



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, JUNE 30, 1892.

NUMBER 26.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES,
ASSOCIATE EDITORS,
C. P. BOLLMAN, W. H. MCKEE.

No legislation can annul the ordinances of nature or abrogate the statutes of the Almighty.—*John J. Ingalls.*

“THE Stundists in Russia,” says a late cablegram, “are being persecuted with unabated vigor.” So are the Adventists in Tennessee.

THERE is no tyranny like religious tyranny, and once admit that religion can be controlled by law, or that it can control law, and freedom is gone—freedom of religion is gone if law can control it, and freedom of the citizen is gone if religion is to control the law.—*Mrs. Susan Bullitt Dixon.*

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.—*Declaration of Independence.*

THE following from the decision of Judge Hammond in the case of R. M. King, is of interest in connection with the like cases of the Adventists tried in Henry County, Tenn., last month. Judge Hammond thus stated his views as to what is the measure of religious liberty, contemplated and guaranteed by the Constitution of Tennessee:—

Sectarian religious belief is guaranteed by the Constitution, 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 himself should not be disturbed in the practices of his creed; which is quite a different thing from saying that in the course of his daily labor . . . he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

That is to say, a man may belong to a sect; that sect may have a creed; they may practice according to that creed, and may not be disturbed in such practice; but at the same time, they must conform to the laws made in aid of the religion of other sects, who have control of legislation.

ACCORDING to Judge Hammond’s interpretation of Tennessee law, if a man be a Baptist he may practice the precepts of the Baptist creed, but if the Methodists should have control of legislation, they could oblige the Baptists by law to conform to the precepts of the Methodist creed. Or one company of people might be Methodists, another Baptists, another Quakers, and so on; but if the Roman Catholics only had control of legislation, and should enact laws enforcing Roman Catholic doctrines and precepts, then the Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, etc., would all be obliged to conform to the Roman Catholic precepts, as by law required. And although protected in the undisturbed practice of *their own* creeds, none of these dissenting sects would be in any wise at liberty to disregard the laws made in aid of the religion of the Roman Catholic sect! And such, according to Judge Hammond’s views, is the freedom of religious belief guaranteed by the Constitution of Tennessee!

IN the case of the imprisoned Adventists in Henry County, Tenn., Judge Swiggart said that were it not for the decision of the Supreme Court, in a like case, to the effect that Sunday labor constitutes a nuisance whether anybody is actually disturbed by it or not, he would be inclined to hold that a nuisance had not been proved. In like manner United States

Judge Hammond said in the case of R. M. King, that if it were within his province to decide that question, he would have no difficulty in thinking that King was wrongfully convicted, and that there is not any foundation for the ruling of the Supreme Court of Tennessee that it is a common law nuisance to work in one’s field on Sunday. But, although he distinctly said that King was wrongfully convicted, and the State Court wrongfully decided when it confirmed his conviction, yet, as it rested exclusively with the State Court to decide what was common law in the State, and as the State court had decided that such was common law, it did not belong to the United States Court to overrule the State decision; and therefore he decided that though the thing was wrongfully done, yet it was due process of law. Surely when judges thus declare their inability to right confessed wrongs, “judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity can not enter.”

They Suffer in Silence.

SPRINGVILLE, Tenn., of unenviable notoriety because of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists with which the name is associated, is a flag station on the Memphis branch of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, about one hundred and twenty-five miles west of Nashville. The total population of the village is seventy-five souls. A mile and a half east of the village is the Seventh-day Adventist Church building, and in the immediate neighborhood of the church reside the forty or more Adventists and their families that compose the membership of the church and Sabbath-school. The railroad and a single county road run through the neighborhood, but a number of private or neighborhood roads make the several small farms in the vicinity easily accessible.

“The Adventist settlement,” as some term it, is one of the most tranquil to be

found anywhere in the thickly populated portions of the United States. The Adventists are a quiet folk. Neighborhood quarrels and boisterous revelry are alike unknown among them. But for the trains on the railroad, the loudest noises ever heard in the community would be the sound of the ax or hammer. On two days of the week, Sabbath and Sunday, even these sounds are seldom made by Adventists, for while they may be seen quietly at work on Sunday, hoeing gardens, cultivating crops or picking fruit, they avoid all noisy work in deference to their Sunday-keeping neighbors and the occasional Sunday churchgoer.

The Adventists hold regular Sabbath services in their little church, consisting of a Sabbath-school followed by preaching, when a minister is present; otherwise one of the elders gives a short exhortation which is followed by social meeting in which all participate. There is also a regular Wednesday evening prayer and social meeting, which is well attended; and Friday evening a Sabbath-school teachers' meeting. Special meetings are held when a minister is in the neighborhood, and generally on Sunday. None of these services differ materially from similar meetings held by other denominations, except that a deeper feeling of earnestness seems to pervade them.

The county being but poorly provided with public schools, a subscription school was started some months ago and is still in successful operation, though likely to be crippled by the persecution of those who are among its principal supporters. This school was designed to be a permanent institution and a part of the plan was to build a new church, in order that the present building might be better fitted for school purposes. What effect the persecution will have on this enterprise, remains to be seen. As the money necessary, has already been subscribed and some of the preliminary work done, it is probable that the new house of worship will be erected in the near future, notwithstanding the hostile attitude of the authorities and the imprisonment of the leading members of the church under an iniquitous Sunday law.

The home life of these Adventists is in keeping with their public profession. In their domestic relations, Christian love supplements and strengthens natural affection; and as a consequence both parents and children are happy in the enjoyment of those ennobling pleasures which God has given his creatures to bind them closer to himself and to each other. Theirs is not a gloomy religion.

But a cloud has settled over this otherwise happy neighborhood. From four of these homes, the light of the husband's and father's presence has gone out. The eyes of the lonely wife are red with weeping, and the plaintive plea of the children, "I want to see my papa," shows that their young hearts have learned sorrow also. These people have wronged no man and have lived in all good conscience toward God, yet they suffer under the color and forms of civil law. But there is no repining, no bitterness, no railing, either against the law or the officers who enforce it; they suffer in silence and meek submission, quietly biding God's time, confident that their faith and practice will be vindicated, if not before, at the final Judgment of the great day. And this is in "Christian America," in the nineteenth century of the Christian era!

C. P. B.

The Establishment of Religion by Colonial Grant and Charter.

In the year 1657 the good people of Plymouth Colony began to put to its legitimate use the legislative structure which they had built, and which Justice Brewer considers to be one of the foundation stones upon which a "Christian nation" has been set, by decreeing that Quakers and heretics had no part or place in their commonwealth. They came, with but few other religious ideas than those which belong to an established church, having dissented and seceded from an established church, to found an establishment of religion of their own, where they could have complete freedom of conscience to worship as they pleased, and turn the tables upon those who disagreed with them by themselves becoming persecutors instead of being the persecuted. This was the natural outcome of the thought with which they came, it was the logical result of the laws which they made, and now, in March, 1658, they speak more decidedly, and at length, to the same point. The court decrees:—

WHEREAS there hath several persons come into this Government commonly called Quakers, whose doctrines and practices manifestly tend to the subversion of the fundamentals of Christian religion church order and the civil peace of this Government as appears by the testimonies given in Sundry depositions and otherwise. It is therefore enacted by the Court and the authority thereof that noe Quaker or person commonly soe called be entertained by any person or persons within this Government under the penalties of five pounds for every such default, or bee whipt; and in case any one shall entertaine any such person ignorantly if he shall testify on his oath that hee knew not them to bee such hee shall be freed of the aforesaid penaltie, provided he upon his first discerning them to bee such doe discover them to the constable or his deputie. It is also enacted by this Court and the authorities thereof that if any rantor or Quaker or person commonly soe called shall come into any towne within this Government and by any person or persons bee knowne or suspected to bee such, the person so knowing or suspecting him shall forthwith acquaint the Constable or his deputie of them on paine of presentment, and so liable to censure in court who forthwith on such notice of them or any other intelligence hee shall have of them, shall diligently endeavour to apprehend him or them, and bring them before some one of the majestates whose shall cause him or them to be committed to Gaole, there to be kept close prisoners, with such victuals onely as the Court alloweth until hee or they shall defray the charge both of their imprisonment and their transportation away; together with an Engagement to returne into this Government noe more or else to be continued in close durance til further order from the Court; and as for as much as the meetings of such persons, whether strangers or others proveth disturbing to the peace of this Government: It is therefore enacted by the Court and the Authority thereof that henceforth noe such meetings bee assembled or kept by any person in any place within this Government under the penalty of forty shillings a time for every speaker, and ten shillings a time for every hearer that are heads of families, and forty shillings a time for the owner of the place that permits them soe to meete together. (And if they meet together att their silent meetings soe called then each person soe meeting together shall pay ten shillings a time and the owner of the place shall pay forty shillings a time.)

The clause in parenthesis was incorporated in the original draft of the decree, but as it stands in the clerk's copy has a pen mark drawn through it, as evidence that it was afterward abrogated. But it stands nevertheless as a silent witness, together with the rest of the decree, of the spirit which actuated those, who, according to the opinion of Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court, were an active factor in the establishment of the religion of this Nation by virtue of which this is a Christian Nation.

It begins to look as if some one needed to revise their ideas of Christianity. Of

course it cannot be Justice Brewer, for he is one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is never well to make a hasty decision, and those of us who have given any thought to this subject are able to hold our views and their expression in abeyance until we have studied these old statutes and charters still more.

W. H. M.

Constitution and Sunday Laws.

THE Constitution of the United States of America and the Constitutions of the several States are the supreme law of the land. All Sunday laws, as such, are made in contravention of these Constitutions and are therefore, notwithstanding the decisions of various and sundry courts to the contrary, absolutely null and void in law, and can be shown to be so; although they have been acted upon and men have been most unjustly punished under them.

It is time that sensible men look into this thing, for whatever touches the rights of one citizen touches the rights of all.

What has been the origin and motive of Sunday laws? From their beginning in the early part of the fourth century, they have been enacted in the interest of the religion of the majority in power at the time, and more in the interest of the power than the religion. But Constitutions are intended expressly to protect all, even a minority of one, in those rights of a free man which are declared by them to be inalienable. And the several Constitutions of the States say that every man shall be protected in the "exercise of his religious belief" (premising that such exercise shall interfere with no one else to their injury) and that "no preference shall be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship." Yet these Constitutions are violated daily and by men who call themselves lawgivers and lawmakers.

The apathy and blindness of the average American citizen to the danger so fast crowding upon us of a union between Church and State in this country, is something appalling to a looker-on. They think because we have railroads and telegraphs and all the science of the nineteenth century that we can not go back to the Inquisition or to the persecutions of two centuries ago or more. They have forecasts of the weather and yet can not read the signs that foretell the corruption of religion and the destruction of law in the abrogation of our Constitutions and the assumption of authority by fanaticism and bigotry. Why men have already been persecuted under these Sunday laws—innocent, true-hearted men, humble, pious men, simple, and plain men who believed in the Bible, word for word, who believed that "the seventh day is the Sabbath" of the Lord their God—"in it thou shalt do no work;" and also believed it to be equally a command of God, "six days shalt thou labor"—men who harmed no one, whose lives were singularly peaceful and pure—such men have been hounded to death in various of our States by religious persecution. And five citizens of Tennessee, Seventh-day Adventists who believe honestly that it is their duty to work six days of the week and rest on the seventh, are now under indictment for the great crime of plowing their own fields on Sunday. Even Constantine in his Sunday laws excepted agriculturalists. It remains for the nineteenth century civ-

ilization to go even farther than the fourth in this barbarism.

Sunday laws are being everywhere proposed; and very recently Judge Hammond, of the Federal Court, declared, in a decision confirming the decision of the Tennessee Court in the case of R. M. King, a Seventh-day Adventist, who was fined and imprisoned for pursuing his "ordinary avocations" on Sunday, that "if one ostentatiously labors for the purpose of emphasizing his distaste for and his disbelief in the custom, he may be made to suffer for his defiance by persecutions, if you call them so, on the part of the great majority, who will compel him to rest when they rest." Poor Mr. King was simply plowing in his own field, in the performance of what he sincerely believed to be his duty, and was injuring no one. He had, according to his belief, the command of God to justify him, the example of the Saviour to uphold him, and, he might well have thought, the Constitution of his State to protect him; and yet this Judge, this *creature*, sweeps away in this decision all the protection accorded by the Constitution to a free exercise of religious belief, sets at naught the example of Jesus Christ who also kept the seventh day as his Sabbath, and holds as an act of criminality, and fit for persecutions, that obedience to his God which was to Mr. King his highest duty. Broken in means and in health by fine and imprisonment, he has been called to his final rest by a higher power than his iniquitous judges, who will surely be called to account if there be any retribution in the future—judges who regarded the conscience of the majority as the only conscience to be considered. God save the mark! what is the conscience of the majority?

In the Congress of the United States, laws are being proposed by members from various States all looking to controlling the Christian Sabbath, Sunday, by law. Christians fondly imagine that by these laws they are, as the old preacher said, "fighting the devil." On the contrary they are preparing the way for a legion of devils to spring upon them as soon as any one of their various sects shall predominate over the rest and become most powerful among them.

When the Sunday rest bill, offered by Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, was defeated some two years since, one of its advocates stated that it would be brought up again at the next session; "not," he said, "that we care so much for this bill, for there is but little in it, but we want it as a precedent; once admit the principle and Congress can not refuse to make other laws in accordance."

A PRECEDENT! TO WHAT?

The Constitutions are the only protection to the minority. Jesus Christ suffered martyrdom at the hands of a majority for expressing his religious belief. He believed he was the son of God, and said so. The Jews did not agree with him in his belief; and, religion being a "part of the law of the land," and subject to the law, and the Jews being the majority who made the laws, they crucified him. Under our Constitution he would have had, though a minority of only one, the perfect right to say he was the son of God and to convert as many as he could to his own faith so long as he injured no one in any way, and would have been protected in this right unless he should have fallen

into the hands of those who would violate the Constitution by making religious belief subject to law, and law subject to whatever religious party might happen to be in power at the time.

For your freedom's sake, Americans, cling to your Constitutions! They are wise, let them be dearer to you than life itself. Cling to them, for once you throw them aside, you indeed "bare your breast to the shaft and your brow to the storm" of whatever odious restrictions a triumphant and tyrannical majority may choose to impose upon you.

But some will say "Sunday laws are not unconstitutional." How can this be so when Congress is expressly forbidden to make any law respecting the establishment of religion, and the States are expressly forbidden to make any law that shall give preference to any religious society or mode of worship. Is not the observance of Sunday, by Christians, as their Sabbath, a part of their mode of worship and are not the Christians a religious society? though subdivided into many sects? and does not the enforcement by law of even one religious observance give preference by law to the mode of worship of which that observance is part? and is not such a law, so far as it goes, a law made to establish that religion to which such observance may belong? How then can it be anything but unconstitutional? how can either Congress or any Legislature make any such law without a direct and positive violation of Constitutions both State and Federal?

But some will say the Sunday laws are not religious in any sense of the word, but only for the benefit of the working classes to insure them rest, whilst others advocate them as a "police regulation."

Now, if the law can decide that a man must rest one day, can it not decide that he must rest two days, or any number of days? Or, that he shall rest only one day in ten, as was decreed in France after the revolution there? But, to be equal, the rest law ought to apply to all men equally and to all sorts of labor. If only works of charity and necessity are to be allowed, and men are forbidden by law to receive pay for Sunday work, then the minister of the gospel could not receive pay for his Sunday preaching—the choristers and the organ-player, the sexton and the boy who blows the bellows would all be debarred from emolument for their Sunday work—and all must do it as a matter of charity. It would be interesting to know how many would continue to preach under this state of the case.

As a police regulation. Under Constitutions that declare "no preference shall be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship," how can an act, solely in deference to the Christian religion, be made a crime that is not a crime *per se*? an act be made a crime that injures no one? an act that is a virtue on Monday, be made a crime on Sunday? and yet the law, so creating a crime for the sole purpose of punishing it in deference to a certain mode of worship, not be unconstitutional? and in defiance of the Constitutions of the States and of the United States? No such laws can stand the test of constitutional integrity.

It may be said it is in the interest of public order to close saloons on Sundays on the ground that idleness begets mischief, and all the working classes being at leisure Sunday, there may be more danger to the peace than on week days. But

if so, the law should be applied not to Sunday alone, or to it as the Sabbath, but every legal holiday as well, since the working classes are equally as idle on those days as on Sundays.

No, gentlemen, make no Sunday laws, repeal all that are now on the statute books. Repeal all school laws relating to religion. Let religion be taught in the homes and the churches where it belongs, and infidelity and atheism can never "hold the reins" as is feared by some, so long as religion is left free. Let all religion be free as the air of heaven. Have no compulsion about it, and like the air its various currents are life-giving and purifying. But once confine it, deprive it of its native freedom, and like the air so confined, it becomes a very engine of destruction and of death itself.—"*Kaintuckee*," in *Henderson (Ky.) Reporter*.

What the Fourth Commandment Requires.

EVERY person has a right to work six days in every week, for the language of the commandment is, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." These words God spake with his own voice, and the right which they confer upon mankind is a God-given right, confirmed by an authority beside which all opposing human authority becomes an absolute nullity.

But the language of the commandment imparts something more than a mere permission to labor upon six days of the week. It imparts something in the nature of an obligation.

The propriety of its doing so can be readily seen. Six days of the week are left to be devoted to man and his temporal interests, but the seventh day is the Lord's,—the day upon which he rested, and which he blessed and sanctified. This day must therefore be kept distinct and separate from all other days, and of course the means for doing this must not be likewise employed in behalf of other days, or the distinction would be lost. If mankind should regularly refrain from work upon two days of the week—the seventh day and some other day—in the manner prescribed by the commandment for the seventh day, there would be nothing in it to show which day it was that God rested upon, and which he sanctified and blessed,—nothing to signify that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested upon the seventh,—and thus the purpose of the institution would entirely fail. The observance of the commandment by rest upon the seventh day would be nullified by the like rest upon the other day. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that the six working days should be kept distinct in character from that day which God has set apart for himself.

But the impropriety of resting upon both the seventh and first days of the week does not stop here; for the first day is a *rival Sabbath*. Peculiarly offensive to God, therefore, must any act be which is an acknowledgment of the claims of this false Sabbath to the sanctity and reverence due his own day. In what other way could such observance of the first day, by one who knew its claims to be false, be taken, but as an insult to the Creator? In what other way could the Creator himself regard it?

The person who refrains from labor upon the first day of the week, thereby acknowledges either the claims of the day,

or the authority of the power which seeks to enforce such rest. He may not "keep" the day as the Sabbath day should be kept, according to the spirit of the Sabbath commandment—his observance of it may be one of form only; but this in the eyes of others at least, is an observance of the day, for only each individual can examine the thoughts and intents of his own heart. The eyes of the world around us can not, or at least do not, penetrate beyond the letter of our Sabbath observance,—the outward refraining from labor; this is all, therefore, that can be asked of any one in enforcing Sunday observance. This also is all that the authors of the first-day Sabbath ever asked as that which should constitute its observance. Sunday was never blessed, sanctified, and made holy; as a rival to the true Sabbath, it is sufficient that the religious world should be induced to rest and attend religious worship upon that day instead of on the seventh day. The edicts which gave rise to Sunday observance never commanded anything more; nor is anything more exacted by the apostate church which has ever been the especial guardian of the day. Every intelligent person knows that the Roman Catholic Church does not demand of its members the observance of Sunday in the spirit of Isa. 58:13. That is the observance demanded by God with reference to his day,—an observance which reaches to the words, and the thoughts of the heart.

"God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" but the "beast," the Papacy, is not a spirit, and demands no spiritual worship. In those countries where the reign of the Papacy is most supreme, the presence of the devout worshiper at mass on Sunday morning, is deemed by the priest nothing incompatible with his presence at a bull fight in the afternoon; and in our own land it is well enough known that the Catholic communicant, having attended religious services in the morning, is at liberty to spend the remainder of the day just about as he pleases.

The Catholic Church does not demand Sunday observance as an act of worship to God, but as an act of homage to itself, and as such it is an act in the highest degree offensive to God. It lowers his Sabbath before the world to a level with the spurious, rival Sabbath which is of satanic origin. It nullifies entirely the act of resting upon the preceding seventh day. To worship God, and an anti-Christian power also, is to worship the latter power alone. God demands that we should worship and serve him always, and him only. The devil is satisfied to let us serve God part of the time and himself the rest of the time, well knowing that we are thereby serving him all the time, and God not at all. We do not think also that any person can afford to surrender, under such circumstances, his right, before mentioned, to six days of secular employment in every week. He who surrenders a God-given right in obedience to an arbitrary demand by any earthly power, merely as an act of homage to itself, makes himself a slave.

We think therefore that it should be a matter of conscience with all observers of the true Sabbath, not to comply with the demand to rest on the first day of the week. However, "let each be fully persuaded in his own mind." It is certain that they, and all others, have a right not to keep Sunday, and we think it equally evident that to do so would be to make a

compromise that would be very displeasing to God.

God will surely vindicate his word; and those who stand upon that word need have no fear but that they will be vindicated with it. Of course, it must not be forgotten that in such a matter every person should act with discretion, taking care not to disturb others, or to make himself needlessly obnoxious to any. Nothing is more unnecessary, nothing would be more unwise, than that any one should make a needless and obnoxious display of his antagonism to Sunday rest. It is enough that a person should quietly and unostentatiously pursue his secular duties upon the first day of the week, and it would certainly be great folly for any one to bring needless trouble in this respect either upon himself or upon the cause of the truth which he professes.—*Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*.

A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation.

[Further extracts from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

JUSTICE BREWER'S decision establishes and justifies the requirement, from all officials, of a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, and the inspiration of the Scriptures, by a quotation from the Constitution of Delaware, of 1776, as follows:—

I. A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be given by divine inspiration.

And the doctrine that is held all through the decision, that this thing and the Constitution speak the same language and have one meaning, is just at this point emphasized in the following words:—

Even the Constitution of the United States, which is supposed to have little touch upon the private life of the individual, contains in the First Amendment a declaration common to the Constitutions of all the States, as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And also provides that the Executive shall have ten days (Sundays excepted) within which to decide whether he will approve or veto a bill. [And there is a sly recognition of Sunday observance as constitutional.] There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious Nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons, they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people.

Having now established a religion for "the entire people," with all the appurtenances thereto, the court cites and sanctions the declaration of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that "Christianity is, and always has been, part of the common law," and then proceeds to establish the doctrine that it is blasphemy to speak or act in contempt "of the religion professed by almost the whole community." And this is done by citing the pagan decision of Chief Justice Kent, of New York, which "assumes that we are a Christian people."

There remains but one thing more to complete the perfect likeness of the whole papal system; and that is the direct and positive sanction of Sunday laws. Nor is this one thing lacking. It is fully and completely supplied. As before observed, it is broadly hinted at in the quotation last made above. But the court does not stop with that; it proceeds to cite the Sunday laws as one of the "organic utterances," which proves conclusively that

this is a Christian Nation." The words of the Court are as follows:—

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life, as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of this same truth. Among other matters, note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies, and most conventions, with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, "In the name of God, Amen;" the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath, with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, legislatures and other similar public assemblies, on that day. . . . These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION.

Now let us sum this up and see what has been done: There is a national religion established, and it is called Christianity and Protestantism. With this there is also specifically justified and established as the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, (1) the maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power; (2) the requirement of the religious oath; (3) the requirement of the religious test-oath as a qualification for office; (4) public taxation for the support of religion and religious teachers; (5) the requirement of a belief in the Trinity, and the inspiration of "holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments;" (6) the guilt of blasphemy upon every one who speaks, or acts, in contempt of the established religion; (7) and laws for the observance of Sunday, with the general cessation of all secular business. All this is declared by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to be the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

Now what more was ever the Papacy than that? What more than that was ever required by the Papacy? Not one thing. And all this is declared in favor of Protestantism. What, then, is this but the legal establishment, and that by the highest court of the Government,—What then is this but the legal establishment of the very likeness of the Papacy? If there is one here who does not think so, then I wish he would tell us what more needs to be done, or what more could be done, to make the likeness of the Papacy, in the principle of the thing?—in principle, I say, not yet in its practical workings, for life has not yet been given to it. But so far as the making of the thing goes, and the establishment of the principles of it, the likeness of the Papacy is made in this decision.

Look at it from another standpoint. Suppose an amendment to the Constitution had been passed by Congress and presented to the people for adoption. Suppose that amendment had recited in a preamble these very historical statements here cited by the Supreme Court, and then upon that had declared that this is a Christian Nation. But even more than this has been and, is now, actually done by this decision. If such an amendment were ever adopted, and so were made a part of the Constitution, it would still remain for the Supreme Court to define the meaning of it. But the Court has already done all this.

The Court has traced the whole course of religious purposes in government from Ferdinand and Isabella down "to the present hour," and has declared that this is the meaning of the Constitution as it now stands. This is the unanimous voice of the authoritative interpreter of the Constitution. Legally, and so far as the

governmental action is concerned, what the Supreme Court says the Constitution means that is what it means. Such, then, being the officially declared meaning of the Constitution as it now is, what more could be done even by an amendment containing these very statements, when it would still remain for the same Court to declare its meaning?

This decision, therefore, is actually stronger, if anything, than an amendment would be in itself. Consequently, if we would be justified in saying to the people that such an amendment would be the making of the image to the Papacy, how much more are we justified in lifting up the voice and saying to all the people that this is the making of an image to the Papacy, that that image is now made, and that this decision opens the way for the fulfillment in completest meaning, of all that prophecy announces and warns against.

Now do not misunderstand. I do not say that the image is living and speaking and acting. I only say that in principle it is made. There yet remains that life shall be given to it, that it shall speak and act.

The World's Fair and Sunday.

THE question propounded in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, "Have the Directors of the Columbian Exhibition been delegated any power by the American people to regulate the religious observances of the World's Fair Exhibitors in 1893?" must be answered in the negative. The assumption by any body of men, no matter how respectable in number and daily walk to speak for the people, and to urge by repeated clamor that they represent the wishes of the people on the subject, is the only basis for the belief that the Directors of the Exposition have been instructed on the question.

The people speak through certain designated and prescribed methods, and their agents in the shape of legislative bodies speaking for the people, are, themselves, restricted in power and may lawfully bind the people only within the scope of the powers delegated to them.

Among those powers there are none delegated which authorize the appropriation of public funds placing restrictions on their expenditure which will deny to any class of citizens equal beneficial results with every other class; and it is contained in that that the majority of the people have no right to instruct the Directors of the Exposition to close the gates on any day of the week, whether the day be Sunday, which is the day observed for religious purposes by Christians, and is not scriptural, or Saturday which is the day observed by the Hebrews and is the Sabbath and scriptural.

To close the gates on Saturday would deny the right to the Jew to visit the Exposition on that day; a right he is entitled to enjoy in common with other citizens and because of his citizenship, and the Jews are a small minority of the people. Yet if the Scripture is to be followed and the Sabbath respected, the gates should be closed on that day, if on any day. The question of numbers can not justify injustice; and the insistence that the majority of religionists in this country observe Sunday and therefore the gates should be closed on that day, is simply the claim of right because of might.

But the majority of the people of these

United States, the majority which is paying the expenses of the Fair, conceding that it does observe Sunday for religious worship does not observe it to the extent of denial of amusements, innocent in themselves, giving no scandal and working no injury; much less when the amusement brings with it instruction and therefore elevation of mind together with health of body. "We the people" is an expression too often the outcome of a feeling which should be written, "We want to be the people, and who, if we were the people, would compel all men to do as we think, not as their liberty of action permits." We, the people, spoke at Omaha demanding the gates of the Exposition be closed on Sunday; and, We, the people, spoke at Philadelphia through the Executive Board, of the Knights of Labor, demanding the gates of the Exposition be kept open on Sunday. We, the Omaha people, claim to represent one-sixth of the population of these United States. But it will not be denied that, at the very least, We, the Philadelphia people, who toil and labor and work six days in the week in fields, and farms, and shops, and mines, and at the desk, and at the case, represent another one-sixth of the population.

The people have not instructed the Directors to close the Fair on Sunday, nor have they delegated that power to anybody, or bodies of men.

The people who pay for the Fair have the right to visit the Fair when their convenience or their pleasure moves them.—*Kentucky Journal.*

Democratic vs. Republican Religion.

THAT exemplar of the perfection of political religion, the *Mail and Express*, true to its political instincts had no criticism of the members of the Republican Convention, when, in session at Minneapolis, they occupied Sunday in electioneering for the great and good Presbyterian candidate; but now the capacities of the English language are scarcely sufficient to furnish invective to heap upon the Democratic Convention and its delegates at Chicago because Democratic politics were not laid aside on Sunday. THE SENTINEL is not partisan in politics, and so wears no party spectacles to blind it to the apparent fact that, according to the creed of the *Mail and Express*, Republican politics are religious and Democratic politics are irreligious. This is another evidence that when the *Mail and Express* has said, as it frequently has, that "religion is politics," that it was always to be understood as intending to say that religion is Republican politics; and so Republican politics being the Christian religion and the American Sunday being the exponent of that religion, which to the *Mail and Express* is but another name for Republicanism, it naturally paraphrases in its own mind that biblical expression as to the Sabbath being made for man, and, applying it to the political Sunday, reads that Sunday was made for the Republican Party and not the Republican Party for Sunday, and it being, thus, quite clearly Republican in character, the Democratic Party has no right or title in it and to it, and any use of the republican Sunday for democratic purposes would be desecration.

The organ of political religion opens its description of Sunday at Chicago during the Democratic Convention with the scare head, "A Riotous Day! How Democrats

desecrated the Sabbath in Chicago;" and continues:—

The Sabbath day was one wild hurrah. . . . The desecration began early. . . . It was a day of utter abandonment and in perfect keeping with Democratic methods. . . . No more disgraceful desecration of the Sabbath was ever witnessed in Chicago. . . . Every delegate drank yesterday, and the bar room doors were wide open. The extra and regular police on duty in the hotel made no secret of taking a drink whenever they wanted it, and once in the afternoon the roundsman marshaled his squad of men in the Auditorium lobby and marched them in a body into the bar, and demanded free drinks for them all—and they got them, too.

One policeman, after drinking one large glass of beer, wanted a second, and because the bartender did not give it to him at once, threatened to make a riot. After getting their beer the policemen took cigars, lighted them and returned to their posts puffing their cigars. And this is Sunday in Chicago.

DEMOCRATIC SABBATH DESECRATION.

Drunken men lie everywhere, and the mob and drunks are heard everywhere. I saw a number of men, too drunk to move, lying in the gutters along Michigan avenue. At one time it looked as if there would be a big fight near the Wigwam between a crowd of men who were trying to force a dead-drunk Democrat into a cab and another crowd who were trying to get him out. Finally the cab drove off and the "terrible example" fell into the gutter and remained there while the two factions fought out the case with their tongues.

A RIOTOUS NIGHT.

At night the Palmer House was again the center of attraction for the crowd, and added to the thousands of Convention yellers came the Chicago people. Men and women swarmed into the place, and the latter brought their children and even their babies. In that great crowd these babies in arms were pushed and hauled about, crying because their parents were out for a Sunday racket. . . .

REBEL AIRS FITLY CLOSE A DESECRATED DAY.

Just before midnight the Calumet Club, of Baltimore, came in with their band, and marching down Congress street, played "Maryland, My Maryland."

On reaching the Auditorium the Baltimore boys serenaded the Tigers with "Dixie," and playing the old rebel tune, marched on to their hotel, thus fitly closing for the Democratic party a most disgusting Sabbath of desecration.

If thus early, in the campaign upon which it has entered to show that politics is religion, the *Mail and Express* finds it necessary to use such descriptive language and broad characterization as this, what is likely to be the style of future canvases in religious politics, when both the editorial and reportorial corps shall have become fully indoctrinated with the theories they are expected to support, and in sympathy with that form of religion, and *en rapport* with that style of political feeling and expression? The policy which the *Mail and Express* is marking out for itself is certainly remarkable.

W. H. M.

"A Warning for the Fair."

COMMENTING upon the wild debauchery which marked Chicago on the Sunday preceding the Democratic Convention, when the city was full of politicians who had not taken the temperance pledge, the *World* says:—

Last Sunday in Chicago was, according to all accounts, not an ideal Sabbatarian Sunday. Sunday in Chicago does not ordinarily meet the Sabbatarian ideal. The theatres are open and performances are given as on week days; concert gardens flourish, the saloon business is lucrative, and no one who yearns for a "little game" need be disappointed on account of the day.

This is the ordinary Sunday of Chicago when the city has only its regular population and its normal accession of visitors. With the unusual number of strangers brought there by the convention, and in the absence of sufficient opportunities of innocent and reputable amusements, the day was, according to reports, largely occupied by a vast and unsavory orgy.

We call attention to this unpleasant subject be-

cause the well-known scenes of dissipation on Sunday in a great city with an unusual crowd of strangers in it are what Chicago may be expected to show to this country every Sunday during the Exposition, if the Exposition is closed to visitors on that day.

The experience of last Sunday proves what we have repeatedly asserted, that to close the Exposition on Sunday would be to drive the visitors to pleasure resorts, to the saloons and to worse places.

There is undoubtedly much truth in the *World's* words. From a civil standpoint the very best thing would be to keep the Fair open on Sunday in the interests of civil order. The religious part of the question would be settled by each individual remaining away from the Fair at such times as conscience might dictate. Of course an open Fair can not be reconciled with proper Sabbath observance, but Sabbath observance is an individual matter. The State has nothing to do with it any more than it has with regular attendance upon religious services. Those who can not conscientiously attend the Fair on Sunday will of course not do so, likewise those who cannot go on the seventh day. But if the managers want to keep the Fair open and can find men willing to do the necessary Sunday work it is their concern.

A Close Likeness.

IN 1658 the preamble to a law promulgated by the General Court of Massachusetts referred to the Quakers as "a pernicious sect" "whose actions tend to undermine civil government," and sets forth that notwithstanding repeated efforts on the part of the authorities "they have not been deterred from their impious attempts to undermine our peace and hazard our ruin."

In like manner, the indictments against Adventists in Tennessee charge that their Sunday work on their farms "is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, to the evil example of society, prejudicial to public morals and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county and against the peace and dignity of the State." The nature of the annoyance was the same in both instances, namely, as a witness in the King case in 1890, testified, "It was very annoying to my feelings." "On what grounds?" was asked. "On the ground that it was a violation of laws, both sacred and civil." "Then it was an excitement of your religious feelings, and repulsive to your views of Christianity?" inquired the attorney. "Yes, sir," answered the witness. The likeness between the persecution of Quakers in Massachusetts in 1658 and that of Adventists in Tennessee in 1890 and 1892 is very close. Two hundred and thirty-four years has made but little change in human nature. This is evinced by the fact as stated by Judge Hammond, that "by a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom."

THE Founder of Christianity taught that the Sabbath was made for man, but a careful study of the *Christian Statesman* and the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* papers has convinced us that the preachers of the country have got it into their heads that Sunday was made for the clergy.—*Christian Gazetteer*.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE National Convention of Loyal Orangemen, in session, at Pittsburg, Penn., has adopted a resolution in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday; but the report does not state that the Orangemen have asked Congress to legislate in the matter.

THE *Post-Intelligencer*, of Paris, Tenn., in its enumeration of cases heard before the Circuit Court of Henry County, in the middle of a column of names of offenders on trial for "gaming," "carrying pistol," "disturbing public worship," "abducting female," "keeping saloon open Sunday," publishes the names, "W. S. Lowry, J. Moon, John Dortch, James Stem, working on Sunday—guilty."

THE platform of the People's Party, of Polk County, Minnesota, adopted by the Convention held at Crookston, May 24, 1892, contains this paragraph:

"That we favor the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition every day of the week."

The Convention, which adopted the platform, consisted of one hundred delegates representing forty-five hundred voters.

THE *Sioux Falls Daily Press* expresses this editorial opinion as to the effort to secure legislation by Congress to close the World's Fair on Sunday: "It appears to the *Press* that, as affairs are now situated, all the talk of governmental interference is useless. The laws of the State of Illinois are yet paramount in the premises, and unless this right is yielded to the Government, the opening or closing of the Fair will depend on enforcement or non-enforcement of the State law."

IT seems in Germany the penny-in-the-slot machine is prohibited from working on Sunday. A late news item from Berlin says: "The ministers of Commerce, Education, and the Interior have issued a circular to the Prussian prefects, instructing them in regard to the operation of the new law regulating Sunday labor, the rules of exemption, etc. One curious paragraph orders the suspension of the sale of sweets, matches, etc., by automatic machines during the prohibited hours."

THE *Tribune*, in reference to the action of the House of Representatives, on May 26, as to the Sunday closing of the Government exhibit at the World's Fair expresses itself thus: "The House has done an inexcusable thing by ordering that the Government exhibit be closed Sunday, meaning thereby that the Government building shall be shut up. When the Sundry Civil bill which contains that foolish direction is considered in the Senate, it should be stricken out, as not representing the wishes of the vast majority of the people of the United States, and as lessening the value of their Exposition. That matter, too, should be left to the judgment of the directors."

IN a recent speech in Congress on closing the World's Fair on Sunday, Mr. Morse is reported to have said:—

Some time since the president of one of our Young Men's Christian Associations addressed an inquiry to the superintendents of a large number of railroads as to the experience of their roads with Sunday trains, asking if they paid, and what was the effect upon the employes. The almost universal answer was that they did not pay, and the effect upon the employes was demoralizing.

It has always been understood that railroad corporations were organized for the purpose of making money. If there has yet been a single instance in which one of these corporations has continued in any given line after it had proved to be unprofitable,

there is no record of it at hand. If Mr. Morse is sure that Sunday trains do not pay, all he will have to do will be to convince the managers that such is the case, and they will be abandoned at once. He would then be saved the trouble of making long speeches on the question before Congress.

At the convention of the National Turner-bund just held in Washington, D. C., the following was adopted:—

WHEREAS, a continued pressure is sought to be exercised for the closing of the Chicago World's Fair on Sundays and holidays: therefore,

Be it resolved by the biennial convention of the North American Turner-bund, in session at Washington, D. C., June, 1892, that the turners, and all liberal-minded citizens of this country for whom they may speak, do most earnestly protest against such Sunday exclusion, and do petition the proper officers of the World's Fair not to yield to this demand of the "Sunday Saints."

A committee of three was appointed to present this, with other resolutions, to Congress.

THE *Boston Congregationalist* says:—

In considering the problem that faces the Directors of the Exposition, it must not be assumed by the churches that the Directors will have nothing but pressure for closing brought to bear upon them. Unitarian conferences throughout the West are petitioning for Sunday opening. The Free Religion Association, at its annual meeting in Boston last week, made similar declarations. But more influential than these will be the letters from the Trade's Unions of the country demanding Sunday opening, Samuel Gompers, President of the Federation of Labor, having just sent a circular letter to all trade's unions in the United States, urging them to use their influence in that way. Still more influential will the secular press be, for with but few exceptions it favors the opening.

It is noticeable that in this entire paragraph, the *Congregationalist* gives no hint that it realizes that there is any principle at stake, or what that principle is; neither does it attribute to any organization mentioned the motive of defence of any principle.

MONTCLAIR, N. J., is a good example of the character of the feeling which inspires the advocates of Sunday laws and their strict enforcement. An enterprise to connect East Orange and Montclair by a street railroad is actively opposed by many residents of Montclair, who are wealthy, able to ride in their own carriages, and have no need of street cars. A published report of the matter says: "There are no Sunday trains to or from Montclair, and the place is isolated from the world on that day of the week. The more wealthy residents say they don't want the town to swarm on the American Sabbath with picnics and sick babies from Orange, while the street railway advocates say they ought to have means of riding for five cents, since they are not rich enough to own carriages."

These citizens of Montclair are determined that the fresh air of the "American Sabbath" shall not be desecrated by sick babies in their town. This is the Christian (?) spirit which inspires Sunday-law advocates the world over.

A DESPATCH from Hingham, Mass., of June 14, says: "Maurice McGrath, Martin McCormick, Amos Stevens, Louis Eldridge, I. A. Reed, John McCormick, and Henry W. Littleton were before Judge Kelly, in the Second District Court this morning, charged with performing unnecessary labor on the Lord's day. All pleaded guilty to the charge, except Mr. McGrath, and were fined five dollars each. Mr. McGrath conducted his case and was discharged.

"These are the first of the batch of Sunday breakers to be brought before the court, but it is claimed that before the summer is over there will be several, if not hundreds of Sabbath-breakers brought before the court, for it is said that all found working on the Lord's day, such as steamboat men, railroad men, carriage and barge drivers, ice men, watering-cart drivers, horse-car drivers, bartenders, cooks

in fact every one who makes Sunday a business day will have to settle before the court, as it is intended to make a crusade against them."

The Denver Daily News in an editorial on Sunday closing at the World's Fair, has this paragraph: "Let us hope that the contest over Sunday as related to the World's Fair will go to the root of the business, and result in a recognition of the undoubted rights of the people. The wisdom of resting one day out of seven is conceded by everybody, but all legal regulations on the subject in this country should be, and rightfully can only be, based on civil and secular grounds. Matters relating to supernatural affairs rest absolutely with the individual, distasteful as that theory is to certain of the clergy, who have not yet become emancipated from the old and ferocious spirit of persecution."

At a meeting of the Associated Trades of New York, resolutions were adopted in reference to the World's Fair, expressing an interest in its behalf, and expressing themselves as "unalterably opposed to the proposed project looking to the closing on Sundays of this great educator of the masses, industrial art and mechanical science.

"Resolved, That in the name of the toilers of the country, we protest against such a sacrifice and denial of their right to examine and study the work and skill of their brother toilers of the earth, on the only day when their time is their own, and their mind is in its most receptive condition to perceive the larger lessons which the dignity, importance, and necessities of the labor world ever teach."

A PITTSBURG justice has been found who is willing to step in to the rescue of the overworked detectives of this country, and say that they can not with impunity be compelled to labor seven days in the week. To be sure the course of Alderman Bleichner does seem to point out an inconsistency in the course of the Law and Order League, but that is to be given to the higher courts to explain away. This is the item, from the Pittsburg Dispatch: "Harry Shellhorn, alias Horn, alias Homer, the Law and Order detective, was fined twenty-five dollars and costs, by Alderman Bleichner yesterday for following his business on Sunday. He is the same man who has figured several times in the local courts. Agent McClure, it is said, declares the decision will not hold, and will appeal the case for his satellite."

LOUIS GOLDSMITH, a Hebrew, of Toronto, Ontario, has been fined five dollars and costs by the police magistrate for allowing a number of employes, all Hebrews, to work on Sunday. The magistrate admitted that it was a hardship that Jews who kept their own Sabbath should be compelled to also observe the Christian Sunday, but such was the law. Henry Cohen, a Hebrew tailor, was also fined for cutting cloth in his store on Sunday.

There is an interesting coincidence of thought and expression between the Canadian and the Tennessee judges, and a startling similarity of conclusion which bodes no good to the dissenter for conscience' sake.

It is reported that the Toronto Baptist Association has passed a resolution requesting the Canadian Government to prohibit the opening of the Canadian exhibit at the World's Fair on Sunday.

"Results of Church and State Union," No. 51 of the "SENTINEL LIBRARY," should be widely circulated. It is by Rev. R. D. Clark, Baptist minister, Eureka, Cal., and is specially valuable for circulation among Baptists. Eight pages; price, one cent; usual discount in large quantities. Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York.

SENTINEL LIBRARY.

ORDER SHEET.

Please send to.....

the following publications, and charge to.....

No. Copies wanted	No.	Price.	No. Copies wanted	No.	Price.
.....	1. The National Reformed Constitution.	3 cts.	29. Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill	10 cts.
.....	2. Religious Liberty	1	30. A Civil Sabbath	1
.....	3. Evils of Religious Legislation	1	31. Union of Church and State	1
.....	4. The Blair Sunday Rest Bill	7	32. Civil Government and Religion, revised edition	25
.....	5. The Blair Educational Amendment	3	33. The Edmunds Resolution	2
.....	6. Purity of National Religion	1	34. Government and the Sermon on the Mount	2
.....	7. National Reform and Rights of Conscience	2	35. A Dangerous League	2
.....	8. The American Papacy	2	36. The Churches and the Public Treasury	4
.....	9. The Salem Witchcraft	1	37. An Attempt to Christianize the Government	2
.....	10. National Reform is Church and State	2	38. Congress and Sunday Legislation	2
.....	11. What Think Ye of Christ?	1	39. God and Caesar	1
.....	12. Bold and Base Avowal	2	40. A Union Between Protestants and Catholics	1
.....	13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity	2	41. The Sunday-Law Movement	1
.....	14. The Republic of Israel	1	42. Sunday Laws of the States and Territories	20
.....	15. National Reformed Presbyterianism	4	43. Should Church Property be Taxed?	2
.....	16. A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement	3	44. "We Declare!" "We Demand!"	2
.....	17. Religion and the Public Schools	4	45. An Unbiased Arraignment	1
.....	18. The National Sunday Law	25	46. The Importance of Maintaining Our Principles	2
.....	19. Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of the American Sentinel	10	47. Should Sabbath Observance be Enforced by Civil Law?	4
.....	20. Romanism and Civil Liberty	4	48. Religious Toleration vs. Religious Rights	1
.....	21. Why We Oppose Religious Legislation	3	49. The Prohibition Party and Freedom of Conscience	1
.....	22. The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights	1	50. Not a Christian Nation	1
.....	23. A Civil Sunday Holiday	1	51. Results of Church and State Union.	1
.....	24. Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1889, (Exact copies, with notes)	1	52.	
.....	25. Civil Government and the Decalogue	1	53.	
.....	26. National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution	1	BIBLE STUDENTS' LIBRARY.		
.....	28. A Religious Political Movement	1	No. 3. Views of National Reform--Pamphlet	15

Copies of this order sheet will be sent free on application. Any of the above tracts and pamphlets will be sent to any address on receipt of price. Address all orders to **PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,** 43 Bond St., New York City. Or Oakland, Cal.

HEALTH FOODS.

PURE CRACKERS AND BISCUITS,
and Cereal Coffee

MANUFACTURED BY THE BATTLE CREEK BAKERY COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED IN 1881.

We manufacture a choice line of these goods, entirely free from lard and all adulterations, at the following prices:—

"A"	Fruit Biscuits, white flour, - sweetened, per lb.	15c
"B"	" " whole wheat flour, " " "	15c
	Fruit Crackers, not sweetened, " " "	15c
	Lemon Cream Biscuits, " " "	12c
	Graham " " " "	12c
	Oat Meal " " " "	12c
"A"	Graham Crackers, slightly sweetened " " "	10c
"B"	" " not sweetened " " "	10c
"A"	Oat Meal " slightly sweetened " " "	10c
"B"	" " not sweetened " " "	10c
	Whole Wheat Crackers, " " "	10c
	White " very palatable, " " "	10c
	Carbon " " " "	15c
	Gluten " " " "	30c
	Cereola, a prepared grain food, in bulk, " " "	10c
	Pure Gluten, " " "	40c
	Wheat " " " "	20c
	Cereal Coffee, prepared from grains only, a very choice and healthful drink, in one and a half lb. packages (Once used, never again refused),	25c

These goods are put up in boxes, at the following prices:—

Fruit Biscuits, A and B, 31 lbs. per box,	\$4.00
Lemon Cream Biscuits, 26 " " "	2.50
Graham " 26 " " "	2.50
Oat Meal " 30 " " "	3.00
Any of the above Crackers, quoted at 10 cents per lb., 38 lbs. per box,	3.00
Cereola, in cases of 50 packages, one and a quarter lbs. each,	6.00
Cereal Coffee, 25 packages,	5.00

Cereola and Gluten are prepared foods, thoroughly cooked and ready for use by the addition of some fluid, as milk and cream, fruit juice or water, as best agrees with the individual.

Cereola is a universal Health Food, and is calculated for use both in sickness and health.

Goods, to the value of eight dollars, will be sent on the receipt of six dollars, being 25 per cent. discount.

In ordering, please remember that the rate of freight on 25 lbs. will be the same as on 100 lbs.

Remit by Bank Draft, Money Order, Express Order, or Postal Note. No private checks accepted.

Write us for special rates on large lots.

REFERENCES.

To whom it may concern:

We the undersigned, residents of Battle Creek, Mich., take pleasure in stating that Mr. Joseph Smith, manager of the Health Food Department of the Battle Creek Bakery Co., has resided in Battle Creek for nearly 20 years, and is a competent and responsible man, and of long experience in his line of business, and one whose goods we can heartily recommend to the public.

URIAH SMIRH, Editor Review and Herald.
HON. W. C. GAGE, Ex-Mayor.
J. B. KRUG, of Krug's Business College.
THOMAS H. BRIGGS, M. D.
HON. GEORGE WILLARD, Pub. Journal.
S. S. FRENCH, M. D.
R. T. KINGMAN, Vice-President City Bank.
M. RORABACHER, M. D.
HON. W. H. MASON, postmaster.
HON. J. W. BAILEY, Ex-Mayor.
T. E. SANDS, M. D.

Address, **BATTLE CREEK BAKERY CO., Battle Creek, Mich.**



NEW YORK, JUNE 30, 1892.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

In order to give the employes of this office a much-needed rest, no paper will be issued next week. No. 27 of THE SENTINEL will bear date of July 14. Our readers will lose nothing by this arrangement, as a volume of THE SENTINEL consists of fifty numbers. Each subscriber will therefore receive his full number of papers during the year.

OUR National Reform exchanges, that want Sunday laws, "but without oppressing any who conscientiously observe the seventh day," are as silent as the grave in regard to the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee. What do the editors of the *Christian Statesman* think about sending honest, God-fearing men to jail upon the strength of the legal fiction that they were "guilty of a public nuisance by working on Sunday, to the prejudice of society, and against the peace and dignity of the State"?

PERSECUTION for conscience' sake has for the most part been in every age under the color and forms of civil law, and the civil officers have ever taken refuge in the plea, "It is the law." It was so in the case of the Adventists now in jail in Tennessee. Both the Judge and the Attorney-General expressed regret for their part in it, but said, "It is the law." And the Legislature says, "It is the law;" and the people say, "It is the law;" and they all, Attorney-General, Judge, Legislature, and people, settle back into a sort of easy, self-satisfied sort of lethargy, feeling that nobody is to blame except those fellows who can't "get their consciences into harmony with the law."

THE following from the Constitution of Tennessee is apropos to the persecution of Adventists in that State under its iniquitous Sunday law:—

No human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. Article 1, Section 3.

These Adventists read the Bible for themselves and believe it as they read, as they have the inalienable, and the constitutional right to do. Accordingly, they believe, as the fourth of the ten command-

ments teaches, that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. Holding this as an obligation which they owe to the Lord, they render it to the Lord. Then, having rendered to God that which is God's, they exercise their God-given right to work the other six days of the week.

AND not only do the Seventh-day Adventists regard it as their *right* to work on Sunday, but they look upon it as a sacred duty to devote Sunday to secular pursuits. Their reasons for taking this view of the question are ably and clearly set forth in an editorial article in the organ of the denomination, the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, of June 14. The article is published, in condensed form, on another page of this paper. We commend it to the careful perusal of every reader of THE SENTINEL.

THE view set forth by the *Advent Review* that the fourth commandment establishes a difference between the Sabbath and the six other days of the week and requires men to respect that difference, is certainly both reasonable and consistent. The seventh day of cessation from labor is God's memorial of his cessation from the work of creation, given to man in order that he might the better remember his Creator. Physical rest for man was evidently not the primary object of the Sabbath; for it "was made for man," as our Lord himself declares, before the fall, and consequently before man stood in need of rest from wearing toil. Clearly its object was to keep in lively exercise man's loyalty to God as the Creator, just as our peculiarly national holidays—the Fourth of July and Washington's Birthday—are designed to fan the flame of patriotism in the American breast. Viewed from this standpoint, it is plain that the fourth commandment not only enjoins the keeping of the true Sabbath, but it likewise forbids rivals and counterfeits.

THE nature of the "disturbance" and "annoyance" caused by the Sunday work of the Adventists in Tennessee, is plainly shown by some of the evidence in the trial of the late R. M. King, in Obion County, that State, in March 1890. Colonel Richardson, counsel for the defendant, asked Mr. Cole, one of the witnesses for the State, questions as follows, and received the subjoined answers:—

Col. R.—Did you see the defendant, Mr. King, working on Sunday?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir, I saw him plowing in his field on Sunday, the twenty-third day of June last.

Col. R.—Did it disturb you in any way?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir, of course it did; it was very annoying to my feelings.

Col. R.—On what grounds?

Mr. Cole.—On the ground that it was a violation of laws, both sacred and civil.

Col. R.—Then it was an excitement of your religious feelings, and repulsive to your views of Christianity?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir.

Col. R.—How long have you known Mr. King?

Mr. Cole.—For about twenty or twenty-five years.

Col. R.—What was the general character of the defendant as a peaceable, quiet, law-abiding citizen, up to the time of this indictment?

Mr. Cole.—It was good.

This makes the matter clear: in Tennessee a man of good character as a peaceable, quiet, law-abiding citizen becomes a nuisance if he observes the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and then goes quietly about his work on Sunday.

REV. DAVID ANDERSON, a correspondent of the *United Presbyterian*, thus defends the system by which the same individual may be counted as a petitioner in favor of Sunday laws and other religious legislation, as many times as he belongs to different organizations:—

While this appears objectionable on its face, yet when we consider these petitions are not personal, but organizational, A has the right of being represented in proportion to his or her working powers in each of these, as these organizations may be affected by the action petitioned for.

It was by exercising this "right" of being numerously counted, that the Sunday forces showed such amazing numerical strength in Ohio and Michigan. At the same ratio there are in the United States not less than ninety millions of people, every man, woman, and child of whom want the World's Fair closed on Sunday. Surely such methods will presently cause petitions to stink in the nostrils of honest men.

A NEWLY enacted statute of Ohio makes it unlawful for any person "engaged in barbering" to prosecute that business Sunday. Nearly all the barbers accept the arrangement gracefully, and announce that they will close their shops on Sunday, but some of them, observing that a similar law with respect to saloon keepers has been violated for years by the use of side doors, and that when any have been brought to trial, the juries obtainable in the police court have invariably acquitted or disagreed, have determined to admit customers by side doors and take the risk of punishment. They say that they must serve their customers, to many of whom a Sunday shave is as much of a necessity as a breakfast.

Such laws are unconstitutional, interfering with the rights and liberty of people. *Syracuse (N. Y.) Times*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, post-paid, \$1.00.

In clubs of less than 100 copies, per year, each, - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York City