spottsylvania and carried before three magistrates who stood ready in the yard of the meeting-house. The victims were bound over to appear at court two days afterwards, and when they appeared accordingly they were told they should be released if they would promise to preach no more in the county for a year and a day. This they positively refused to do, and they were immediately ordered to jail." A well-supported tradition has told us that when these three Baptists were brought to trial at Fredericksburg, the prosecuting attorney had drawn up an indictment against them 'for preaching the gospel contrary to law.'

"Patrick Henry had heard of the case, and he rode fifty miles to hear more.

"He kept his seat while the indictment was being read, and while the prosecutor opened the case, then rising, he solemnly addressed the court: "May it please your worships, What did I hear read? Did I hear it distinctly, or was it a mistake of my own? Did I hear an expression that these men whom your worships are about to try for misdemeanor, are charged with *preaching the gospel of the Son of God?*"

"The tone, the manner, the subject, sent an indescribable thrill to every heart. Then, continuing, the orator carried home the appeal with such power that the prosecuting attorney turned pale with agitation and the court was hardly restrained from directing the sheriff at once to discharge the prisoners. Yet even Patrick Henry was not strong enough to arrest the tyranny caused by an established church.

"In Middlesex and Caroline counties many Baptist ministers were arrested and confined. They were lodged in jails swarming with vermin, and were treated like criminals; yet their spirits were buoyant, and persecution did nothing but increase the zeal and numbers of the sect. Insult was then offered to their ministers during service, and frequently mounted men would ride into the water while they were administering immersion, and attempt to turn the ceremony into a farce. In 1772 a letter appeared in the *Virginia Gazette*, addressed to Anabaptists imprisoned in Caroline County. The writer justifies their imprisonment on the basis, not of any statute, but of English common law. He charges them with teaching heresy and hateful doctrines, and with disturbing the peace of religion. He admits that the English Act of Toleration applies to the colony, but denies that the Baptists are entitled to its benefits."*

The above reads so like a chapter of the recent history of Tennessee, Georgia and other States, in their treatment of Adventists, that the latter seems almost like a continuation of the same revolting details.

The excuse for prosecuting these people is as transparent, and the act as unjustifiable, as were those of the Episcopal Church toward the Baptists of a hundred years ago. And though a people may be misguided, the principle remains the same. It will not answer to say the Baptists were right and the Adventists are wrong.

He is no friend of religious liberty who is satisfied with liberty only for himself, but he is the true friend of liberty who is anxious that every other man shall enjoy equal liberty with himself no matter how greatly the other man may differ from him religiously.

Patrick Henry was an Episcopalian, and his church enjoyed the favor of the State in 1768 when he went to defend the Baptists who were being persecuted by his own people for preaching contrary to the established faith. Where are the descendants of these Baptists now? Are they satisfied that liberty has been accorded them to preach baptism by immersion and all other doctrines of the gospel as they understand them? Baptists believe that the men who persecuted them were fighting against God.

Suppose it should finally appear that Adventists too were reformers and that God had called them to preach the restoration of the Sabbath of the Bible, will they be any more excusable for the part that some have enacted toward these people because the States have retained upon their statute books some of the religious laws enacted during the period of religious establishment, or even that have been since enacted? Oh, for more Patrick Henrys to defend the principles of religious liberty, and to stand for justice for all mankind.

How the religion of Jesus Christ would appeal to the better judgment of men if only those professing faith in it would live out its teaching before the world.

THE SUNDAY LAW IN NEW YORK.

THE Sunday law of this State is about to be again tested in the courts. The facts are thus stated by the *Rochester Herald*, of the 24th ult:—

"The defendant members of the Rochester Baseball Club, accused of violating the Sunday law by playing ball at Riverside Park on Sunday, appeared before Justice of the Peace

Frank, in Irondequoit yesterday, and gave bail to appear before the Grand Jury. The defendants were represented by H. J. Tuttle, of the firm of Tuttle & Hallock. The people were represented by Henry W. Conklin.

"If the ball players are indicted, the trial will be an interesting one from a legal standpoint. In the case of the people against Moses, reported in the New York Court of Appeal cases, the defendant was accused of violating the Sunday law by fishing on Sunday. In that case Judge Earl held that fishing on private grounds even is a violation of the law. Judges Finch, Peckham and Gray dissented from the view taken by Judge Earl. Judge Maynard concurred with Judge Earl's opinion on the ground that the act constituted a *serious interruption of the religious repose and peace of the community* in which the fishing was done; so that Judge Maynard's construction of the law forms the basis of the interpretation of the law laid down by the Court of Appeals.

"It will be claimed in the case of the Rochester baseball players that there was no disturbance of the religious peace of the persons making the complaint. During the entire summer at the Sunday games, where the crowds ranged from 4,000 to 7,000 persons, there was not a single disturbance of any kind. No intoxicating liquors were sold on the grounds; in fact, before the Raines law went into effect, the association in charge of the team permitted no liquor to be sold on the grounds on Sunday. During the entire summer there was not a single fight on the grounds. For this reason it will be claimed there is no just cause for claiming that the religious repose of the neighborhood was disturbed by the Sunday games. It will be claimed that the man making the complaint against the Sunday games lives nearly three miles from the grounds, and therefore had no reason for being exercised on the ground of disturbance, against the playing of Sunday games."

LIMITS OF OBEDIENCE TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

OBEDIENCE is to be rendered to all human governments, in subordination to the will of God. These governments are a recognized necessity in the nature of the case, and their existence is manifestly in accordance with the divine will. Hence the presumption is always in favor of the authority of civil law; and any refusal to obey, must be based on the moral proof that obedience will be sin. The one who proposes to disregard human law, must be persuaded in his own mind that, in that course, he will meet the approval of God. It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God, rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine.

There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant, and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. Sometimes a decided attitude, on the part of a large number, in opposition to a wicked law, will set the law aside, and make it inoperative. Such a movement is as

* Robt. H. Howson, in "History of Virginia."

justifiable as any revolution. But these cases are rare. The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

It is often urged that the right of private judgment, as now maintained, in reference to obedience to the laws of the land, will subvert government, and introduce confusion and anarchy. . . . The danger, however, is greatly over-estimated. Government is never the gainer in the execution of a law that is manifestly unjust. . . . Conscientious men are not the enemies, but the friends, of any government but a tyranny. They are its strength, and not its weakness. Daniel, in Babylon, praying, contrary to the law, was the true friend and supporter of the government; while those who, in their pretended zeal for the law and the constitution, would strike down the good man, were its real enemies. It is only when government transcends its sphere, that it comes in conflict with the consciences of men.

But it is objected that the example is corrupting, that a bad man will violate a good law, because the good man refuses to obey a wicked law. The cases are just as unlike as right and wrong, and any attempt to justify the one by the other, is gross dishonesty. Unquestionably, the principle can be abused by the wicked, and so can any truth, whatever, but the principle of unquestioning obedience to human law, is false, and needs no perversion to make it mischievous. Practically, the cases are few, in well-established governments, where the law encroaches upon the rights of conscience; but if the principle be surrendered, the cases will multiply. . . . The most grievous of all imperfections in government, is the failure to secure the just and good result. Injustice and oppression are not made tolerable, by being in strict accordance with the law. Nothing is surer, in the end, than the reaction of such wrong to break down the most perfectly constituted government.—Fairchild's Moral Philosophy, pp. 178-186.

NEWS AND NOTES.

HOTEL keepers at South Beach, Staten Island, are awaiting the outcome of a case in the courts which will test the legality of Sunday dancing in such establishments. If the result is as they hope, they will give dances every Sunday evening during the winter.

THE legal committee of the public school Charter Association of San Francisco, Cal., has decided that a clause in the new charter barring from the ranks of primary or grammar school teachers all persons who have not been educated in the public school system of California, is unconstitutional and void.

At Freeport, Ill., October 1, Rev. John G. Wooley addressed the ministers of the Rock River conference in language which reflected severely upon the national Republican party nominee, Mr. McKinley, for failure to declare against monopolies and trusts, and declared that all the latter were behind him to secure his election. A majority of the conference promptly drew up and signed a resolution of censure upon Mr. Wooley for such expression of his sentiments.

THE "Business Men's National Campaign Committee" have sent out a letter to the Catholic clergy of the country, attacking the Democratic platform, making allusion to "the patriotism and eminent public services of the late Most Reverend Archbishop Hughes

and many others of the Roman Catholic clergy, when the integrity of our government was threatened on a former occasion," and calling upon the clergy to throw their influence against the political movement which aims at securing a decision in the presidential contest which "would be thoroughly immoral and would precipitate an ethical and material calamity of incalculable magnitude." Similar letters, it is said, have been sent to the clergy of all denominations.

POLICE Commissioner Roosevelt, of New York City, has been asked by Mayor Strong to set up a standard of sacredness by which to test Chinese Sunday concerts. This is the result of a plea made by Chinese merchants for exemption from police interference with their Sunday concerts, which they said would cause them a loss during the year of \$10,000. They affirmed that the concerts were in every way sacred, and had a tendency to educate the audiences in the principles of Confucius.

In a sermon delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, Washington, September 27, Rev. T. De Witt Talmage touched upon the subject of pulpit politics in these words: "Every minister must do as he feels called on to do, and I will not criticise him for doing what he considers his duty; but all the political bargains from pulpits from now until the 3rd of November will not in all the United States change one vote, but will leave many ears stopped against anything that such clerymen may utter the rest of their lives."

A CRUSADE against Sunday golf playing has been inaugurated by some citizens of Staatsburg, Dutchess County, N. Y., the offenders being representatives of New York's "four hundred," who have residences in or near the village. A sermon delivered by the Rev. Mr. Miles in Staatsburg on a recent Sunday gave the signal for the battle. "If there are any Christians in this place," he said, "they will see that these people stop their sports on Sunday." Quite a number seem to have availed themselves of this opportunity to demonstrate their Christianity.

THAT political sentiment is with the clergy, as with other people, a matter of personal opinion, was evidenced by a sermon delivered by Rev. Herbert N. Casson, in the "Labor Church" at Lynn, Mass., September 27, in which the speaker was as outspoken in his praise of candidate W. J. Bryan and that for which he stands as the pulpit politicians have generally been during this campaign in denunciation of the same. Mr. Casson stated at the outset that his sermon would be a political one, on which account he would omit the reading of the usual Scripture lesson.

THE legality of Sunday work by Hebrews is to be tested in the city of Portland, Maine. The "law" in that place forbids keeping open places of business on the "sabbath," and is a statute handed down from Puritan times, but not regarded as worthy of enforcement in more recent years. But the Sunday observance movement having reached Portland, there has been observable of late a tendency to make use of this "blue law," which resulted in the arrest on the 27th inst. of two Hebrews, Messrs. Press and Berman, who were keeping "open shop." The former pleaded not guilty, but the latter admitted the charge against him, and in court stated that his store was kept closed on Saturdays, and that for seven years past he had been doing business on Sundays without molestation; also that "a lot of others" kept open on Sunday the same as he did. He gave notice that he would appeal from any sentence that might be imposed in the lower court, and was released on \$100 bail. Press based his plea of "not guilty" upon the fact that bakery carts and milk wagons were run on Sundays as on other days; but the court explained that these were not parallel cases, since neither a milk wagon nor a bakery cart is an "open shop." In the light of this

revelation Mr. Press decided that he would comply with the statute, upon promise to do which the judge suspended sentence. Meanwhile explicit orders were issued to the police of the city to arrest all Hebrews found hereafter keeping open shop on Sunday.

Large Type BIBLES For Those with Poor Eyesight

We have many inquiries for a Bible of convenient size to use and carry, and with large clear print. The Bible, specimen type of which is shown below, we think will meet the requirements of the case. (Specimen of type shows only one column of the Bible. It is a two-column book like most Bibles, the full size of page being 5 1/2 x 8 3/8 in.) Persons desiring such a Bible as

The burnt offering EXOD 32 And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the bread that is in the basket, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. 33 And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement

Specimen of Small Pica Type in Bible No. 1730.

this are usually elderly persons, and want simply the Scriptures themselves, without helps or references. This Bible contains a Family Register, Tables of Weights and Measures, and 16 excellent Maps, but has no references or other additional matter. It is printed from clear, new, small pica type, and is bound in French Morocco, limp round corners and has gilt edges. Sent postpaid on receipt of price. Order by number.

PRICE:

No. 1730. French Morocco, Limp Covers, Round Corners. Side and Back Title in Gold, Gilt Edges, Postpaid, \$2.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO. 39 Bond St., New York.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.



TREAT YOUR CATARRH WITH THE "SUCCESS" NASAL SYRINGE

Remedies are useless unless they are applied to the disease. The "Success" will do this by means of a soft rubber tube inserted in the nasal cavity, as shown by cut. Catarrh can be CURED with this syringe by the simple use of Glycerine, diluted with water. Sent postpaid on receipt of

75c. Address, A. MALLETT, 39 Bond Street, New York City.

The Grand Trunk Railway OF CANADA

AND THE

Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway

Form the GREAT THROUGH LINE to all Points in the West,

AND OFFER TO THE TRAVELING PUBLIC THE ADVANTAGE OF THROUGH TRAINS WITHOUT TRANSFER, AND A VIEW OF

THE ST. CLAIR TUNNEL,

"THE LINK THAT BINDS TWO GREAT NATIONS."

It is the greatest submarine tunnel in the world, extending from Port Huron, Mich., under the St. Clair River to Sarnia, Ontario, and connecting the Grand Trunk Railway System of Canada with the Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway. It has just been completed at a cost of \$2,700,000.

The tunnel proper is a continuous iron tube, nineteen feet and ten inches in diameter, and 6025 feet, or more than a mile, long. The length of the approaches, in addition to the tunnel proper, is 5603 feet, making all told a little over two miles.

Trains of the Grand Trunk and Chicago & Grand Trunk Railways are hauled through this tunnel by engines specially constructed for the purpose. They are said to be the largest engines in the world. The entire weight of the engine and tender rests upon ten drive-wheels. The weight of one of these monster engines in actual service is found to be approximately one hundred tons.

N. J. POWER, G. P. A. Grand Trunk Ry., MONTREAL, CANADA. W. E. DAVIS, G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry., CHICAGO, ILL.

FRANK P. DWYER, Eastern Passenger Agent, G. T. Ry., 271 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.



NEW YORK, OCTOBER 8, 1896.

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.

THAT which contravenes natural rights instead of guaranteeing them is usurpation and not legitimate, God-ordained authority; "for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil."

CIVIL government is ordained of God, but so are its limitations. "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men . . . are endowed BY THEIR CREATOR with certain unalienable rights; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

THE Pope has been chosen by Hayti and San Domingo to arbitrate a dispute between them respecting boundary lines. In view of this the *Catholic Review*, of October 3, exclaims, "Would that all disagreements among peoples were peacefully submitted to the impartial and enlightened adjudication of the Common Father of Christendom." Such is one of the Papacy's cherished hopes.

THE new "apostolic" delegate from Rome to the United States, Monsignor Martinelli, arrived in New York, October 3. The Catholic press of the country seems to be divided in opinion respecting the position the papal delegate will hold in this country, the *Freeman's Journal* asserting that his authority will be even greater than that exercised by his predecessor, Satolli.

"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 not 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."

"FULL religious liberty," remarks the *New York Sun*, in its "Spanish-American News," "exists in Mexico, and it is foolish to attach any significance to the deeds of the brawlers who smashed the windows of a Protestant church and college in the city of Aguas Calientes. The riot was a small one, and its leaders were arrested. It was just such an outbreak as may occur anywhere at a moment

of excitement. There are over a hundred Protestant churches in Mexico which hold services and engage in mission work without any disturbance, and the government of President Diaz has always manifested its determination to maintain the rights of all denominations."

It is indeed true that a large measure of religious liberty is enjoyed in Mexico, and whatever restrictions there are, owe their existence to the aggressions of Rome.

AN address "To the Christian Citizens of the United States," has been sent out through the country as the result of a mass meeting of Christian people, held recently in Chicago, and presided over by Evangelist D. L. Moody, for the purpose of considering the present unsettled condition of affairs in the nation politically and socially. The address earnestly invites Christians of all denominations to unite in observing October 8, as a day of fasting, confession, and prayer to God, for divine assistance in dealing with the issues which demand settlement at this time.

METHODISTS AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

No people ought to be more tolerant than the Methodists, for few people have, in modern times, suffered more for conscience' sake than they.

John Wesley himself was repeatedly mobbed and arrested, and was even indicted in due form, ostensibly for violation of civil law, but really because of his religious faith and practice.

In the early days of Methodism it was customary in England to seize men, and compel them to serve either in the army or navy. On one occasion "Meriton [a Methodist preacher] himself was impressed, and his companion escaped only by running from street to street, and finally taking refuge at a private house, where he was compassionately locked up in a closet till midnight, when, disguised in female dress, he made his way out of the town, passing sentinels who were appointed to watch for him on the bridge. John Bennet, another itinerant, was 'impressed' with three of his lay brethren in Cheshire."¹

The same author tells that "a humble Cornish preacher was pulled down by a constable while preaching at Corlam and borne off to the House of Correction at Bodmin. A warrant was gotten out for John Wesley himself in Cornwall."² Mr. Wesley was not held, however, on this occasion. The officers finding him a well-bred gentleman and a clergyman instead of a rowdy, permitted him to go.

Thomas Welsh, another Methodist preacher, was mobbed and imprisoned in Ireland as a "turbulent person," but really for preaching the gospel. He was arrested at one of his

own meetings and conducted to the magistrate, "who demanded a promise that he would preach no more. He refused and was sent away to prison."

Charles Wesley was, on one occasion, indicted as a vagabond. This remarkable presentment still stands on the city records and declares that "we find and present Charles Wesley to be a person of ill-fame, a vagabond, and a common disturber of his majesty's peace, and pray that he may be transported." Nine of his associates were denounced in the same terms. The indictment was not sustained.

John Wesley was indicted in Savannah, Georgia, in 1737, one of the counts in the indictment being that he had "broken the laws of the realm, contrary to the peace of our sovereign lord the king, his crown and dignity by speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent." This case was never brought to trial, but Mr. Wesley was kept as a kind of "prisoner-at-large," until finally, tiring of the delay, he returned to England.

On another occasion in England Mr. Wesley was imprisoned for three months for debt, his enemies taking advantage of temporary financial embarrassment to persecute him.

This recital of persecution of Methodists might be continued almost indefinitely, for the chapter of the wrongs they suffered is a long one; but space forbids a continuation of it at present. We are only sorry that too many Methodists have forgotten their early experience and to the extent of their ability, and so far as the more liberal laws under which we now live permit, stand ready to harass and persecute those whose faith and practice now differ from theirs, as theirs formerly differed from that of the majority. Nevertheless, we do not believe that history has been written in vain, and we have confidence that there are not wanting many honest hearts who are still loyal to the principles of civil and religious liberty for which the early Methodists contended so earnestly.

³ *Id.* pp. 294, 295.

⁴ "John Wesley a Missioner to Georgia," by William Stevens Perry, D. D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Iowa; *New York Independent*, March 5, 1891, pp. 5, 6.

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.

Published Weekly by Pacific Press Publishing Co.

ORGAN OF THE
International Religious Liberty Association.

PRESIDENT,	ALLEN MOON.
VICE-PRESIDENT,	A. T. JONES.
SECRETARY,	A. F. BALLENGER.

Single Copy, Per Year, - - \$1.00.

ADDRESS, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
39 Bond Street, New York.

¹ "History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism," Vol. I. p. 224.

² *Id.*