



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT: FOR I CAME NOT TO JUDGE THE WORLD, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD."

Vol. 10. No. 33.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 22, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT IN NEW YORK.

If anything had been lacking to illustrate fully the absurdity of Sunday legislation, it would be supplied by current events in this city.

New York has a very voluminous Sunday law, comprising, all told, about 2,200 words, and the possibilities bound up in it are immense. The most recent addition to the Sunday Code of the State, is a section prohibiting barbering on Sunday, except in New York and Saratoga, and also in these cities after one o'clock, P. M., on that day.

Some of the decisions under the Sunday statute of the State are specially worthy of note in this connection.

In 1811, Judge Kent said that "the statute has, for over a century, recognized the sanctity and the obligation [of Sunday], and punished its violators." While in the case of *Campbell vs. International Society* (4 Bos., New York, 298), we are told that the statute "explicitly recognizes the first day of the week as holy time, and thus it has brought us back to the full and large and absolute rule of interdiction which we find provided in the earliest laws of Christian States, and which the construction of the statute of Charles II. has tended somewhat to narrow and impair." Again, in 12, New York, 455, the question is asked, "Is it not obvious that by reason of keeping a store open for business, a temptation is presented to those who have no regard for Sunday as holy time to violate the law?" Again, Judge Allen, of New York, held in 1861 that "the law of the State conforms to the law of God as that law is recognized by a great majority of the people."

These authorities might be multiplied, but they are sufficient to show the purpose and intent of the Sunday statutes of New York.

That they rest upon a distinctively religious basis, is beyond question; but that they utterly fail in this purpose is plainly shown by the manner of their application, as well as by the statutes themselves. The sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited in general, but is none the less carried on extensively by clubs for the use of members. Thus the law in effect permits the rich man to do on Sunday what it prohibits to the poor man. That this is any great deprivation to the poor man we do not believe, because we think that all are better off without intoxicating drinks; but we very much doubt the wisdom of giving free rein to the liquor traffic six days in the week and of limiting it to wealthy clubs upon Sunday. The only reasons for prohibition that the State ought to consider apply equally to every day; and that they are given weight only in behalf of one day, shows that the restriction is for the purpose of honoring Sunday rather than restricting the liquor traffic.

Shooting, hunting, trapping and fishing, are prohibited on Sunday, and this section has been so rigidly construed as to extend even to the taking of fish in private ponds. Such a regulation can have only one object, namely, the exaltation of the day because of its religious character.

Another section prohibits all labor on Sunday "except works of necessity or charity;" and "works of necessity and charity" are defined as including "whatever is needful during the day for the good order, health, or comfort of the community." It is also provided that "it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor upon the first day of the week, that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as holy time." This latter exemption serves to emphasize the religious character of the statute. All "public sports, exercises, pastimes or shows upon the first day of the week," are prohibited, but it has been held that "three men playing ball upon Sunday on private grounds" does not constitute a breach of the peace; and only a few months since Judge Gaynor, of Brooklyn, discharged a number of young men, arrested for playing ball on Sunday on a common in the city of Brooklyn, saying that it was no violation of the law.

Section 266 reads:—

All trades, manufacturers, agricultural or mechan-

ical employments upon the first day of the week are prohibited, except when the same are works of necessity they may be performed on that day in their usual and orderly manner, so as not to interfere with the repose and religious liberty of the community.

But the next section provides for the sale of articles of food at any time before 10 o'clock in the morning, and prepared tobacco, fruit, confectionery, newspapers, drugs, medicines, and surgical appliances at any other time of the day.

We have no fault to find with the sale of tobacco, fruit, and confectionery, newspapers, etc., on Sunday more than on other days; but viewed from the standpoint of various decisions that the purpose of the statute is to preserve the sanctity of the day, we can but wonder what kind of sanctity it is that can be preserved by a statute which prohibits all agricultural and mechanical employments, and at the same time permits the sale of tobacco, confectionery, etc.

Another feature which emphasizes the religious character of the Sunday statute of New York, is the prohibition of all parades and processions on Sunday, except funeral processions for the actual burial of the dead, and "processions to and from a place of worship in connection with a religious service there celebrated."

Another section prohibits theatricals, operas, etc. Doubtless it is this provision which has given rise to the so-called "sacred" concerts, wherein the livery of heaven is made to do service for the devil.

Some of the decisions under the New York Sunday statute are peculiar; for instance, "a contract for the hire of a horse to be used on Sunday for pleasure cannot be enforced;" but "an agreement to make an ascension in a balloon on Sunday from a public garden, is within the statute." Tobacco, fruit, etc., may be freely sold at any hour of the day, but it is a crime to sell a glass of soda-water, or a paper of pins.

According to this statute, which it has been judicially declared, "is in harmony with the religion of the country and the religious sentiment of the public," it is wrong to do barbering on Sunday in any place within the limits of New York State, except in the cities of New York and Saratoga, and even here it is right only until one o'clock in the afternoon. According to this "law" it is wrong for an

expressman or drayman to receive or convey or deliver goods on Sunday, but quite right for the railroad companies or steamboats to do the same thing. It is quite right for a man to stand upon the street selling cigars, but wrong for another man, or for anybody else, to sell a pair of shoe-strings either on the street or in a store.

But enough has been given to illustrate not only the absurdity but the immorality of the so-called Sunday laws. Their purpose is declared to be to "protect the sanctity of the sabbath;" but their effect is the very opposite or would be were there any sanctity attached to the day which they are intended to safeguard. Their effect is to turn away the minds of the people from the law of God and center it upon the "law" of the State. They in effect say that the law of God is defective; that its prohibitions are too broad and sweeping, and that it must be changed in order to meet the conditions of modern society. And instead of leaving it to the individual conscience, a thousand absurd and inconsistent prohibitions are adopted, arbitrarily prohibiting one thing and permitting something else, which is neither more necessary nor more moral; hence the conscience is seared as with a hot iron. The individual, instead of asking, "What does the law of God say?" inquires only, What does the law of the State say? and the conscience is eased in committing sin if the act done is within the statute. Thus men are taught to look not to the law of God as a moral standard, but to the "law" of the State; the result is that their morals are no more perfect than is the "law" by which they are regulated.

There has recently been an effort made in this city to enforce the Sunday statutes. This has been carried so far that some dealers have even been afraid to sell soda-water. Only a few weeks ago general notice was served throughout the city that all business must close. The manager of this office was notified to close up, which, however, he refused to do, and has not as yet been molested; but the end is not yet. Bigotry and fanaticism have not yet exhausted themselves; and the Sunday-law crusade has not run its course. Mayor Strong spent a recent Sunday at Asbury Park, N. J., and while there expressed his determination to enforce the "law," and made special mention of the Sunday statute, which he said would be rigidly enforced; hence interesting developments may be expected in New York City ere long. However, these things only serve to illustrate the absurdity and immorality of Sunday legislation.

WITHOUT EXCUSE.

THE *Tribune*, of Knoxville, Tenn., is published daily, including Sunday; yet, in its issue of August 7, it says:—

These thirty thousand Adventists want the statutory laws which meet the approval of some twenty millions of Christians in this country changed to suit their views, or amended as to give them the privilege of disregarding Sunday while denying the privilege to all who do not believe as they do. The law compels nobody to observe Sunday religiously. It makes it a legal day of rest, and enables the moral and religious element to devote the day to worship or religious observance undisturbed.

We suppose that even the *Tribune* cannot be held responsible for what it does not know, as it would be unfair to so hopelessly load down even a newspaper; but there is no reason why it should not have known that Adventists do not ask "the privilege of disregarding Sunday while denying the privilege to all who do not believe as they do."

In a memorial presented to the legislature of Tennessee last April, the Adventists plainly

said: "We do not ask simply for a clause exempting us from the penalties of the law, but for the repeal of the law; because to ask simply an exemption would be to admit the right of the State to legislate upon such questions, and consent that the legislature might properly require of others that which we are not willing it should exact from us."

This thing was not done in a corner, and the *Tribune* ought to have known the facts before trying to state them.

The *Tribune* continues:—

The law provides the largest religious freedom consistent with common sense and good government; it cannot undertake to adjust itself to exactly suit the views of the Adventists whose peculiar ideas lead them into deliberate violation of the law.

Then why does not the *Tribune* obey the "law"? If the "law" is so good and so just, what possible excuse can the publishers of a newspaper have for violating it, as is done in the *Tribune* office fifty-two weeks every year? Or are we to understand that it is all right to violate the Sunday "law" for gain, but wrong to violate it for conscience' sake?

But the *Tribune* says that "the Adventist is not compelled to labor on Sunday; he is not compelled to observe it in a religious manner; it does not force him to observe Saturday as a religious day; he can devote any day in the week he chooses to religious observance or worship, and so can anybody else. Sunday is the accepted sabbath of this country, and the law protects it as a day of rest."

Again, the *Tribune* is discussing questions about which it knows nothing. The Adventist is compelled by the law of the Sabbath to labor on Sunday, for only by habitually treating it as a common day can he obey the fourth commandment. But in view of the utterances quoted, what possible excuse can the *Tribune* have for violating the Sunday statute of the State of Tennessee?

THE MAN-MADE SABBATH.

THE weakness and imperfection of human handiwork are often apparent enough in mundane things, but in the man-made sabbath they attain to such surpassing proportions as to eclipse all else. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, the Sabbath being a thing that is divine?

The man-made sabbath is the Sunday. This institution must be upheld by force, or it will fall to the ground. But force does not commend itself in such a thing to the upright person. Force is for the wicked, not for the good.

It cannot be upheld without force, and it cannot be enforced without working hardship to innocent people. But a sabbath that works hardship upon people, works exactly contrary to the divine purpose of the Sabbath, which is to do people good and not to injure them. Human wisdom and discretion must direct the enforcement of the human sabbath, and these qualities, finite in themselves and often coupled with and controlled by a blind zeal, make it inevitable that the enforcement of the man-made sabbath should often be attended by injustice. Along with the poisonous liquor which should not be drunk on any day, the Sunday law is quite liable in many instances to shut away from poor people some of the necessities of life. Cases illustrating this have been evolved from the effort now in progress to enforce the Sunday law in this city. And still greater is the hardship which it brings upon those who, in obedience to God's command, observe the seventh day,—subjecting them to persecution and imprisonment, to say nothing of the financial loss which would result to them from Sunday idleness.

Contrast with this man-made sabbath, the

divine institution, "the Sabbath of the Lord," that was made by Him who is infinite, who created man and sustains and ministers to him in all the needs of his human nature, even numbering the hairs of his head. At the close of creation, God rested on the seventh day and blessed that day, that it might be a blessing to mankind. He made it a day of delight to all who observe it, without a single exception. Upon this point he says, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. 58:13, 14. Here is delight in its highest and most elevating form, and this delight God pledges to every observer of his holy day. There is no hardship in the Sabbath of the Lord, but only blessing; for it brings each individual into communion with Him who is infinite in goodness, in wisdom and in power.

God's Sabbath was made for man. Mark 2:27. This the Saviour said when he rebuked the Pharisees who found fault with his disciples because they plucked and ate the grain as they were passing through the fields on the Sabbath day. The Pharisees had made a sabbath which was against man, by perverting the divine institution to an agreement with their own human ideas, and loading it with man-made restrictions, by which a person would be compelled to go hungry on the Sabbath if the least work, such, for example, as that done by the disciples, were involved in the preparation of his food. To keep the Sabbath as they had made it by their traditions, was an intolerable burden, a mere exhibition of a person's powers of endurance. Parallel with this "Jewish Sabbath," and partaking of the same nature, was the Puritan Sunday, with its austere regulations for the department of old and young. This was against man, both in the day which it required to be observed, and in the manner of its observance. God has blessed only the seventh day, and only that day can bring the Sabbath blessing to mankind. Man cannot bless a day or make it holy or cause it to be a blessing and a delight to those who observe it. This can be done only by the power of God.

But while the seventh day has been made a day of special blessing and delight by the act of God, and while he has both the power and the wisdom that enable him to deal impartially with every person, he does not force his Sabbath upon any. He sets it before men and invites them to receive it as a blessing from him, but leaves all free to choose whether they will do so or not. It is left for the man-made sabbath to be thrust upon people by force. Having neither the power nor the wisdom nor the Word of God to give it force, its dependence is only human precepts, human example and enactments. And as human precept and example are found insufficient to give it respect and stability among men, the highest power of man is invoked in its support, which is the power of law. But human law cannot change the heart, or touch the hidden springs of love and free will which must be called into action in true Sabbath keeping, as set forth in the Word of God.

This completes the picture of human folly which is being exhibited before the world by the misguided people who are working to force Sunday keeping upon their fellowmen by law. Sabbath making and Sabbath enforcing are things altogether beyond the finite wisdom

and power of man. Meanwhile the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, blessed and sanctified by Him and perfectly adapted to our human needs,—remains for all mankind, a day of blessing and delight to all who choose its observance, and a sign of their vital connection with the one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN CANADA.

Darrell, Ont., Aug. 14, 1895.

AMERICAN SENTINEL: On August 7, John Mathews, of Selton, Ontario, a Seventh-day Adventist, was summoned to appear before Magistrate Watson, of Ridgetown, Ontario, at 2:30 P. M., Aug. 10, 1895, to answer for the crime of cutting hay on the 7th of July, A. D. 1895, and building a fence, etc., on the 4th of August, A. D. 1895.

As the 10th of August would occur on the Sabbath day, Mr. Mathews left his work on the farm, five miles from Ridgetown, and visited the magistrate. He declined to appear on that day as it would be an open violation of the fourth commandment. It was arranged that he should appear on the 12th of August. Nevertheless the case was called Saturday afternoon, with two justices on the bench, and John Mathews' name was called twice. He was at that hour engaged in worship with others of like faith, some twenty miles from Ridgetown. The justice then issued a warrant with instruction to bring him by force to court on Tuesday, the 13th of August, at 2 o'clock, P. M.

When the case was called yesterday, the crowd was so great that the magistrate's office was too small, and the court adjourned to the old township hall. The large room was soon filled, and great interest was taken in everything said and done during the trial.

Four witnesses were called. One swore that he was not nearer to Mr. Mathews than forty or fifty rods, still he could see him plain enough. He also swore that he stood at his gate at sundown and saw Mr. Mathews raking hay. This gate is over sixty rods from the said field, and between is a thick grove of maples. He felt disturbed, too. Mr. Mathews was called, and here I give his testimony just as it was taken down in the court records:—

I am the defendant. I am a farmer. I was summoned the 7th of August. I am under arrest at the present time. I am charged with working on the Lord's day, July 7, 1895. I kept the day before, July 6, for the Lord's day, and on July 7, I was engaged in farm work. That was the first day of the week. That was not the Lord's day. Saturday comes on the Lord's day.

How do you know that?

I know that by the old family Bible.

Here the Bible, a large book, was produced and admitted as evidence. The question was referred to Elder A. O. Burrill and he was told that if he wished he could make a plea in its defense. The prosecuting lawyer kept objecting to any Bible proof. He said, "Let the statute settle which is the Lord's day."

Mr. Mathews answered again:—

The reason I did not appear on the summons, it was the Sabbath day.

I was cutting hay on July 7, 1895, also raked hay on that day. I am not in partnership with Mr. Watt. I am hired by the year to Mr. Watt—rate, \$180; began working for him the 12th of September, 1894. This was a part of the work I was hired to do. I believe it would be wrong to work on Saturday, because the Bible tells us to keep it holy. I am a farmer; I work for my living.

(Signed)

JOHN MATHEWS.

The case closed here. Mr. Watt objected to a conviction, on the ground that Mr. Mathews' act was not prohibited by the statute.

Elder Burrill then made a strong plea for

the truth. As he closed his argument with an exhortation to the court to consider well what it was doing; that they were called upon to-day to do the same work as the rulers were in the days of our Saviour; that a sentence of conviction would be convicting anew the Lord Jesus, the silence in the large hall was almost painful. We knew that the truth had scored a great victory in Ontario.

Justice Watson was greatly perplexed, but he had associated with him another magistrate, who was satisfied that the law should be enforced. They both were exceedingly kind and considerate, and we believe made their decision as they thought according to the civil statute.

Judgment as follows:—

Fine, \$5; constable's fee, \$5; witnesses' fees, \$8; justice's fee, \$2.65; total, \$20.65. to be paid in ten days, or confinement in county jail at Chatham thirty days.

Mr. Mathews immediately refused to pay the fine, and told them that they might as well take him to jail. The court said, "No; you have ten days, then they will be after you." So we have one of our brethren, charged with a crime, taken by criminal warrant, tried by a criminal court and condemned to prison, left free for ten days to go where he chooses, and his prosecutors—persecutors—entertaining no fear but that he will be at his place of work ready to be offered when the tenth day comes.

May God awaken the liberty-loving people of Ontario to a sense of the dangerous work they are just entering upon, and save this goodly land and its citizens from the disgrace and ignomy that now hangs like a pall over Tennessee and other States of that mighty Union.

P. M. HOWE.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

BY H. E. GIDDINGS.

THIS is the theme of the hour, because, to use the language of the movement itself, "Its officers and workers include representatives of all the churches and young people's societies," and plans were laid to have over one hundred thousand lectures delivered June 30, setting forth the objects of the "Christian Citizenship League," and exhorting all good people to enlist under its banner.

Christian Citizenship is clearly defined in its own literature which is sent out freely to all ministers and workers.

The president of the league, E. D. Wheelock, 153 La Salle Street, Chicago, says in the *New Revival*:—

The first league was organized in March, 1894. It has since been incorporated as a National League, and has organized auxiliary leagues in other cities in Illinois and other States.

The widespread interest in the work has made necessary the publication of an organ, the *Christian Citizen*, which includes among its editors and contributors, Dr. Carlos Martyn, Francis E. Willard, L. L. D., Rev. Chas. H. Parkhurst, D. D., and Prof. Graham Taylor.

With a league in every county or city in the Union, every public evil can be overthrown. The cooperation of all Christian people is invoked to this end.

"Christian" is a title which belongs to the follower of Christ, and signifies that he is like Christ. The association of such individuals forms the church. The work of the church is to enlighten the world.

Its mission, in the words of Christ, is, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Its field of operation is the moral and intelligent nature of man. "Come now, and let us reason together," "though your sins be as

scarlet, they shall be as white as snow." "If ye be willing and obedient."

The weapons of its warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. The sword of the Spirit, the Word of God.

Its power is that Holy Spirit of promise, to guide into all truth. "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him."

Its methods moral suasion. "Knowing the terror of the Lord we persuade men."

The mission of the State is to maintain civil order in society. "That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life."

The field in which the State has a right to operate is the relations between man and man, or the interests of the masses in common.

Its power is by human consent. As stated in the Declaration of Independence, governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The proper methods are the sword and musket. "He beareth not the sword in vain." "He is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

With such vastly different missions and widely diverging fields of operation, how can the elements of the Church and State, religion and civil power, or Christianity and civil citizenship, be blended to work in harmony to a common end?

Here we have a plan given which is neither new or novel.

"Christian Citizenship" has a special message to Christian men, and calls upon them to put their loyalty to Jesus Christ into their politics, to serve him at the caucus and primaries, and vote as he would have them vote.

"It maintains that to promote righteousness and justice is the duty of every official, from the President down, and that not one of them has any right to do anything which Jesus Christ would not do in his place."

"The Church manifestly should not, as an organization, go into politics, but the righteousness taught by the church should reach to the caucus, primary, city hall, state house and capitol."

"Neither the Church or young people's societies can, in their organized capacities, take political action; but every member of every church and society should be so well informed concerning public questions as to enable him intelligently and persistently to oppose corrupt political rule. In these days, ignorance is a disgrace and apathy is treason."

—*Christian Citizenship Literature, New Revival, and Document No. 10.*

"It is not an attempt to bring the Church into politics, or to combine Church and State." —*Document No. 10.*

"The Christian Citizenship League," of Chicago, was favored, on May 26, by a speech from Joseph Cook, of Boston, which it warmly indorsed by its official organ, *The Christian Citizen*, of June, 1895.

Mr. Cook said: "The power to dominate American politics lies in the hands of the five million American Christian voters, and that with the power is the equal responsibility." By indorsement this is Christian Citizenship literature. These utterances briefly stated amount to this.

The league does not believe in a union of Church and State, and the Church has no right as such to enter politics. But every member of each church and young people's religious society should be informed in the public evils of the State, and the righteousness taught by the Church, that they can become active in the political field purifying the State by infusing the righteousness of the Church through caucus and poles to city hall, state house and capitol. That the Church, with its five million voters, holds the power to

dominate or rule American politics, and with the power is the responsibility to use it. In other words, the religious people are able to control the politics of this country according to the righteousness taught by the Church and as members of churches and religious societies it is their duty to learn the right thing at the Church, and then as dutiful citizens (not as church members) they must enter the caucus, primary, city hall and capitol, and see that it (the righteousness of the Church) is acted out in every avenue of State affairs.

The subtle danger in this movement lies in its generous profession and the credulity with which its sophism is received.

Its inexcusable wickedness is found in its assertion that it is not a union of Church and State. While it is planning in every proposition for the most gigantic and absolute union of Church and State that could be conceived in the mind of the most intolerant bigot.

Its generous profession that it is in favor of all good and no evil is deceptive in that it is not satisfied, like Jesus, the author of Christianity and the head of the Church, to live out right principles and teach them in love by doing good to all; but the modern idea of self-constituted guardianship proposes to take civil power to compel others to do right (their kind of right) which is much easier for the carnal mind than to do good itself.

The people seeing so much evil in the land and with a longing desire to see it eradicated seize with avidity upon anything that has in it even a promise of better things, without questioning the sincerity of the champion or the logical results of his plan.

This movement is wicked in falsely denying that it is a union of Church and State. Notice that every great national act, whether it be of origin or reform, is first born in the mind of some individual. It is then advocated until sufficient numbers form the same conception, to enable them to carry it out in legal form.

Now when an idea is formed in the minds of men that it is incumbent upon the Church to purify politics by putting the righteousness of the Church into every office of the State in the form of church saints for officers, and when every member of every church sees it this way, and they are strong enough to rule the State, or as Joseph Cook said, "dominate American politics," and having the power they feel responsible for its exercise; what more would it take to form a union of Church and State?

When the State is officered by the Church and its power lies in the hands of religious voters who receive their instruction at the Church as to the righteousness which should be infused into the caucus voted for at the poles legalized in the State House and executed at the Capitol, how much more would it take to put the Church power in a position to "dominate"?

From this standpoint, based upon their own utterances, we can see how subtly-wicked and dangerous this movement is.

To say that they do not want to unite Church and State, but simply want to organize in such a way as to at once put the Church in a position to dominate State affairs, is to deny in profession the object in view.

In the days of papal supremacy the State was officered by the Church, and the power to dominate politics was in the hands of the religious just exactly as this league proposes, and the State executed the enemies of the Church.

This league, as if purposely to fulfill Rev. 13: 14, 15, by deceiving the people, is leading them to make an image to the papal theo-

racy. Beware of the snare. We are living in the days of that very thing, and its doom is given in Rev. 14: 9, 10.

July 30, 1895.

A KNOXVILLE ATTORNEY DEFENDS THE ADVENTISTS.

THE *Knoxville* (Tenn.) *Tribune* of the 7th inst., had a rather supercilious, but very shallow, editorial criticism of Seventh-day Adventists, their doctrines and practices, to which an attorney of that city replies in the *Tribune* of the 11th inst., as follows:—

Law and Religious Freedom.

To the Editor of the *Tribune*:

Your editorial on "Peculiar People" in your issue of Wednesday, the 7th inst., gives rise to three important questions:

First. Does the Sunday law provide for a "legal rest day" for civil purposes merely? The only way we may answer that is to try to ascertain the intention of the framers, both from the object of its passage, as may be shown in its recitals, and from the acts and the reasons therefor it purports to regulate. The recital in the act of 1741 which has been codified says: "That all and every person and persons whomsoever shall on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety." When the act was carried in the old code, the recital above quoted was omitted, the penal part of the language is about the same, with a few verbal alterations. It cannot be denied that the object of the act was to prohibit labor upon Sunday so that all might apply themselves on that day faithfully to religion and piety. The law did not and the law does not, as modified in the code, compel people to worship on that day, but it does say emphatically what day shall be set apart for everybody, irrespective of their belief, for religious purposes. It does not say, "You shall worship," but it does say, "You shall not work on that day." Why? Because as you have truly put it, "Sunday is the accepted sabbath of the country;" that is, the day for rest that the majority believe in. Does the majority believe in that day from a civil standpoint or from a religious? If from a religious view, have the majority the right to impose their matters of conscience upon the few because they are the stronger? Does might make right?

There is no use in saying the law is a mere civil regulation. It is true the acts it prohibits may be denominated civil, but the reason for which those acts are inhibited is religious. The court in construing this law says it "was to further the observance of the sabbath according to the spirit of its original institution." We all know the Sabbath was instituted for religious purposes; it gets its being from faith. It was set apart by the State because the framers of that law believed Sunday to be the particular day divinely appointed for rest. Though the law may regulate our conduct can it be gainsaid that it was enacted for the furtherance of and is founded upon religion?

Second. If founded upon religion is it right for the majority to be conscience for the minority? Let us be retrospective. Protestants have figured out the Latin Kingdom or Pagan Rome to be the numbered "beast" of Revelation, upon whose head the angels are directed to pour out the wrath of God without mixture. You know Pagan Rome's popular maxim was *Vox populi vox dei*. Rome presumed by her laws to provide for polytheism, her State religion (sic), "the largest religious freedom [for her subjects] consistent with

common sense and good government." Everybody had all the religious freedom wanted till the followers of the humble Nazarene got to teaching in the name of "a certain man called Jesus." Then is when persecution began. Why? Because that was not in harmony with the State law. Their theory was that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." And if the majority had the right in their republic to say what gods should be worshiped, the State was not going to "undertake to adjust itself to exactly suit the views" of the travel-stained, humble, "fanatical" disciples, "whose peculiar ideas led them into deliberate violation of the law." Fanaticism is the most common application to any faith counter to our own because it does violence to our order of thinking. It is for that very reason religion and all its ordinances should be confined to its own church. The majority in Rome said what gods all should worship; the majority in Tennessee say what day all shall observe as holy time, or for religious purposes. The principle in the two republics is the same.

The same popular maxim was crystallized in papal Rome when the ecclesiastical and civil powers were united. The Protestants see in this unholy union the beast with the lamb-like appearance, and they heard its dragon-like voice in the days of the Inquisition. Then the church was at the head of the State in all matters of religion; now, the church tells the State which is the day we should keep holy or observe for religious purposes. Is not the principle the same? Observe the differences of faith respecting the day in which we should rest. The Catholics observe Sunday because they believe their church changed the day by virtue of its divinely-delegated power. The majority of the Protestants observe Sunday in honor of the resurrection of Christ. The Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists contend that the rest-day has never been changed, and hence they keep Saturday, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

On this point, the editor of the *New Orleans Times-Democrat* says: "On the one side is the express command of Jehovah to keep the seventh day holy; and opposed to it is the injunction of secular legislatures to keep the first day holy. That is the difficulty in which Seventh-day Adventists find themselves, and as we said, they obey the voice of God rather than the voice of man. In this age of boasted civilization they are punished for acting up to their religious convictions." Is it not strange that after the gospel has been proclaimed for over eighteen hundred years that the most "fanatical" thing that a man can do is to obey the commandment of God?

Third. The act says: "If any merchant, artificer, tradesman, farmer, or other person, shall be guilty of doing or exercising any of the common avocations of life," etc. Don't you think this law is broad enough, if impartially enforced, to stop the running of steam and surface railways, milk and ice wagons, and even the printing of Sunday newspapers?

The "howl of 'persecution' and 'tyranny'" smacks very strong of that flavor when evidenced by the fact, as noticed by the *Sentinel*, of Knoxville, of the partial enforcement of the Sunday laws against Seventh-day Adventists, and when one of that faith who is now in the chain-gang in Tennessee for working on Sunday, stated to the jury that before he accepted the Advent faith he used to work every Sunday in the Dayton Iron Mills, walking through the city in his working clothes, unmolested by the law, and without disturbing the religious quietude of Sunday keepers.

CYRUS SIMMONS.

WILL THERE BE CIVIL WAR IN CANADA?

[From the New York Sun, August 12.]

SOME articles lately published in newspapers regarded as the organs of the party in power in Manitoba, indicate that the province will persist in its refusal so to modify the school laws as to give Catholics part of the education fund. Moreover, the Dominion Government is invited to explain how it expects to enforce the threatened remedial measures should it venture to enact them at the next session of the Ottawa Parliament. That is to say, the party dominant in Manitoba avows its resolve to repudiate the British North America act, as the charter of Canadian Confederation is called, and this can only mean that if an attempt at coercion is made, an appeal for protection to the United States will follow.

It is, of course, possible for the lieutenant-governor of Manitoba, acting under instructions from the governor-general of the Dominion, to dismiss his present ministers and form a cabinet pledged to introduce a bill restoring to Catholics the privileges formerly enjoyed by them in the matter of education. But no such bill would be passed by the present provincial legislature, nor is there any reason to suppose, in view of the great preponderance of the Protestants among the electors, that a new legislature would evince a more tractable spirit. Sooner or later, therefore, the Tories, now in power at Ottawa, will have to keep the promise which they lately made to their Catholic supporters in Quebec, and carry through the Dominion Parliament remedial measures intended to supersede and override the will of the Manitoba legislature. The Tories will also have to provide for the execution of such measures by the coercive powers of the central government.

It is nothing short, then, of civil war which seems likely to be the outcome of the education crisis in Canada. In the threatened collision, however, between Federal and provincial interests the conditions will be very different from those under which the Riel rebellion took place. Then the central power, in its determination to discipline the French Catholics of Manitoba, had the ardent support of the Protestants of Ontario, while arrayed no less zealously against it were the sympathies of the Catholic population of Quebec. Now it is the Catholics of Quebec who call upon the Dominion Government to see to it that their co-religionists in Manitoba are not deprived of the rights guaranteed to them by the Manitoba act under which the province was constituted a part of the Dominion in 1870. That act, repeating a provision of the British North America act, declared that the provincial legislature should make no laws "prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the time of the union." Now, at that time the Catholics and Protestants in Manitoba were nearly equal in point of numbers, and the first education act passed by the provincial legislature gave, conformably to the previous practice, to each religious community complete control of its own schools, with an equal share in all money voted for primary education. This state of things lasted for some twenty years; but in 1890 the Protestants, who had come to constitute a great majority of the population, passed a law making all public schools non-sectarian, and, while compelling Catholics to contribute to the school fund, refusing to appropriate any part of it for Catholic educational establishments. This law was declared unconstitutional by the governor-general of the Dominion in council, and upon appeal to the imperial

privy council the decision was confirmed. One of the most embarrassing questions which will confront Mr. Chamberlain, in his post of secretary for the colonies, will be whether, seeing that the Protestants of Manitoba refuse to obey the mandate of the imperial privy council, he will authorize the Dominion Government to resort to military force for the purpose of executing measures designed to reinstate the Catholics of Manitoba in their legal rights with regard to school money.

Although the Catholics have law upon their side, it will be hard for Mr. Chamberlain, who is a nonconformist, to authorize the use of force to compel the appropriation of public money in Manitoba to denominational schools. It is even possible that the Tory Government at Ottawa will not ask him for such authorization; for the Orangemen of Ontario have given the ministers warning that they will enter on the path of coercion at their peril. The warning caused the Dominion Government to postpone definite action for six months; but this sign of hesitation gave such umbrage to their Quebec supporters that a crisis was only averted by an explicit pledge that, should the Manitobans in the interim fail to give the Catholics their rights, the necessary remedial measures should be introduced in the Ottawa House of Commons not later than next January.

The dilemma, then, in which the Canadian Tories find themselves is this: If they make up their minds to enforce the constitution of the Dominion they will provoke civil war in Manitoba, and will cause the Protestants, who constitute a great majority in Ontario, to regard with detestation the scheme of Federal union contrived by Sir John Macdonald. If, on the other hand, the Dominion Government shall decline or delay to employ force for the coercion of Manitoba, the Catholic masters of the province of Quebec will have a strong motive for seceding from a confederation in which their co-religionists are deprived of their legal rights.

A MAN-INVENTED CHURCH FESTIVAL.

[From the New York Daily News, July 17.]

THE penal code, in the sections quoted by Judge McAdam in his recent decision, uses the word "sabbath," for the first time, we believe, in the legislation of this State. Other enactments, for instance, the Revised Statutes, have spoken of "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," as the period set apart for abstention from labor. We think this change of designations, made by the code, is unfortunate and incorrect, not only because introducing confusion into our law, but as wrongly describing the space of time intended.

The "Sabbath" is the Hebrew word which the Bible uses for the last day of the week. "The seventh day is the Sabbath," say the ten commandments, which were dictated to Moses on Mount Sinai, and Saturday has been accordingly ever since observed by the Jewish people all over the world. The Emperor Constantine, though still a pagan, devoted the first day of the week to Christian observance, and the popes recommended Sunday and the general accord of Christendom established Sunday—the day of the resurrection—as one upon which pious ceremonies and invocations should be invariably used. But neither Constantine nor the papal authority ever presumed to authoritatively declare Sunday to be a sabbath, and the term "Christian sabbath" is applied to it merely by usage and not by any divine direction. The Christian sabbath is therefore not the Sabbath as proclaimed by the Jewish Scriptures, and by the law given

to Moses on the Mount, for the Bible nowhere stamps it as sacred or applies it to the commands and prohibitions that belong to the Sabbath the Bible established. It is a man-invented, not a God-proclaimed church festival.

SUNDAY HYPOCRISY.

[From the Truth Seeker, August 10.]

OH, the hypocrisy of this Sunday business! On July 14th the old cup-defender, the *Vigilant*, and the new one, the *Defender*, tested their relative merits over the course at Newport. Says the report of the New York *Press*:—

As it was Sunday, the race was not called a race, but merely a friendly sail. It was a race, nevertheless, and decided just what everybody wanted to know—if the *Defender* was a faster boat than the improved *Vigilant*.

Could anything imaginable be more childish and pueril? This pretense is akin to that which disgraces Congress—if it does—when the hands of the clock are turned back if a session holds over into Sunday, and the journal is made to read as the record of the proceedings of Saturday. Will we ever, here in the United States, get out of our swaddling-clothes?

FROM THE CHAIN-GANG.

THE authorities of Rhea County, Tenn., have moved the chain-gang from the northern part of the county to the vicinity of Graysville, the home of the persecuted Adventists. The following extract from a letter written under date of August 13, by one of these criminals(?) will be of interest:—

We are located in an old two-story log house about one and a half miles north of Graysville. The house has been ceiled and weather-boarded in bygone days. All the windows have iron bars bolted across them. I slept last night behind the bars, but the door was open and the guard on the porch.

We went to work on the road about one and a half miles north of Graysville, digging up trees and making the roads wider. Wright Rains and B. F. Bowers have jobs driving teams on the road. Martins furnishes teams. All are prominent persecutors of the Adventists. But I think what little pay they get out of it and the satisfaction of seeing us at work on the roads is all the good they will ever get out of it unless they become as Paul.

The Graysville brethren and sisters came out to see us at work this afternoon.

We don't think now that any of us will ever work again in the chain-gang. None of us are sorry that we have worked, but I think in the future we will let them do what they will with us, but we will not work, should we be again prosecuted for exercising our God-given rights. If we leave it in the hands of the Lord it will all come out right in the end.

We are all well, healthy and happy. The sun has been extremely hot to-day. One big mulatto got so hot this afternoon he had to stop work, but none of us has done that yet.

They furnish us plenty to eat now, and as Brother Morgan is cook, it is well prepared. My time should be out in a week from to-day. I must close as it is dark, and workhouse is out of lamp oil.

THE LAW OF EQUALITY.

[From the New York World, August 12.]

THE law of equality is the foundation of the law of liberty. It is solely because men are "created equal" that they have an "unalienable right" to liberty.

If men were not created equal then one man or some men would have the right to rule others, to dominate their wills, to control their conduct, to direct their consciences. Every instinct of the American people denies the existence of such a right anywhere on earth.

Our system of government rests solely upon

the doctrine of an absolutely equal humanity. Its first and fundamental proposition of "self-evident" truth is that "all men are created equal." It is as a corollary from this that the Declaration asserts that men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," and that "among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The entire history of humanity's struggle for freedom has been a record of the assertion of equal rights. That history is not yet complete. The struggle for liberty is not yet done. The actual as well as the theoretical equality of citizens is not yet fully recognized in our practice or completely guarded in our laws. All that was once claimed for despots as "divine right" is still claimed for majorities under the name of law.

SOUTH AFRICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

BY G. B. THOMPSON.

THE agitation for Sunday laws increases. Like the pestilence that walks in darkness it moves on disguised and spreads its contagion everywhere. Religious bodies meet frequently and rarely adjourn without discussing what can be done to prop up Sunday. Their clamor for more laws knows no satisfaction so long as it is possible for the people to find anything else to employ their time other than attending church and listening to a dry sermon on Sunday.

In the South African Republic, the synod of the Dutch Reformed Church has recently had a sitting, and wrestled with the Sunday desecration problem. They memorialized the government, praying for such legislation as will put an everlasting quietus on all Sunday races, gambling, and work in the mines. Also that the government regulate the postal and telegraph business a little more in harmony with the supposed sanctity of the day. No protest being heard from these spiritual guides concerning gambling, horse-races, etc., on other days, and no demand being made for a law prohibiting them, we are left to conclude that they are not opposed to their running in full blast six days, so they stop on Sunday. But if held on Sunday, the people (and some are professed Christians, too) congregate to the horse-race more than to church. This causes many empty pews, and a corresponding shrinkage in the contents of the ubiquitous contribution plate.

This shortage in the church's exchequer, makes the sin of Sunday horse-racing exceedingly aggravating. One Transvaal clergyman is reported to have said that he saw no harm in an individual attending a "skirt dance" on Sunday, provided that he did not neglect any religious duties to do so. That is the point exactly; it is the formal religious observance of Sunday that is the object of all Sunday laws.

The Colonial Parliament is now in session in Cape Town. The members of that body had scarcely gotten into their seats before the demand for a more strict Sunday law began. And as usual the prime movers in the agitation are religious leaders. About the only thing that the Sunday law of the colony does not prohibit, is the holding of so-called "sacred concerts" on Sunday. Some have been recently held, with a good attendance. Some claim that nude pictures were shown. Perhaps so. But is a nude picture any worse to look at on Sunday than on Monday? And if it is the obscene pictures that they are seeking to prohibit, why do they ask for a law prohibiting them only on Sunday? Is not this sanctioning them six days in the week? It certainly

is, and shows that all the stir is being made to exalt Sunday, and that the hubbub about the immoral concerts is only a lambskin to cover the gaunt-wolf of religious legislation.

The present agitation began in the Young Men's Christian Association, and finally crystallized into a deputation of clergymen calling on the premier and the treasurer-general, and asking for the introduction into Parliament of a bill prohibiting all sacred concerts on Sunday. The dean of Cape Town, Rev. Steyyler, of the Dutch Reformed Church, and the president of the Y. M. C. A., addressed the ministry. They thanked the Lord for the English sabbath, and argued, among other things, that *vox populi is vox Dei*. The reverend gentleman, no doubt, meant that the voice of the majority—"we"—is the voice of the Deity. "No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you." Job 12:2.

The premier and the treasurer-general both replied to the deputation, promising them such a bill as they had asked for. The deputation then withdrew.

While they are thus seeking to suppress immorality by law, meetings are being held in different parts of the colony to protest against what they term an "iniquitous impost" being placed on breadstuffs, while Cape brandy is free from excise. One speaker claimed that bread was now dearer in the colony than any other place in the world, while brandy was cheaper.

If there is any other wonderful thing beside those enumerated by the wise man in Proverbs, it is the ways of a government that seeks to make men moral by law.

Grahamstown, S. Africa,
July 17, 1895.

MORE PRESS COMMENTS CONCERNING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN TENNESSEE.

Worthy a Torquemada.

[From the *Manayunk (Pa.) Sentinel*, July 25.]

WE have received a copy of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, published at 43 Bond street, New York City, containing a marked notice stating that the eight Seventh-day Adventists who were arrested in Tennessee, for working on Sunday, have been sentenced to ninety days' imprisonment and work in the chain-gang.

There is no use in making a howl over this matter. If the law says that work must not be done on the Sabbath, the law should be upheld and violators subjected to the full penalty.

It is too late a day for cranks to control this country, and the sooner they become aware of that fact and take their departure to other climes, the better for all concerned.

It Is Persecution.

[From the *Daily Progress, Harriman, Tenn.*, July 28.]

THE action of the prosecutors against the Seventh-day Adventists savors as much of persecution as did the action of the old Puritans of New England, and unless history fails to repeat itself, as has never yet been the case, the reaction will be just as decided, and go just as far to the opposite extreme. Every faith prospers under persecution, and no more certain plan can be devised to make any movement successful than by a most persistent and actively intolerant opposition.

The Church of Rome had too firmly established Sunday as a day of rest, for the Reformers to attempt to change it, and the Christian world have gone on in following the error of the Romish Church for three hundred

years. The position of the Seventh-day Adventists is impregnable in the light of sacred history. There is no excuse for violating the command of God to keep the Sabbath holy, and the penalty for such violation, as stated by God himself, is death! The idea advanced . . . that you may begin with any day you please, and keep holy the seventh day after that beginning, is too absurd for argument.

"Persecution of the Worst Sort."

[From the *Roseland (La.) Herald*, July 12.]

"Is it persecution?" We say it is persecution of the worst sort. Seventh-day Adventists are arrested for cutting wood or weeding in their gardens; while coal mines, factories, railroads, etc., are not molested. A short time ago a Seventh-day Adventist, in Tennessee, was arrested for working in his garden on Sunday, and the man who swore out the warrant for his arrest was driving home a cow he had bought when he was "scandalized" by seeing his neighbor working. "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel!"

No Defense For It.

[From the *Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin*, July 27.]

SEVERAL of the Southern States in the name of law are imprisoning and persecuting the Seventh-day Baptists [Adventists] with a persistence worthy the bigots of other days. One of these religionists is now in jail at Centerville, Md., because he planted some flowers in his own garden on a Sunday morning; and during this month twelve citizens of Tennessee have been tried for the same offense, or something equally harmless, and sent to jail.

There is no defense for such conduct on the part of professed Christians of other faiths. It was the mission of the Saviour through love to draw all men unto himself. He said: "Resist not evil. . . . Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them which spitefully use you, and persecute you." It is not the Christlike who seek to antagonize men in his name instead of uniting them in love to God—it is not true religion that excites these bitter and rancorous feelings and intensifies hatred. The gentle and tolerant spirit of the Master are the jewels which his true followers most prize.

Little Improvement Over the Dark Ages.

[From the *Eureka (Cal.) Daily Standard*, July 24.]

WHO dares boast of religious freedom in Tennessee where a union soldier, seventy years old, a man of upright character, and a Christian, is cast into prison and set to breaking rocks on the highway with the chain-gang of criminals, because he lives up to the teachings of the Bible as he understands them?*

Such proceedings on the part of professed Christians make us respect the man who makes no claims to be religious. The other churches who profess to love the same Christ and worship the same God, are doing this work of the devil. They may be honest and sincere men, too, as were the Calvinists when they roasted a man alive for not agreeing with them in faith, or the men who set to work the tortures

* Father Gillett is not one of the convicted men, as his case was not tried—the State witnesses not being present. His case was postponed against his earnest protest. He demanded either trial or the dismissal of the case.

of the terrible "Inquisition." If these things can be done in this boasted land of liberty, at the close of the nineteenth century, by men who profess to love God and follow the teachings of Jesus Christ, then are we but little improved since the rack and the torture were used to cure men of heresy.

Is imprisonment and the life of a convict, for no crime save that of living out his religious convictions, what the aged Elder Gillett fought three years to secure? Let us not point the finger of scorn to the fires of the Inquisition, to the Calvinists, or the New England Puritans when these things can be done in "Free America." We should hide our faces in shame for Tennessee and her laws.

For Conscience' Sake.

[From the *Bellows Falls (Vt.) Times.*]

THE Seventh-day Adventists and the courts in East Tennessee are again involved in legal complications. Nine of the Adventists have recently been fined from \$5 to \$15 for doing manual labor on Sunday contrary to the statute. This sort of fining goes on regularly from year to year, yet the fines are never paid and the Adventists go to jail. They contend that to pay the fine would be to acknowledge that the law of man which says they shall pay the fine is superior to the law of God which says keep holy the Sabbath day.

This sort of prosecution is nothing but persecution. Those pious souls in Tennessee should remember that the Adventists are observing the Levitical Sabbath, and that the first day of the week, as observed by the majority in any community, is a sabbath established by man.

What did these Adventists do on Sunday? One was shingling a house, another was hoeing in a cornfield, and a third, a boy, was splitting wood for his mother. They were doing these things peaceably, simply following their every day avocations. If the people of Tennessee are such sticklers for the observance of Sunday, their religious zeal ought to carry them a little farther. No doubt there are a few livery stables down that way that hold open on Sunday, and it is reported that the laborers in the mines know no difference between Sunday and other days of the week. Why are not some of the great and wealthy corporations which are famous for their disregard of any sabbath reminded that there is a Sunday law on the statutes? Why are the poor and men of no repute always selected for examples of judicial correction?

We here submit for the benefit of all who think it their duty to force their views on others by the power of legislative acts, a noble sentiment from the pen of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism:—

"Condemn no man for not thinking as you think. Let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself. Let every man use his own judgment, since every man must give an account of himself to God. Abhor every approach, in any kind or degree, to the spirit of persecution. If you cannot reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force a man into it. If love will not compel him to come, leave him to God, the Judge of all."

THERE are many who do not seem to be sensible that all violence in religion is irreligious, and that, whoever is wrong, the persecutor cannot be right.—*Thomas Clarke.*

EQUAL liberty was originally the portion and is still the birthright of all men.—*B. Franklin.*

: : B I B L E S

BAGSTER'S - COMPREHENSIVE - TEACHERS' - BIBLE.

Emerald Type. Size—8½ x 5½ x 1¼ inches.

Swedish Morocco, improved divinity circuit, leather lined to edge, round corners, red under gold edges, with Illustrations, 14 Maps, Concordance, Helps, etc. Post paid, \$5 00

GENUINE : OXFORD : TEACHERS' : BIBLES.

Minion Type. Size—5 x 7¾ inches.

Fine Levant Morocco (brown), divinity circuit, calf lined, round corners, gold edges, Maps, Concordance, and many other valuable helps. Post paid, \$5.00

LARGE . TYPE . BIBLES

FOR THOSE WITH POOR EYESIGHT.

French Morocco, limp covers, round corners, side and back title in gold, gilt edges, Family Register and Maps. Post paid, \$2.00

ADDRESS,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

OAKLAND, CAL.

FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
BY E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the Church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the papacy, which was simply a new form of paganism. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book.

Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,

CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,

Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street, New York City.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.



CAN I OBTAIN A PATENT? For a prompt answer and an honest opinion, write to **MUNN & CO.**, who have had nearly fifty years' experience in the patent business. Communications strictly confidential. A **Handbook of Information concerning Patents** and how to obtain them sent free. Also a catalogue of mechanical and scientific books sent free. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice in the *Scientific American*, and thus are brought widely before the public without cost to the inventor. This splendid paper, issued weekly, elegantly illustrated, has by far the largest circulation of any scientific work in the world. \$3 a year. Sample copies sent free. Building Edition, monthly, \$3.50 a year. Single copies, 25 cents. Every number contains beautiful plates, in colors, and photographs of new houses, with plans, enabling builders to show the latest designs and secure contracts. Address **MUNN & CO., NEW YORK, 361 BROADWAY.**

"Before He Is Twenty,"

—OR—

"Five Perplexing Phases of the Boy Question,"

IS A VERY

HELPFUL BOOK FOR PARENTS.



It is divided into five chapters, by as many different writers, each treating of a particular phase of a boy's life.

The first chapter, "THE BOY AND HIS FATHER," by Robert J. Burdette, is alone worth many times the price of the book to any father of a young boy.

The other chapters, "WHEN HE DECIDES," "THE BOY IN THE OFFICE," "HIS EVENINGS AND AMUSEMENTS," and "LOOKING TOWARD A WIFE," are all important and helpful.

104 pages, bound in cloth, embossed in jet and gold, price, 75 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1.	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2.	" " " 3 "	15c.
No. 3.	Sealskin, 2 "	15c.
No. 4.	" " 3 "	25c.
No. 5.	Russia leather, for 4 "	25c.
No. 6.	Sealskin, 4 "	40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND STREET,
New York City.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 23, 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 Seventh-day Adventist, whose arrest in Chicago we noted last week, has been bound over to the grand jury, which sits the first week in September.

It is stated that Korea has adopted strict regulations for the observance of Sunday. And why not? It is "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," and Korea is pagan.

MR. JOHN FAUST, the Seventh-day Adventist cobbler, arrested for mending his own shoes in his own room, July 21, has been indicted by the grand jury of the Criminal Court of the city of Baltimore, and his trial is liable to occur at any time.

Outside the city of Baltimore justices of the peace have exclusive original jurisdiction, and the higher court can try such cases only on appeal, but it seems that in Baltimore the Criminal Court has exclusive original jurisdiction in Sunday cases.

We shall keep our readers fully informed in regard to this case.

Olney, Ill., August 13, 1895.

EDITOR SENTINEL: John Foll, Ross Foll, George Dunlap, J. C. Snell and Chas. Snell, were arrested for Sunday labor to-day, and had their trial in the justice's court, J. H. Gunn, Esq., presiding. They were found guilty, and fined \$1 and costs each, amounting to \$22.45 each. The statute under which they were arrested (chap. 38, par. 317, Illinois statutes) plainly says: "This section shall not be construed to prevent the due exercise of conscience by whomever thinks proper to keep any other day as a sabbath." They have not yet decided what they will do, but may appeal. More later. State's attorney for this (Richland) county opposed us in these cases. J. W. SCOLES.

FURTHER particulars concerning the prosecutions in London, Eng., for Sunday labor, inform us that the Adventist publishing house on Holloway Road has been fined about \$100 (including costs) for successive violations of the Sunday (factory) law, and the defendants were informed that in case the fines are not satisfied there will be an imprisonment of fourteen days for each offense.

The ostensible aim of this factory law is to protect women and minors from being overworked; but in this prosecution there is no charge of overwork or of hardship to the employes, all of whom rest on the seventh day of the week. The prosecution rests solely on the fact that work was done on the first day of the week. Instead of being a protection to these employes, the law, as it is applied,

actually works hardship to them, since it would deprive them of one-sixth of their wages. The manager of the office is prosecuted under a law designed to protect employes, because the law is not allowed to work exactly contrary to its purpose! Was ever a law made to exhibit such absurdity of injustice?

The trouble is, it is a Sunday law. Doubtless its originators thought it a very benign and useful piece of legislation, as indeed it seems upon its face. But there was a dead fly in the ointment, and now it comes to light. And that is true of every legal measure which has within it the Sunday institution. Sunday laws will never operate as they are intended; for they are contrary to the eternal law of right.

THE *Christian Statesman* complains that the nation has never witnessed such a carnival of Sunday "desecration" as "we are having this present summer." A large share of the blame the *Statesman* lays at the door of camp-meeting managers, and says:—

Church members do not feel their responsibility for the preservation of the sabbath as they should. Consistent loyalty to the Lord of the Sabbath requires separation from their sin. But it is clear that nothing short of statute law, properly enforced, will meet the necessities of the case as set forth above.

What a confession! Church members must be compelled by statute to manifest a "loyalty" for the Lord of the Sabbath which they do not feel! But is it any wonder, since the leaders of religious thought defiantly trample upon the real Sabbath, the Lord's day of the Scriptures, heap contempt upon it, and attempt to compel the observance of a counterfeit without divine warrant? Is it any wonder, we say, that even members of Sunday-keeping churches do not respect the day?

PERSECUTION IN BALTIMORE.

MR. FAUST, the Seventh-day Adventist, mentioned in another column, was arrested on the 12th inst. for the third time. Following his arrest for mending his own shoes in his own house on Sunday, July 21, Mr. Faust attended the Seventh-day Adventist camp-meeting at Newark, Del., August 1-12. The rest of the story is thus told by Mr. Allen Moon, president of the International Religious Liberty Association:—

Before he went to camp-meeting he was arrested and brought before Justice Anderson of the northwest police station, and held to answer to the grand jury, and before he returned that body handed in an indictment against him. He learned before he left the grounds that he was wanted by the police, and when he returned he was seen by the police several times during the day Monday, but they did not come after him until 10:30 in the evening, and then they took him and locked him up in a cell until morning. They then put him in the prison van and drove round to all the police stations and gathered in a dozen or more ruffians smoking and swearing, and he was nearly suffocated with the smoke and heat, but he finally reached the sheriff's office. The sheriff released him to go after some one to sign his bond, which was signed on Wednesday morning.

The devilry of the whole matter was that the police took advantage of the absence of all his friends, and locked him up from 10:30 Monday evening until 2:30 P. M. Tuesday, without anything to eat, when all they had to do, or all they should have done, was to have

notified him to appear at the sheriff's office and renew his bond, for he was already under a bond of \$300, and there was no need of locking him up under the circumstances, even if he had been a criminal; but the police, who are Catholics, wanted to heap indignities upon him.

That which has stirred up these Roman Catholic policemen is the fact that two Seventh-day Adventist ministers, Elders Ballou and Franke, are holding tent meetings in that quarter of the city, and have, of course, said some plain things about the papacy. The papists are trying to "get even" on them by means of the Sunday statute, which is openly violated by thousands all over the city every Sunday without remark, but which is enforced against this Adventist as a means of venting petty religious bigotry.

APROPOS of the note from J. W. Scoles, relative to the conviction of five Adventists in Illinois, is the suggestion that it seems to make a deal of difference whose ox is gored. In those States where the statutes make no exception in favor of observers of another day, the courts seem to act their part very reluctantly, and only because it is their "duty" under the "law." But in States having such exceptions the courts seem determined to find some way of evading the plain provisions of the statute so that the hated Adventists may be convicted right or wrong. It is simply the beginning of the end.

THE *Nebraska City News*, of July 30, reports a disgraceful attempt made in that city the previous evening to break up a street-meeting of the Salvation Army, by means of the fire engine and hose of the city fire department. The group of Salvationists were sprayed from the engine until the emphatic disapproval of the citizens present put a stop to the proceedings of their persecutors. This and other like outrages recently perpetrated upon members of this religious body are manifestations of the same spirit of religious intolerance which prompted persecutions for conscience' sake in all past times.

THE *Mail and Express*, of July 22, told of two shots fired that day from the proving grounds of the army ordnance station, at Sandy Hook, which narrowly missed an incoming steamer, and then adds—

One Sunday afternoon last summer the fishing steamer *Al. Foster*, with her usual crowd of fishermen, had just got under way for home after a day on the fishing banks, when a huge projectile went screaming over the vessel and buried itself in the sea beyond.

And so it seems that the United States sometimes tests guns on the "Christian sabbath." Nevertheless this is a "Christian nation," for has not the Supreme Court confessed as much?

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.

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