



"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."

VOLUME 10.

NEW YORK, MAY 16, 1895.

NUMBER 20.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

ONE of the most far-reaching and destructive errors of the day is the exaltation of the State to a place it was never designed to occupy, and which in the very nature of things it cannot occupy without destroying at once liberty in both civil and religious things, and putting man in the place of God.

THE pagan conception of the State is summed up in the motto: "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The proper conception of the State is tersely expressed in the Declaration of Independence: "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 to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

HERE the individual and not the State is given the first place; and government, instead of being lord and master, is the servant of the people, created by them and deriving its just powers from them. God, the Creator, and not the State, is declared to be the author of rights. And not only is he in this declared to be superior to the State, but he is likewise set forth as superior to the people; hence it is impossible that the voice of the people should be "the voice of God." The people make the State, and it derives all its just powers from the people; but even they, the people, the makers of the State, do not make rights, and cannot destroy them. They may by despotic power invade these rights, but they still exist, for they are God-given and are co-existent with their Author, for they subsist in his very nature.

To deny the existence of inalienable, God-given rights, rights that are above and beyond the power of human government to take away, is to deny the sovereignty of God

himself and to make him subordinate to the State; for it is to put the State in the place of God, or rather to make the State God, which is, in fact, the pagan conception of the State; hence the pagan motto previously quoted, or in other words, the assumption that the people in their aggregate capacity are divine, that by sufficiently multiplying the finite, infinity is the result, that by massing humanity, divinity is created.

THE doctrine of inalienable rights was not new, as some seem to suppose, when the Declaration of Independence was written. Eleven years before Jefferson wrote that immortal document, Blackstone had published to the world this statement of the same principle:—

Those rights which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as life and liberty, need not the aid of human laws to be more effectually invested in every man than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable.

It was perhaps only liberty pertaining to civil things, to the mere temporalities of life, that Blackstone had in mind when he wrote these words; but be that as it may, a greater than Blackstone had, centuries before, enunciated the doctrine of inalienable rights as pertaining to man's relations to his Creator; for this doctrine is set forth as certainly in the words: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's," as in the Declaration of Independence itself.

BUT even before the time of our Saviour this principle had been discovered and boldly announced in the court of the most powerful monarch of ancient times. The three captive Hebrews were conscious of rights superior to human law when they boldly declared to Nebuchadnezzar: "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." This was a declaration of independence long antedating the one written by Jefferson, and was as truly an avowal of the existence of natural, God-given rights as was the document signed by our forefathers in Philadelphia, on the Fourth of July, 1776. The words of Daniel to the king when he had deliberately disobeyed him in the matter of offering prayer, are likewise an assertion of the

same divine right. He had disobeyed the king, and yet he said boldly: "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

THAT the doctrine of inalienable rights must be true is evident from the fact that in no other way could God retain the throne of moral dominion. Man must have, so far as his fellow-men are concerned, perfect liberty in things pertaining to God, or else God could not govern by a perfect law. Had God committed the administration of his law to men, it must necessarily have been imperfect since the administrators of law must also interpret the law which they administer; and the law is, for the time being, whatever its authorized interpreter says it is. Hence, had God committed to men moral government there could in the very nature of the case, have been no certain moral standard.

GOD has committed to man the maintenance of his own rights in civil things; and it is for this purpose that civil government is ordained. Hence civil government should be used for no other purpose than the conservation of civil rights. It was Jefferson who said of the duties of legislators: "Their true office is to declare and enforce our natural right and duties and to take none of them from us. No man," he continues, "has a natural right to commit aggressions on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of society; and this is all that the laws should enforce upon him."

BUT some may query, Why spend time proving in this enlightened age, in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, a truth which was recognized as self-evident more than a century ago? Simply because it is neither as clearly seen nor as universally recognized to-day as it was in 1776. A different theory of civil government obtains largely to-day. Instead of being regarded as the creature and servant of the people, the State is clothed with "that divinity" which was once supposed to "hedge about a king;" government, instead of being merely the conservator of natural rights, is said to have "unlimited and undivided power

over every individual within its jurisdiction, over every institution that its subjects may establish within its territory, and over every commodity that exists within its territory."* In short, the State, like the king, "can do no wrong."

SUCH a theory is utterly destructive of both civil and religious liberty. It destroys *all* individual liberty and makes every man a slave. Yea more, it puts the State in the place of God and makes every man who accepts it a veritable pagan; and that whether he realizes it or not, for no man can accept this theory of government and say with the apostles: "We ought to obey God rather than men." For this reason the AMERICAN SENTINEL protests against the doctrine as un-American and unchristian.

PROTESTANTS PETITION SATOLLI.

A FEW weeks since, "Father" Phelan, editor of the *Western Watchman*, published some shamefully untrue things about Christian Endeavor conventions. These false charges, however, could not harm Christian Endeavorers; but since they were made, Christian Endeavorers have themselves said and done things that are harming them.

The proper thing for them to have done is thus stated by Christ:—

Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you. Matt. 5:11, 12.

But instead of following the counsel of Christ and being "exceeding glad," the Christian Endeavorers became "exceeding mad," and one of their spokesmen is reported as saying, in an address entitled, "Father Phelan's base attack upon the young people of America":—

Judas Iscariot was a gentleman compared with this shameless priest. I wouldn't be surprised if Mr. Iscariot would decline to recognize him below.

Father confessor! God pity the poor girl that should ever be so silly as to whisper her secrets in such a swine's ears.

Retraction is no remedy. Swift and adequate punishment alone will reach the case, and if it does not soon follow, the whole Romish Church authorities will be held responsible.

But the Christian Endeavorers did not stop with rendering railing for railing, cursing for cursing, but have, astonishing to relate, petitioned Mgr. Satolli to curse "Father" Phelan also. The following is a copy of this remarkable document:—

To His Reverence, Mgr. Satolli, Roman Catholic University, Washington, D. C.:—

We, the undersigned Christian Endeavorers of Asbury Park, N. J., respectfully call your attention to the wicked, false, and slanderous statements published by Father Phelan, one of your priests in St. Louis. This base and inexcusable assault is made upon more than three millions of pious, earnest, godly, and irreproachable young Christians in America. It is unparalleled in its baseness and enormity, and should consign its author to everlasting infamy and contempt. We therefore ask that the creature from which it emanated be degraded, unfrocked, and deposed from the high position which he has so recklessly disgraced. We are encouraged to make this petition from the many protestations which you, as well as the Holy See which you ably represent, have recently fully and earnestly made, with full confidence that you will give it immediate and careful consideration.

We had not read five lines of this document before we predicted that this tacit acknowledgment of Satolli, as a representative of

the "Holy See" to which not only Roman Catholics may appeal, but to which Protestants also may petition for redress of grievances, would be pointed to by Roman Catholics as a recognition of papal authority. In this prediction we were right.

The first to call attention to it was "Father" Phelan himself, who says:—

The preachers some time ago were shouting to Mgr. Satolli from the Atlantic to the Pacific to get out of the country; not to stand upon the order of his going, but go at once. Now they are on their knees to him to stay just long enough to cut our head off!—*The Western Watchman*, May 2.

The *Northwestern Chronicle*, of May 3, Archbishop Ireland's official organ, regards the matter in much the same light. It says, after condemning "Father" Phelan's utterances:—

Another thing is also observable in connection with the affair, and that is that the attacked parties themselves are glad to appeal to Archbishop Satolli for redress, which will unquestionably be given if it is in his power. So an apostolic delegate, even if he is an "eyetalian," is not so bad a thing after all.

It was this appealing for redress of grievances that laid the foundation of the papacy which banished religious freedom from the earth. The disputing bishops appealed to the Bishop of Rome to decide their disputes. Later the Bishop of Rome claimed the prerogative to decide such questions, and later still pointed to the appeals to him as an acknowledgment of his authority. Rome always encourages such appeals and then never forgets them when made. An illustration of this is seen in the controversy between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church. Every petition from the bishops of England to the Bishop of Rome is now used to show that the Church in England once recognized the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and that her failure to do so now is an evidence of apostasy.

Protestants, if you are not prepared to accept popery from A to Z, then don't petition the papal delegate.

"ARROGANT CONTRARINESS."

THE *Hartville (Mo.) Press*, of April 25, contained this heartless editorial reference to the recent imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists at Dayton, Tenn.:—

Eight Seventh-day Adventists are imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., for laboring on Sunday. This is right. When people become so they won't be governed by the laws of their State they ought to migrate or at least be punished for their arrant contrariness.

Fidelity to principle has always been regarded by the persecutor as "arrant contrariness." Especially was this true of the early persecution of the Christians by the pagans. Pliny, the pagan governor of the Province of Bithynia, writes thus to the Emperor Trajan regarding the former's attitude toward the Christians:—

I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as Christians. I asked them whether they were Christians or not. If they confessed that they were Christians, I asked them again, and a third time, intermixing threatenings with the questions. If they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed; for I did not doubt but, let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this *positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished*.

If the editor of the *Hartville Press* were called upon to obey a law in conflict with his conscience, we have that respect for him to believe that he would refuse to violate his conscience even in the face of the charge of "arrant contrariness."

THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

[From the *Dayton (Tenn.) Republican*, April 26.]

SINCE the cases of the Graysville Adventists have come before the courts, the *Republican* has had a good deal to say about this Christian organization, and the prosecution they have suffered because of their consistent adherence to the biblical command to keep the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, as the day of physical rest and spiritual exaltation.

There are those in this community who differ with us as to the rights and privileges these people are entitled to in their belief before the civil law of the State. They deny that the law persecutes them when they are arrested, fined and imprisoned for working on Sunday, or the first day of the week. Their arguments are all of one color. They say the law does not restrain or prohibit the Adventists in observing Saturday as the day of rest and religious worship, and that it only operates against them when they fail to observe Sunday also; and they base this argument on the plea that the minority must conform to the usages and customs of the majority.

In reply to this the Adventists claim that in matters of spiritual belief one man is as much entitled to his opinion as ten thousand who hold a contrary opinion, and that this is plainly recognized and set forth in the State constitution. Upon this they rest their claim. Of course if this is denied and legerdemain and juggling of words is used to twist and distort the plain meaning and intent of the constitution, then indeed there is no use in making any sort of argument in the case.

Article 3 of the Bill of Rights of the State constitution says:—

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

The Adventists' "mode of worship" is to observe Saturday as the Sabbath; this the law does not interfere with. The "mode of worship" of the majority of the Christians of the State is to observe Sunday as the Sabbath; this the law has legalized and thereby has given preference to this "religious establishment or mode of worship," in direct violation of the constitution; and this same law requires the seventh-day observers to keep Sunday, or the first day, also, thereby robbing them of one-sixth of the time they are naturally entitled to.

The Adventists observe fifty-two Saturdays in the year as the Sabbath; this they believe is solemnly enjoined upon them in God's Word; the law of the State, that is to say, a legislative enactment, requires them to also observe fifty-two Sundays; this makes one hundred and four days of rest, half of it enforced. They are ground between the upper and nether millstones—God's command and the State's command. As between the two they obey God's mandate, believing that it is higher than man's law; that it is, in fact, the fundamental law of the universe, and that its violation will be punished with death everlasting. With them it is a solemn choice as to the conscientious discharge of their duty. It is not because they love Cæsar less, but Rome more. They claim that the divine command to labor six days in the week is just as mandatory as the injunction to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath.

For this the Adventists are called fanatics, and it has been said that they delight to pose as martyrs. We do not believe this. It is certainly no light matter for these people to undergo these persecutions; and when one reflects that they could avoid them by a simple surrender of the steadfast faith that is in

*"The Sphere of the State," Professor Hoffman, Union College, 1895.

them, their sublime confidence in the integrity of their cause and their devotion to principle is something beautiful. They have the spirit of the old fathers of Israel, in that they meekly submit to persecution for faith's sake. In this day and age, when the obligations of Church and State lie so lightly upon us, and we are too apt to "bend the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift may follow fawning," it is refreshing to witness such devotion to principle.

The trouble is, that on this question the Church and State are at variance. The State has assumed to interpret the Scriptures for us and lay down an iron-clad rule regulating our faith and practice. As has always happened in a union of Church and State, great injustice is worked to a body of Christians who cannot agree with the State. Every man should be allowed to interpret the Bible according to the guide furnished him by his own reason and conscience; the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock to enunciate this truth. Their descendants cannot afford to go backward. The growth of humanity should be towards breadth and freedom.

A large number of States have exemption clauses that release all persons who conscientiously observe Saturday as the Sabbath from the operations of the Sunday law, thus recognizing that the minority have just as many rights as the majority in matters involving religious belief, just so long as they do not trench upon or interfere with the natural rights of others.

The State of Tennessee should enact some legislation that will afford these people relief. They are among our best Christian people, thrifty, frugal, God-fearing, law-abiding, obeying in their proper spheres both Church and State, good neighbors, kind fathers and husbands. They are truly imbued with a deep piety and fervor unusual in this age of loose materialism. How any one can feel offended toward them on account of their religious practices is more than the writer, who is not himself an Adventist, can understand. Rather should they receive the approbation of every right-minded person for their consistent adherence to the plain teaching of the Bible, a book that all Christian denominations profess to revere above everything else on earth, but which seems to have rather fallen into disuse as a moral code of faith and practice.

A LETTER TO A CLERICAL FRIEND.

Dear Brother: Your kind, earnest letter of May 2 is received. I am pleased to note that you are willing to confess that the scriptural arguments in favor of the seventh day are "strong and not easily set aside." By your making this honest confession instead of resorting to the unworthy quibbling so often employed to evade the plain statements of Scripture on this question, I am encouraged to reason with you out of the Scriptures concerning the important questions raised in your last letter.

Your first question briefly stated is this: Why is it that men and women who observe Sunday as the Sabbath are blessed of God with healing power for both their spiritual and physical ills, if they are in error regarding the Sabbath?

I take it that this question is asked in all sincerity, and I therefore the more cheerfully undertake to answer it. In the outset, I thank the Lord for the mercy he manifests in blessing the children of men, *notwithstanding* their errors of doctrine. That this is true is clearly shown by the experience of the

apostles. They did not believe that Jesus would die. When the Lord told the apostles that he "must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day," Peter voiced the sentiment of the apostles when he answered, "Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee." Matt. 16:21, 22.

Now you and I regard a belief in the death and resurrection of Christ as a vital, fundamental truth, and should anyone profess to work miracles in the name of Christ to-day while denying the fact of his death and resurrection, we would regard him as an impostor, notwithstanding we were not able to dispute the genuineness of his miracle. And yet Christ, before this time and while his disciples held this great error, called them unto him and "gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease," and then sent them forth with the command: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give." Matt. 10:1, 8.

Not until after the death and resurrection of Christ did the disciples correct their error regarding the nature of Christ's mission, and then not until he had "upbraided them with their unbelief" (Mark 16:14), and said to them (Luke 24:25-27): "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

Now I wish to ask you, Brother —, ought the disciples, after the light regarding the true nature of Christ's mission had dawned upon them from the Scriptures and revealed to them that their expectation of a glorious, temporal reign of Christ must give way to the truth that his disciples as a despised minority, must long and patiently suffer at the hands of a cruel world;—ought they to have reasoned thus: "We honestly confess that the Scriptures do seem to teach that Christ must die, but we cannot understand how it can be that we have been so blessed while believing differently. How could we have had the power to heal the sick and cleanse the lepers, if we were in error on this all-important point?" Oh, Brother —, don't use the great mercy of God to you and others to sanctify a dogma of the Church which conflicts with the plain command of God. You have been honest in observing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, as the disciples were honest in believing that Christ would not die but take the kingdom of David and reign over the earth at that time. God has blessed you notwithstanding your errors, and now instead of using that blessing to confirm you in the error, you should accept the truth and praise him for his mercy in blessing you notwithstanding your error. The disciples were blessed while holding to errors because they were honest in the belief of their errors and were willing to exchange them for the truth. Their testimony is, "Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?"

Now, you will agree with me that had they rejected the unfolded scriptures, they could not then have claimed the blessing. We are not judged by what we do not know, but by our attitude toward what we might and do know to be truth.

If you would but stop and think, your position would prevent anyone's growing in the knowledge of the truth. When additional truth was revealed, the answer would suffice,

"God has blessed me while holding this view, therefore this view must be right and the new view wrong."

Two Sabbaths ago, I, with others, was called to pray for the healing of a sister who was afflicted with a chronic disease which disqualified her for the care of her family of little ones. We went, and followed the instruction given in James 5:14-16, and the sufferer was instantly healed. Now, shall I conclude that I am in error on no point of truth, and when later, I shall find myself in error on some point, shall I refuse to accept the truth and forsake the error, and give as a reason that the Lord blessed me while holding the old position, therefore it must be right?—No, no; I hold myself in readiness to accept any new truth that is supported by Scripture, and will not point to the fact that God in his infinite mercy blessed me while in error as a reason for rejecting the truth. The Lord has placed his Word above miracles. He says, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, *though one rose from the dead.*" And the Lord has especially warned us against deceptive miracles in the last days, which would be so wonderful as to almost "deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24. And Paul warns us against "the working of Satan [just before the coming of the Lord] with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10. Instead of miracles being the test of Scripture truth, Scripture truth is the test of miracles. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

I have not time to-day to answer your last question, but will answer it in a few days.

Yours fraternally,
A. F. BALLENGER.

MODERN RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

[From *The Progress*, Minneapolis, Minn.]

GOVERNOR TURNBY, of Tennessee, has recently pardoned eight Seventh-day Adventists who were not long since imprisoned for doing work on Sunday, at Dayton, Rhea County, Tenn. In passing sentence, the judge admitted the force of the arguments for the defense, the injustice of the law, and the malice of the prosecution. The act of the governor in exercising the pardoning power in this case is upheld by the best sense of the commonwealth of Tennessee and will be approved by the lovers of justice and liberty everywhere.

The Adventists are peaceable and industrious people, and their persecution in Tennessee is due to personal spite on the part of persons who took advantage of an old law that is a disgrace to the statute books of that State. The Adventists make the Bible their rule of conduct and observe the seventh day of the week as a day of rest, according to the fourth commandment as they say, and allege that they cannot conscientiously do otherwise. They accordingly rest on Saturday, and work on other days of the week.

Three of the imprisoned men were convicted for digging a well on Sunday; one for cutting wood, one for pulling fodder and one for putting wire netting around a vegetable bed. Their terms of imprisonment ranged from twenty to seventy-six days. Judge J. G. Parks who presided, said: "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 in-

terfere with some natural right of his neighbors."

The Adventists have nowhere been charged with interfering with the rights of other persons. For ten years past they have been persecuted in Tennessee, and similar action has been taken against them in Arkansas, in Georgia, in Maryland and in Massachusetts. Fifty-three have been convicted and thirty have suffered imprisonment. The complainants allege that they are shocked or disturbed by the knowledge merely that Sunday work was being done. One person was "shocked" at seeing Sunday hoeing while he himself was driving a cow home from a neighbor's.

The observance of the first day of the week instead of the seventh as a day of rest was a change made by the Christian church since the death of Christ, and was purely a church regulation. The observance of either rests with the conscience of each individual, and the laws of a free country are supposed to protect every individual in the free exercise of his own conscience, provided he does not interfere with the rights of others.

The question arises: Is the United States of America a free country? Are men to be deprived of freedom of conscience who interfere with no other's rights? Press and public are pointing and should continue to point the finger of scorn at the States which retain laws which make religious persecution possible. The afflictions which are being endured by the Adventists will doubtless accomplish beneficent reform, for the best way, sometimes, to get rid of a bad law is to enforce it. Persecution for conscience' sake will not long be tolerated in America.

THE "EXAMINER," THE [N. Y.] "CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE," AND THE SABBATH.

THE Baptist Church discards infant baptism because it is not commanded by the Word of God, yet it observes the first day of the week as the Sabbath. This inconsistency is constantly getting Baptists into trouble. When the church demands a scriptural command for infant baptism from some church which adheres to the unscriptural practice, they are sure to be met with the challenge for a scriptural command for Sunday observance. Here is an instance taken from the *New York Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of April 25:—

The following is from the *Examiner*:—

"The late Thomas Cooper, of England, an eminent popular lecturer, who in mature life became a Christian and a Baptist, once explained the way in which he was led to adopt Baptist views. In conversation with a Christian woman, a Baptist, he said: 'I have generally found that, whatever practices or beliefs there may be among the various Christian bodies, they have usually some text which, rightly or wrongly, is quoted to justify them; but I have never heard of any text which authorizes the old Romish custom of the christening of church bells.' 'Really,' replied his friend, 'that is a very simple matter. The christening of bells is authorized by the very next verse to the one which commands the christening of babies!'—a remark which set Thomas Cooper thinking, with the result above indicated."

The *Christian Advocate* quotes the foregoing and follows it with this comment:—

Why this was published we can hardly imagine. Is there any person who supposes that all the practices or beliefs of Christians can be sustained by some positive text? Our Baptist friends would find great difficulty in finding a positive text in support of some of their beliefs. Without doubt there is no text commanding the christening of babies. Nor is there any commanding the substitution of the Lord's day for the Sabbath.

The church dogma of Sunday sacredness is becoming a universal cudgel with which to smite him who would appeal to Scripture as

the only authority for doctrine and practice. When a Protestant church appeals to Scripture against the unscriptural doctrines and practices of the papacy, the papist seizes the Sunday cudgel and cracks his Protestant disputant over the head with it, and forthwith he is silent. Then when a Protestant of one church, as in the foregoing instance, attempts to appeal to Bible truth against unbiblical traditions, the defender of tradition instantly seizes the Sunday cudgel and pounds his Protestant brother into silence.

The fact is, the Sunday institution stands as the ensign of tradition and ritualism, while the Sabbath stands for the Bible and Jesus Christ.

BLUE LAWS.

THE genuineness of the special code called the "Blue Laws of Connecticut" is questioned, but that these laws expressed the prevailing religious prejudice there can be no doubt. The people of New England two hundred years ago were not distinguished for pious hospitality. A person of a different faith from the common Puritan belief was a foe. There was little religious toleration among the early settlers of our land. A Puritan had little charity, and while he wished freedom to worship God in *his* way, he was not willing to allow another freedom to differ from him.

Quakers and Catholics were objects of particular aversion to the Puritan. He was not able to comprehend how his God allowed a Quaker to live on the earth, or a Catholic to breathe the air of heaven. To his mind God erred in not putting them out of existence without apology. In these so-called "Blue Laws of Connecticut" we find three against the Quaker and two against Catholic priests. They are as follows:—

If any person turn Quaker, he shall be banished, and not suffered to return upon pain of death.

No Quaker or Dissenter from the established worship of this Dominion shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of magistrates or any officer.

No food or lodging shall be offered to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretics.

No Catholic priest shall abide in this dominion; he shall be banished and suffer death on his return.

Priests may be seized by anyone without a warrant.

We make fun of the Blue Laws, but there are laws on the statute books of Massachusetts that were born of religious intolerance. People must be just as free to doubt, or to deny as to believe, and they must be entitled to as much consideration from the State as the most devout worshiper, so long as they are honest, upright citizens. The State should know neither Christian, Jew, nor infidel, and all laws which punish men for non-observance of a certain religious custom ought to be repealed.—*Exchange.*

SOME SUNDAY LAW INCONSISTENCIES.

[By Wm. Geo. Oppenheim, in *New York World*.]

IF I were a philosopher I might offer some reflections on and draw some deductions from certain perplexities that beset men of this city on Sunday. As, for instance, if I were a philosopher, I might ask myself where freedom of action ends and restraint begins.

On Sunday Mr. De Smythe is at liberty—if he is a member of an uptown club—to enter its reception-room, call for any beverage, vinous, malt, or spirituous, and have it brought to him with most perfunctory elegance by a swallow-tailed waiter. But Mr. De Smythe is not permitted on that holy day to buy beer, wine, or liquor at a hotel or saloon bar.

On Sunday John Smith is free to go to the

park or a garden and listen to the strains that issue from the kiosk, but he is restrained on that holy day from listening to instrumental music in a public hall. He may go to a concert in the evening, where gems from operas are sung by Melba, De Reszke, or Scalchi, but he cannot hear an opera in its entirety.

On Sunday he may take a pleasure trip on a steamboat or may witness a swimming match, but he is debarred from seeing athletes bat at a baseball. On Sunday he may buy a cigar, but it is made a crime to sell him a pair of gloves or an umbrella. On Sunday he may drive with considerable rapidity on the boulevard, but he may not witness a race.

On Sunday Mr. De Smythe's coachman is permitted to drive him to the church door and wait on the box till the service is over, and after that may drive him to his club, where he gets his dinner and his bottle of '64 Hochheimer; but the coachman may not take either wife or sweetheart on Sunday to a grove where there are music and beer, Hochheimer, or anything but plain Crotonheimer.

On Sunday he may buy a good dinner either at his club or at a hotel, but the grocers are forbidden, under penalties, to sell him the wherewithal to make a Sunday dinner at home.

On Sunday De Smythe may be shaved by the obsequious Figaro at his club-rooms, but it is now contemplated that this necessity shall be denied to plain John Smith at the hair-dressing rooms throughout the city.

On Sunday he may look at the panorama in Twenty-fourth Street, but the sight of a pantomime in Fourteenth Street is debarred him.

On Sunday he may hear the blare of trumpets and the music of Cappa's band at the head of a funeral parade, but itinerant musicians with the best of intentions and wind are not allowed to play for him on this same Sunday.

Strange, isn't it?

SUNDAY BASEBALL IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

BY H. F. PHELPS.

IT was supposed that the Sunday saloon would be the first point of attack by the Sunday Observance League of St. Paul, but it has turned out to be the Sunday baseball game. From early spring, preparations have been going on in order that St. Paul might not be behind other cities by being minus a Sunday baseball game. The grounds were leased and enclosed, and stands were made. During all this time there was not a ripple on the surface indicating the deep under-current that was running counter to the popular game; nor was there anything that indicated the storm that would soon break on the heads of the movers in the enterprise. But on Friday, April 19, before the first game was to be played, the wind began to blow. The mayor was visited by a representative of the Sunday Observance League, the Rev. C. E. Haupt, of the Church of the Messiah, who suggested that it would be for the good of the community to put a stop to the game. As his honor was of a different opinion as to what would be for the good of the community, they could not agree; the mayor contending that the best government was the one that governed least. Mr. Haupt could hardly admit the truth of this maxim, as he thought the people could not govern themselves; and that it was only true when the people were fully capable of self-government.

But a query arises on this point. Admitting that the people are not fully capable of

self-government, who made the Sunday Observance League the governors of the people who cannot govern themselves? Where are their credentials?

Mr. Haupt urged his case as a needful one, and pointed to the fact that there is a statute forbidding baseball games and prize fights on Sunday; but all to no effect, for the mayor thought such laws were not to be strictly enforced, but only held as a club over the heads of transgressors.

In an interview with a press representative, Mr. Haupt candidly admitted in the following words that the movement was for the sake of enforcing "Sabbath [Sunday] observance":—

I think that the Sunday law should be enforced and the Sabbath observed in all respects if it is to be observed at all. . . . I did not ask Mayor Smith to stop the Sunday baseball game because my church is within two blocks of the ball grounds, but merely because I believe that if the Sabbath is to be a blessing to us it should be fully observed.

That is to say: Mr. Haupt believes that the Sabbath is to be observed on Sunday, and that in a particular manner, in order that the Sabbath may be a blessing; and that he finds no other way in which to bring about the desired observance except to appeal to the civil authority and demand the enforcement of civil law against the unbeliever! Is this doing as he would like to be done by? Is it Christian?

The game was played, and still the battle rages, for a second game, under protection of four special and one mounted police, has been played. Several mass meetings have been held, both for and against the games being played on Sunday. Petitions and counter-petitions have been circulated, and sermons have been preached against the games; the "Saturday half holiday" has been strongly advocated, and attorneys have been consulted. Thus, as in the earlier centuries, the Church will turn the seventh day of the week, God's Sabbath, into a holiday and a day of revelry, in order that it may exalt the man-made Sabbath, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times."

At this writing, the question is still unsettled. The mayor is still obdurate, and the opposers of the games are determined. Of course no one can predict the outcome.

St. Paul, May 6.

A MINISTER CALLS A HALT.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, April 30.]

At a meeting of the Methodist ministers yesterday morning, Rev. Dr. Davis W. Clark, of the Union Church, Covington, read a paper entitled, "Paul, the First Professor of Pastoral Theology." He created a sensation by saying that ministers of the gospel had no business in bringing into their pulpits discussions on municipal reform. St. Paul had been a roaming missionary, not an agitator nor reformer, but a non-partisan in the modern sense of that word. He had not even proclaimed against slavery. The ministers' full and ready field was to engage in a spiritual warfare upon strict gospel lines. Instead of spending so much of their valuable time in schemes of municipal reform, it would be far better advised for them to invoke the power of the Holy Ghost to create a healthy sentiment for the extermination of the evils they were complaining of. He would advise the ministers to go out among the people, as did St. Paul, and preach the gospel. Their time would be more profitably spent in leading the youth of the country into right and godly paths. All the ministerial agitation about municipal reform would lead to no results.

He did not believe in agitation, but in personal persuasion. He would say to the young men of this country: "Don't be a partisan and

don't wear a white rose in the lapel of your coat, and don't join the A. P. A., but join the church and learn from it wisdom that will impress you and remain with you all your life."

In conclusion, Dr. Clark said: "No minister has a right to use his pulpit for any political movement. He has a right to teach the boys and girls of the community in which he lives the duties of true citizenship."

When Dr. Clark had finished his address, Rev. Dr. John Pearson, President of the Municipal Reform League, arose, and, to the astonishment of all, stated that he was delighted with Dr. Clark's essay. However, said he: "In his community there may not be any youth that are liable to be led away by municipal misrule, nor in any danger from the saloons or the race track, but Covington and Cincinnati are in continual communication with a consolidated system of gambling that is bleeding the families of the poor and sending to death and destruction many a young man of promise."

Dr. A. L. Conger, Dr. A. H. Rust and others arose to side with the essayist. Rev. Dr. Peck, the evangelist, of Denver, Colo., spoke against the present movement of municipal reform. He said the devil was trying to blind the preachers, and that preaching the gospel and attending strictly to ministerial duties would be better agents of municipal reform.

Rev. Dr. Sylvester Weeks, President of the Methodist Ministers' Conference, arose to say: "I am heartily sick and tired of this constant meddling by the ministers with political matters and their attacks upon the mayor. In attending to their business, ministers would find plenty to do. I have read Dr. S. McChesney's open letter, which is an excellent thing, and voices the sentiments of a majority of the Methodist ministers."

DR. MCCHESENEY'S LETTER.

Walnut Hills, April 28, 1895.

REV. WM. MCKIBBIN, D. D.—Dear Sir: After further deliberation, I concluded not to advertise from my pulpit the Municipal Reform meeting, to be held at your church, and, therefore, feel obliged to give you my reasons.

1. I am unwilling at this juncture to seem to be even in part responsible for the sentiments of reform speakers of whose antecedents I am not adequately advised.

2. I am not satisfied in my own mind that the moral effect of this reform agitation is for reform, pure and simple, unalloyed by political aspirations of participants, and which at the outcome might prove that our churches had been used as a leverage to resuscitate moribund politicians.

3. If it is a question of bossism I will say that I hesitate about becoming a party to an exchange until I shall know something about the substitute boss. I would not exchange even a pack horse until I had seen the other horse.

4. We have recently been furnished with so striking an illustration of the possible political effects of a municipal reform movement in the city of Columbus, Ohio, that, personally, I do not care to participate in a similar reformation in Cincinnati—especially at a time when the nation itself is prostrate in consequence of the denomination of a power which deceived the country with the cry of reform.

5. The citizens of Cincinnati, including the laity of our churches, are better advised as to the actual facts than our city pastors can be, if they are occupied chiefly with pastoral duties. Is it because the laity are so lumpish

that the ministers are shut up to the alternative of leading the reform movement, and that too, under the disadvantage of the suspicion of endeavoring to play the role of a Parkhurst?

Are our laymen so much afraid of imperiling secular interests that they have not the courage to participate to any appreciable extent in a public reform movement? Who believes that?

If that be true, it would seem that our first duty as ministers is to reform the laity.

The non-enforcement of the law is, indeed, a serious affair in municipal government. Is it any the less serious in matters ecclesiastical?

Again, in a country where government is established upon the basis of separation of Church and State, citizenship, with all its privileges and responsibilities, remains alike to preachers and laymen.

How far it is proper and just for ecclesiastical organizations, as such, to make war upon the municipal authorities, is a question which calls for serious consideration.

Is it not safe to affirm that in a country where liberty is supposed to mean something besides license, if the civil authorities were to make war upon any ecclesiastical organization, there would be no hesitation about the assertion of rights under the Constitution?

As guardians of public morals there can be little room for doubt as to the legitimate functions of the churches.

By what means, and in what way, and to what extent, such guardianship shall assert itself are still open questions.

I prefer, therefore, to confine my responsibility in the premises to my own pulpit. With assurance of personal esteem, I am, sincerely yours,
S. MCCHESENEY.

PROTESTANT INCONSISTENCIES.

[From Zion's Watch Tower.]

OF all religionists "Protestants" seem the most inconsistent. Evangelist Moody continues to charge Protestants a good stiff price for reviving them, but shows his love for papists by donating \$500 to help build a Roman Catholic church, and by prohibiting the sale upon his school premises of a newspaper containing an anti-Romanist article.

The World's Parliament of Religions clearly showed that many professed ministers of Christ were not only ready to ignore the *faith*, but even the *name* of Christ—to draw men after them.

Recently a Baptist church edifice was dedicated, and all the denominations of the town were represented at the ceremony by their ministers except the Roman Catholic. For his consistency and honesty the priest was roundly denounced. His reply was to the effect that he recognized a wide difference between the teachings of his church and those of the one to be honored by the dedicatory services, and that he wished to be consistent and honest in his conduct as well as in his professions.

A Jewish synagogue was dedicated in Cleveland, and Protestant ministers vied with one another at the service to show that faith in Christ means nothing. This is not Christian love, or "love of the brethren," so highly commended by the apostle as one of the evidences that we "have passed from death unto life." It is worldly love—the result either of ignorance or of disloyalty to Christ. It is the kind of love mentioned in the Scriptures thus: "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."

Far better, far more consistent, is the Jew-

ish view of the matter, expressed by the *Jewish Exponent*, as follows:

The participation of Christian divines in the services at Jewish houses of worship, a notable instance of which—at the dedication of a synagogue in Cleveland—has attracted attention, is accepted as a welcome evidence of good-will and mutual toleration, if it has no under or deeper significance.

It must be confessed, however, that the expression of this sentiment in this way does not seem specially appropriate. For men to ignore broad lines of demarcation, and to announce a harmony where none exists, can only lead to eventual discord. We prefer that Christians and Jews shall remain distinct in the domain of religion, mutually respecting each other's convictions, but agreeing to disagree on this one subject. On all others they can join hands, or at least the lines of cleavage will be other than between Jews and Christians.

On occasions of large and general importance, even of religious significance, it may not be unmeet for Jews and Christians to join where no sectarian question is at issue. On other occasions it is better to follow the Mosaic injunction not to remove the landmarks.

Not a great while ago a conference of Christians and Jews was held in the First M. E. Church of Chicago, in which ministers of several denominations took prominent part, notably Revs. W. E. Blackstone, C. A. Blanchard, D. C. Marquis, E. P. Goodwin. The meetings were opened and closed with devotional "exercises"—singing, prayer, etc.—and the name of Christ was entirely ignored; even the benediction was Moses' blessing, written off and read for the occasion.

The *Chicago Tribune* criticised the matter and interviewed both Jews and Christians on the subject. The Jewish Rabbi said:—

It was undoubtedly the intention on the part of those who arranged the affair to have all reference to Christ and the Trinity omitted from the devotional exercises. As such it was a great concession on their part, and I think an unfortunate one. More than that, it was the most inconsistent in those who believe that prayer should be offered in the name of Christ. It seems to me that the whole thing was unfortunate.

I do not wish to be understood as questioning the honest intent of the promoters of the conference. I was of the impression that it was a scheme to convert us and wrote Mr. Blackstone that were such the case he had better not waste his efforts. He assured me that such was not the case, and I am now convinced to that effect. I am quite certain it did no good, and I hope it did no harm. I was amused at one thing: Mr. Blackstone asked me if I thought the conference would draw a crowd. I replied that it certainly would, as anything in the nature of a show was certain to draw well in Chicago. He replied that he intended to take from it the character of a show by having devotional exercises. I was much surprised at that, wondering all the while how Jews and Christians could possibly worship together. You see, I did not think they would eliminate Christ. It was done, I suppose, to give the conference a solemn character. This end, however, was not fully attained, as I was often interrupted, during my address, by applause.

MORE PRESS COMMENTS ON TENNESSEE PERSECUTIONS.

[From the *Charlotte (Mich.) Tribune*, April 17.]

THE spirit of Cotton Mather seems to be controlling affairs at Dayton, Tenn., where no less than five Adventists have been in jail for a month for no other reason than that they serve God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The Protestant churches should be the loudest in condemnation of such practices.

[“Protestant,” in *Noblesville (Ind.) Ledger*, April 19.]

Now this persecution is as plain a violation of this law as is possible, to say nothing of the Constitution of the United States and Declaration of Independence,

which guarantee the utmost religious freedom. And yet to say nothing of the laws and precepts of the Bible, which these same persecutors profess to believe, every law and precept of which they violate—especially the great ten commandment law that says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath.” They break the law themselves and then punish men for keeping it. “How long, O Lord! how long?”

[From the *New Era*, Grand Junction, Ia., April 20.]

THE Governor of Tennessee has pardoned the five Adventists, in Rhea County jail, on conviction of working on Sunday. This comes at the same time with the distribution of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, a church paper, containing a full showing of the cause and principle to sustain which these Tennessee members of the church accepted imprisonment rather than pay fines.

[From *Mystic (Conn.) Press*, April 5.]

THE article headed “Religious Persecution,” in another column, reveals the existence of laws on the statute books of at least one of the States of the Union, and a disposition to enforce them oppressively, totally incompatible with a free State under an enlightened government. Such proscription and persecution for conscience' sake is a step backward toward the iron rule of a godless ecclesiasticism in the Dark Ages.

[From the *Sunday Gazetteer*, Denison, Tex.]

SOME persons, and there are “orthodox” Christians among the number, are disposed to sneer at these people [Seventh-day Adventists] who go to prison rather than obey a civil law which they believe to be an infraction of a divine command, and which undoubtedly annuls the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty. Those who criticise the action of these people are certainly not familiar with the history of primitive Christianity. The Christians of the first two centuries gloried in martyrdom, and rather than obey Roman laws requiring them to observe certain time-honored customs they believed to be contrary to the teachings of Jesus, they submitted to the most excruciating tortures, if we may believe the statements of the fathers. Few Christians at this time are seeking martyrdom, but the best representatives we have of primitive Christianity in this respect are the Seventh-day Adventists.

[From the *Nashville (Tenn.) Banner*.]

THERE is a law on the statute books of Tennessee which says no man shall work on Sunday, and as these people believe the fourth commandment requires them to keep holy the seventh day of the week, and consequently work on Sunday as any other day of the week, their enemies in the neighborhood had them indicted for Sabbath-breaking.

The most prominent people in the colony thus fell under the heavy hand of the law. Nine of them were convicted and sent to jail for terms ranging from sixteen to seventy-six days each. Among them were the principal of the school and his first assistant and the minister of the colony. This caused the academy to be closed and sadly interrupted the serenity of the community.

In passing the sentence upon the nine men, Judge Parks recited the Sunday law and the Supreme Court decision upholding it, and then expressed his personal regret that some of the best and most law-abiding citizens of the county should be compelled to suffer persecution in the matter of conscience.

[From the *Noblesville (Ind.) Ledger*, April 19.]

In another column of this paper will be found a communication in reference to the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee for violation of the Sunday law. The author of the article does not overstate the matter when he says it is persecution similar to that in the days of the early Christians. It is an interference with religious liberty and a relic of the Dark Ages that is greatly at variance with the principles of religious liberty and freedom of conscience conceded and guaranteed to the people of this United States. If Tennessee has a statute requiring some of her citizens to observe Sunday as a day of rest when they

religiously and conscientiously observe another day for that purpose, it should be repealed.

The facts in the case, as the *Ledger* understands it, are that a community of Adventists in Tennessee, sober, honest, upright people, had built up a large school there and were living according to their religious belief, until certain evil-minded persons had them arrested and broke up the school by imprisoning the teacher because of observing the seventh instead of the first day of the week.

Such persecution in the name of the law must fail of the purpose intended, and will sooner or later react against those instigating and encouraging it.

Gubernatorial Clemency.

[From the *Times-Democrat*, New Orleans, La.]

A DISPATCH from Nashville, Tenn., which the *Times-Democrat* published a few days ago, gave an account of an act of clemency on the part of Governor Turney of that State which will meet with universal approbation outside the ranks of the “unco guid” who hold that only what they themselves believe and do has the sanction of heaven.

We have called the governor's act an act of clemency, but it would have been nearer the mark to call it an act of simple justice. For what was it? In one of the counties of Tennessee there is a large colony of what is known as “Seventh-day Adventists,” one of the articles of whose creed is that the seventh, not the first, day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. They worship, therefore, on the seventh day of the week, and work on the first.

That arrangement did not suit the self-righteous views of the Tennesseans in their vicinity, who rest and worship on the first day of the week; and, accordingly, to prevent the Seventh-day Adventists from working on the first day of the week, they invoked some Blue Laws of Tennessee which are a relic of mediæval barbarism and which are maintained by a State only to its disgrace, and under the terms of these Blue Laws they had a number of the most prominent Seventh-day Adventists cast into prison for periods varying from sixteen to seventy-six days. Among the nine Adventists jailed like common felons was the minister of the colony, which is an exceedingly well-behaved and prosperous colony, and the principal of the academy.

Those of the incarcerated Adventists who had the short sentences to work out worked them out and were liberated; and at the end of last week Governor Turney extended official clemency to those who had the longer sentences imposed on them, and restored them to the freedom of which it is a veritable scandal to the State of Tennessee that they should ever have been deprived.

Now, if we mistake not, the readers of the *Times-Democrat* will agree with us in doubting whether the word “clemency” should be applied to the governor's act. If the word “clemency” can be applied under the circumstances, it can only be in that stereotyped signification when clemency is merely equivalent to the stoppage of a continuing injustice. And such clemency is of course no clemency, in the proper acceptance of the term, to men who are being outrageously, even if legally, robbed of their freedom.

But, clemency or no clemency, the incarceration of these well-behaved and responsible citizens for holding to a religious belief which happens not to be the belief of the majority and for giving their religious belief its appropriate action, is one of the worst instances of persecution which this country has witnessed in this latter part of the nineteenth century, when we had proudly been flattering ourselves that we had attained the perfection of religious toleration. The Tennesseans who invoked an old Blue Law against these men and put them in prison had their prototype in a well-known scriptural character who prayed much in public, and whose prayer was mostly a recital of his self-asserted superiority to other men; and their Christianity is more the Christianity of a Torquemada than of Him who preached that wonderful sermon on the mount which is the world's high-water mark of kindness and brotherly love.

The enlightened State of Tennessee should have the law which sends such men to jail repealed with the least possible delay, or it will lay itself open to a charge of narrow-minded intolerance which will cause civilization, let alone religion, to blush for very shame.

THE BIBLE DAY AND THE MEETING AT TROAS.

A READER asks this question: "What reason have you for saying that the meeting of Acts 20:6 was held on Saturday night and that a part of Sunday was spent in traveling?"

The Bible day, unlike the modern day, begins at the setting of the sun. That this is true is shown by several texts of Scripture. In the first chapter of Genesis we find repeatedly the expression, "The evening and the morning were the first day," "The evening and the morning were the second day," etc. This alone would of course not be conclusive, though it is suggestive. But in Lev. 23:32 we find the express command: "From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." That the "even" here referred to was marked by the setting of the sun is evident from Mark 1:32: "And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased," etc. The connection shows that the setting of the sun marked the close of the Sabbath, which, according to the commandment, was and is, the seventh day.

The texts cited establish clearly the fact that the Bible day commences with the even, that is, at the setting of the sun. The meeting at Troas was on the first day of the week. It was likewise an evening meeting, for "there were many lights in the upper chamber."

But, according to the Bible, the evening of the first day of the week is not what we call Sunday evening, but what corresponds to our Saturday evening. This conclusion is unavoidable. It follows therefore that "a part of Sunday was spent, by Paul and his company, in traveling," for the record is, that after healing the young man who fell from the window, Paul "talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." While of Luke and his companions we read: "We went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos, there intending to take in Paul; for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot."

The only reasonable conclusion to be arrived at from a careful reading of the whole account of the visit to Troas, is that arriving at Troas early on Sunday, Paul and his company spent an entire week there. At the close of the Sabbath, Luke and his companions sailed for Assos, but Paul tarried over night, held a farewell meeting with the church at Troas, and then went on foot to Assos, where he met his companions who had made the much longer journey by water. The twentieth chapter of Acts affords not even a hint of Sunday sacredness, but rather the contrary.

The view here presented is not peculiar to observers of the seventh day, but is identical with that presented by Conybeare and Howson, in their "Life and Epistle of the Apostle Paul," so far as the time of the Troas meeting and the Bible day are concerned.

THE *Evening Journal*, of Lewiston, Maine, in its issue of May 7, gives some account of the Methodist Conference at Saco, Maine, in which it is related how the chairman "Rev. Dr. Stackpole, of Auburn, chairman of the committee on Sabbath observance," threw a bombshell into the conference in the shape of certain resolutions touching the observance of Sunday. One of the doctor's propositions was that whereas "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," "whatever ministers to his welfare, physical, mental, moral, and religious, is good," and not to be prohibited. "Recreation," says the doctor, "that brings real rest to the body and soul should not be prohibited." This was entirely

too liberal to meet the mind of the conference as was also this proposition: "The notion that God is a stickler as to what twenty-four hours of the week should be specially consecrated to him is belittling to God and man. Custom and propriety commend the Lord's day. . . . Great charity must be used toward those who conscientiously differ from us in the estimation of the day and its observance."

But this was an application of the seventh-part-of-time theory not to be tolerated in a Methodist conference, and so Dr. Stackpole's resolutions were rejected and others substituted. The Maine Methodists have no charity to waste on those who differ from them as to the day to be observed as the Sabbath.

A GENTLEMAN, writing to the *Dayton Republican*, from Sherman Heights, a suburb of Chattanooga, Tenn., has this to say about the Adventist cases in Rhea County:—

I admire the stand you have taken in the matter of the arrest and imprisonment of the Seventh-day Adventists. I am just as much in favor of law and order, and of the observance and conformity to the law, as any man, especially the observance of the day recognized by a great majority of the Christian people as the Sabbath, but this thing of straining at a gnat and swallowing an elephant is disgusting. A man who believes that he is doing no wrong, and in his judgment violating no law of the Bible, goes out and chops a little kindling wood or does some other work that he deems right on the day which he thinks is a week day. What a sensation is created! With what holy horror the saints hold up their hands and cry out, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" While he is at this labor, to him not wrong, along comes a railroad train, thundering and roaring and whistling and jarring the earth, disturbing the worshippers while engaged in their religious duties. Come to Sherman Heights, even, and you can go to the store and buy what you wish on Sunday. Picnics and various other amusements abound. In the large cities theaters are open day and night. On our rivers steamboats are playing their trade. Furnaces run full blast on Sunday. Why does the law not take hold of them?

The question raised by the correspondent of the *Republican* is easily answered: the Sunday work of the Adventists is a protest against Sunday sacredness because it is coupled with Sabbath rest. Hence the offense to the moral sentiment of the community.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

READ the following and see if there is not some publication among them which you desire to read, or which will benefit some friend:—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street, New York City.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

History of the Doctrine of the Soul,

among all races and peoples, ancient and modern, including theologians, philosophers, scientists, and untutored aborigines, carefully brought down to the present time. 136 pp., 12mo., 75 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street New York City.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

BIBLES

WE have only a few **Genuine Oxford Teachers' Bibles** bound in fine brown levant morocco, divinity circuit, calf lined, silk sewed, round corners, gold edges. Size 5 x 7 3/4 inches.

Specimen of type.

An exhortation		DEUTERONOMY, XI.	to obedience.
Before CHRIST 1451.	CHAPTER XI.	14 That 'I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, ' the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil.	Before CHRIST 1451.
a ch. 10. 12. & 30. 16. 20. b Zech. 3. 7.	1 An exhortation to obedience, 2 by their own experience of God's great works, 8 by promises of God's great blessings, 15 and by threatenings, 18 a careful study is required in God's words, 28 The blessing and curse is set before them.	15 ' And I will ' send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full.	' Lev. 26. 4. ch. 28. 12. ' Joel 2. 23. Jan. 5. 7. ' Ps. 104. 14.
o ch. 8. 5.	THEREFORE thou shalt a love the LORD thy God, and b keep his charge, and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments, alway.	16 Take heed to yourselves, ' that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and ' serve other gods, and worship them;	' Heb. give. y ch. 6. 11. Joel 2. 19. ' ch. 29. 18. Job 31. 27. a ch. 8. 19. & 30. 17. b ch. 6. 15. ' 1 Kin. 8. 35.
d ch. 5. 22. e ch. 7. 19.	2 And know ye this day: for I speak not with your children which have not known, and which have not seen e the chastisement of the LORD your God, d his greatness, e his mighty hand, and his stretched out arm,	17 And then b the LORD's wrath be kindled against you, and he e shut up the heaven, that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit; and lest d ye perish quickly from off the	' 2 Chr. 6. 26. & 7. 13. d ch. 4. 26.
y Ps. 78. 12. & 135. 9.	3 ' And his miracles, and his acts, which he did in the midst of Egypt		

We will mark the name of any person designated by the purchasers upon the outside or inside of the cover, in gold letters, if it is desired, without extra charge, and send post-paid for \$5.85.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond St., New York City.



NEW YORK, MAY 16, 1895.

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

THE *Republican*, of Dayton, Tenn., says that a bill was introduced into the legislature of that State on the 27th ult., "to amend section 2289 of the Code so as to provide that persons observing Saturday as the Sabbath shall not be liable to penalty for working on Sunday." Such a bill would of course relieve the persecuted Adventists for the time being, were it to become a law; but it would not settle the principle at stake. Section 2289 of the Code of Tennessee ought to be repealed, as should every similar law in every State in the Union and of every country in the world. The whole principle of Sunday legislation is wrong.

HUNTINGTON, W. Va., a city of some ten thousand inhabitants, is agitated from center to circumference over the question of general Sunday closing, including the suspension of street car traffic. The mayor's orders to the chief of police were:—

You are, therefore, directed to order closed, on each and every Sunday after the first of May, all business houses of every description, including barber shops, public bath rooms, fruit stands, restaurants, all classes of confectionery stores, meat shops, newspaper offices, and soda water and ice cream parlors; to prohibit all labor (excepting cases of charity and absolute necessity), including delivery and sale of newspapers, and delivery of ice, milk and meat; to order closed all drug stores, except for the sole purpose of filling prescriptions duly issued by a licensed physician.

You are admonished to cause the carrying out of the foregoing instructions and all other ordinances, with justice to all and favors to no one.

Street cars are not specially mentioned in this order, but the company is being prosecuted for violation of the ordinance. Several smaller towns in the State are following the lead of Huntington, and the crusade promises to become general.

THAT we are living in an age of moral degeneracy was strikingly illustrated recently in the city of Brooklyn.

The bookkeeper of a wealthy club was found to be a defaulter to a large amount, and was criminally prosecuted.

A petition, signed by a large number of respectable persons, was presented to the trial-judge, praying for leniency for the embezzler. Among the reasons urged for clemency was this:—

He was surrounded by many temptations; he was actuated by a desire, so common in our modern life, to live on a scale equal to that of the gentlemen with whom he associated daily, and to raise and educate his children as did his neighbors.

The *Christian Advocate*, of this city, refers to the facts stated as "an illustration of the widespread decline of principle," and says:

"More sympathy is now shown for thieves and defaulters than admiration for simple, old-fashioned honesty."

The *Advocate's* remark is quite true, but is not that paper partly responsible for the moral degeneracy which substitutes custom for the moral law and places a higher value upon the applause of men than the favor of God? For instance, in the matter of Sunday-keeping, very many religious papers and ministers of the gospel acknowledge that they have no better authority for the observance of the first day of the week than custom. They would keep the day commanded by God, but by so doing they would lose caste and influence. Are not the cases, if not parallel, at least akin? The defaulter breaks the eighth commandment that he may appear well, while the others break the fourth commandment that they may stand well, be popular and avoid the self-denial incident to being out of joint with the practices of society at large. Is not the principle the same?

GEORGIA AT IT AGAIN.

A SPECIAL telegram announces that J. Q. Allison, a Seventh-day Adventist of Douglas County, Ga., has been arrested for working on Sunday. He is to be tried this week. Mr. Allison, if convicted, will, according to the Georgia statute, "be punished by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars, imprisonment not to exceed six months, to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or on such other works as the county authorities may employ the chain-gang, not to exceed twelve months, and any one or more of these punishments may be ordered in the discretion of the judge."

In case a fine is imposed, Section 4582 of the Georgia Code makes the following provisions for its disposal:—

All moneys arising from fines imposed for offenses, the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day, shall be paid to the ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed for the purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath-schools in the county.

In case the convicted party refuses to pay fines, or in case he is sentenced to the chain-gang, Section 4814 provides:—

In all cases where persons are convicted of misdemeanor, and sentenced to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or public roads, or when such persons are confined in jail for non-payment of fines imposed for such misdemeanor, the ordinary of the county, and where there is a board of commissioners of roads and revenues of the counties, then said board of commissioners, and in these counties where there is a county judge, then the said county judge, where such conviction was had, or where such convicts may be confined, may place such convicts, in the county or elsewhere, to work upon such public works of the county, in chain-gangs, or otherwise, or hire out such convicts, upon such terms and restrictions as may subserve the ends of justice, and place such convicts under such guards as may be necessary for their safe keeping.

In case of "insurrection" (which would doubtless include a refusal to work in the chain-gang on the Sabbath), Section 4821 provides:—

Whenever any convict or convicts now confined, or hereafter to be confined, in the penitentiary of this State, or member or members of the chain-gang now confined, or hereafter to be confined, in the penitentiary of this State, or wherever else employed as such, shall be guilty of insurrection or attempt at insurrection, such convict or convicts, or member or members of the chain-gang, shall, upon trial and conviction in the Supreme Court of the county in which the crime is committed, be deemed guilty of a capital offense, and punished with death, or such other punishment as the judge in his discretion may inflict.

Thus it appears that Mr. Allison is facing as a possibility, first, a thousand-dollar fine; second, six months' imprisonment; third, the chain-gang; fourth, all three combined; fifth, he faces the possibility of being sold to the highest bidder, to some contractor, and in either case whether in the chain-gang of the State or the private contractor, should he refuse to work on the Sabbath, as he surely would, he "may be punished with death"!

The State of Georgia is not in Russia; it is in the southeastern part of the United States, and professed Protestant churches are behind this barbarous Sunday law.

OF the Charlton Sunday bill, referred to by us last week, the *Toronto World*, of the 9th inst., says:—

At the evening session Charlton's Sabbath Observance bill was considered in committee and eventually a motion of Mr. W. F. Maclean's that the committee rise, was carried by 37 to 25. This for the present kills the bill, but Mr. Charlton will endeavor to get it restored to the order paper.

In the discussion of the bill, one member (Mr. Maclean) said, as reported in the *Toronto Daily Mail*, "The mover of the bill posed as an opponent to trade restriction, but wanted to restrict liberty of conscience. He would like to forge a yoke to place around the neck of the people."

Mr. Curran characterized the language of the section as vague and indefinite, and said endless litigation would result if it was adopted. The section exempted religious publications without affording any definition of what a religious publication was.

Mr. Amyot, the gentleman who so ably opposed a similar bill introduced by Mr. Charlton last year, thought that moral legislation of the character desired by the honorable gentleman was not within the sphere of the House. He also resented the arbitrary setting aside of the first day of the week by the honorable gentleman, when all creeds did not recognize it as the Sabbath day. And Mr. Amyot is right.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- -	90c
"	25 to 99	" " " " " "	- -	80c
"	100 to 249	" " " " " "	- -	75c
"	250 to 499	" " " " " "	- -	70c
"	500 to 999	" " " " " "	- -	65c
"	1000 or more	" " " " " "	- -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union.			- -	5 shilling.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

48 Bond Street, New York City.