



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

Vol. 11, No. 25.

NEW YORK, JUNE 18, 1896.

Price, Three Cents.

American Sentinel,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY

FOR THE

International Religious Liberty Association,

President, ALLEN MOON. - - Vice-President, A. T. JONES.
Secretary, - - - A. F. BALLENGER.

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

THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS' CONTEST FOR THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE.*

THE long struggle between freedom and despotism which has centered around the rights of conscience, affords perhaps no picture more pathetic and sublime than that presented by the lowland Christians of Scotland, in their heroic maintenance of their faith under bitter persecution, in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

It is at a critical epoch of the Reformation that the "Covenanters," as these Christians were called, came prominently upon the stage of action. "The Reformation was ebbing in Germany, in France, in Holland, in all the countries of Christendom; everywhere a double-headed tyranny was advancing on men, trampling down the liberties of nations and the rights of churches." But God had left not himself without witnesses, and in that as in every other crisis of his work he had chosen ones who would not bow the knee to Baal,—men and women who held not their lives dearer than their Master's cause, which was the cause of humanity, and whose zeal waned not either in the face of general spiritual declension, or of the dragon of prosecution. These held aloft the standard of liberty which elsewhere was trailing in the dust, and the value of their service to humanity cannot be measured. In the persons of these noblest of her representatives, Scotland "had so illustrated the fundamental principles of the struggle and the momentous issues at stake, and she had so exalted the contest in the eyes of the world, investing it with a moral grandeur that stimulated England, that she mainly contributed to the turning of the tide and

the triumph of the Protestant cause all over Christendom."

Theirs Was a Contest With the Government.

The contest of the Covenanters was a contest with the government. Charles II. was then seated upon the throne of Great Britain. Though professedly a Protestant, he was a

was ambitious, unscrupulous, despotic. He determined that no authority other than his own should be acknowledged in his kingdom in any matter, either civil or religious. Accordingly, one of his first acts as king was the securing from the Scottish parliament of the "Act of Supremacy, which transferred the



THE MAIDEN MARTYR.

"Aged matrons and pious maidens were executed on the scaffold or tied to stakes within the sea-mark and drowned."*

Romanist at heart, and a ready tool in the hands of the Jesuits. As a civil ruler he

whole power of the Church to the king, by making him absolute judge in both civil and ecclesiastical matters."

"This act was immediately followed by an-

* The quotations in this article are from Wylie's "History of Protestantism," Vol. III, chapters 23, 26, 27, 28.

* (See also the poem on page 196.)

other, which was meant to carry into effect the former. This second act imposed an oath of allegiance. . . . The new oath bound the swearer to uphold the supremacy of the king in all religious as well as all civil matters; and to refuse the oath, or deny the principle it contained, was declared to be high treason." But the Scottish Christians felt themselves bound by the "Solemn League and Covenant," to which they had sworn only a short time before, and which stood in direct opposition to the oath demanded by the king. It was an oath which allegiance to Christ would not permit them to take.

The obligations imposed by the "Solemn League and Covenant," as summarized by the historian, were: "1. Defense of Reformed Presbyterian religion in Scotland. 2. Promotion of uniformity among the churches of the three kingdoms. 3. Extirpation of popery, prelacy, and all unsound forms of religion. 4. Preservation of parliaments, and of the liberties of the people. 5. Defense of the sovereign in his maintaining the reformed religion, the parliaments, and the liberties of the people. 6. Discovery and punishment of malignants, and disturbers of the peace and welfare of the nations. 7. Mutual protection and defense of each individually, and of all jointly, who were within the bonds of the Covenant. 8. Sincere and earnest endeavor to set an example before the world of public, personal, and domestic virtue and godliness."

The Purpose of the King.

The king—the government—was determined to establish prelacy in Scotland. It was to this end that these acts had been passed aiming to make him the acknowledged authority in both the civil and spiritual realms. Accordingly, "the bishops held diocesan courts, and summoned the ministers to receive collation at their hands. If the ministers would obey the summons, the bishops would regard it as an admission of their office. . . . To their great mortification very few ministers presented themselves. In only a few solitary instances were the episcopal mandates obeyed."

Middleton, the king's prime minister in Scotland, was very wroth at this contumacious disregard of authority. "To the irascibility and imperiousness with which nature had endowed him, Middleton added the training of the camp, and he resolved to deal with this matter of conscience as he would with any ordinary breach of military discipline. He did not understand this opposition. The law was clear. The king had commanded the ministers to receive collation at the hands of the bishop, and the king must be obeyed, and if not, the recusant must take the consequences."

Yes, "the law was clear," and, by the "logic" which persecution invokes, there was nothing left for the king's officer but to enforce it; and enforce it he did. It was quite in harmony with his nature to inflict cruelties upon such as dared stand for liberty of conscience against his own command and the "law" of the realm; and had his nature been otherwise, he would doubtless still have been able to foresee, after the manner of some eminent men of our times, that "the best way to get rid of a bad law is to enforce it;" so that the result to the unfortunate Scots would have been the same. It is bad enough to become the victim of the passions of men by nature base and unprincipled; but no cruelty of human passion ever exceeded the cruelty of "logic," in the grasp of short-sighted finite intellects fired by religious zeal. No

weapon has ever proved more dangerous to the rights and liberties of mankind.

Banished for Their Faith.

At a meeting of the King's Privy Council, held in the College Hall of Glasgow, Oct. 1, 1662, for the purpose of devising decisive measures for crushing the opposition to prelacy, it was resolved "to extrude from their livings and banish from their parishes all the ministers who had been ordained since 1649, and had not received presentation and collation as the king's act required. In pursuance of this summary and violent decision, a proclamation was drawn up, to be published on the 4th of October, commanding all such ministers to withdraw themselves and their families out of their parishes before the 1st of November next, and forbidding them to reside within the bounds of their respective presbyteries."

"Hardly four weeks had he given the ministers to determine the grave question whether they should renounce their Presbyterianism or surrender their livings. They did not need even that short space to make up their minds. Four hours—four minutes—were enough when the question was so manifestly whether they should obey God or King Charles. When the 1st of November came, four hundred ministers—more than a third of the Scottish clergy—rose up, and quitting their manse, their churches, and their parishes, went forth with their families into banishment."

"It was the beginning of winter, and the sight of the bare earth and the bleak skies would add to the gloom around them. They went forth not knowing whither they went. . . . The sacrifice they were now making had only added to their guilt in the eyes of their monarch, and they knew that, distressing as was their present condition, their future lot was sure to be more wretched; but rather than take their hands from the plough they would part with even dearer possessions than those of which they had been stripped. They had counted the cost, and would go forward in the path on which they had set out, although they plainly desecrated a scaffold at the end of it."

They Met in the Fields.

"It was now that the field-meetings termed 'conventicles' arose. The greater part of the pious ministers cast out, and their places filled by incapable men, the people left the new preachers to hold forth within empty walls. It was in vain that the church doors were thrown open on Sunday morning; few entered save the curates' dependants, or the reprobates of the place; the bulk of the population were elsewhere; . . . they had gathered by hundreds or by thousands, devout and reverend, on some moorland, or in some sequestered glen, or on some mountain side, there to listen to one of the ejected ministers, who taking his stand on some rock or knoll, preached the word of life."

All this, of course, was exceedingly mortifying to the bishops, and only added to their rage and determination to crush out the spirit of religious liberty. The common people now became the victims of their tyranny. "The conventicle was denounced as a rendezvous of rebellion, and a rain of edicts was directed against it. All persons attending field preachings were to be punished with fine and confiscation of their property. Those informing against them were to share the fines and the property confiscated, save when it chanced to be the estate of a landlord that fell under the Act. These good things the Privy Council kept for themselves. . . .

Magistrates were enjoined to see that no conventicle was held within their burgh; landlords were taken bound for their tenants, masters for their servants; and if any should transgress in this respect, by stealing away to hear one of the outed ministers, his superior, whether magistrate, landlord, or master, was to denounce or punish the culprit; and failing to do so was himself to incur the penalties he ought to have inflicted upon his dependants. These unrighteous edicts received rigorous execution, and sums were extorted thereby which amazed one when he reflected to what extent the country had suffered from previous pillagings. It was not enough, in order to escape this legal robbery, that one eschewed the conventicle; he must be in his place in the parish church on Sunday; for every day's absence he was liable to a fine."

Made a Capital Crime.

Finally an edict was issued which made it a capital crime to attend a field-preaching bearing arms. That the Covenanters did bear arms at these gatherings, and that they offered armed resistance to the king's forces, was a source of great weakness to their cause. They were engaged in a contest which, while conducted simply through faith in God, could know no defeat, for God himself has made victory sure to faith. But when they essayed to fight the battle with worldly weapons of warfare, the event by no means justified their position. The battle for God's authority against the king's was God's battle; but the Lord's battles are not fought by the losing side. They took the battle out of God's hands, and the result was disaster. God's battles are fought not with carnal weapons, but with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Nothing can stand before that sword, and all who hold to that word by faith will triumph with it.

Their Military Power Broken.

A disastrous engagement with the king's forces on June 22, 1679, left the military power of the Covenanters completely broken, and 1,200 of the latter prisoners in the hands of their enemies. These unfortunates were made the victims of every species of barbarity. At the end of five months their number was reduced by nearly 1,000, the most of these having succumbed to inhuman treatment. The remainder were transported to Barbadoes, and the ship being wrecked in a storm, many were drowned, and others who reached the land were sold into slavery.

"The years that followed are known as 'the killing times;' and truly Scotland during them became not unlike that from which the term is borrowed—the shambles. The Presbyterians were hunted on the mountains and tracked by the bloodhounds of the Privy Council to the caves and dens where they had hid themselves. Claverhouse and his dragoons were continually on the pursuit, shooting down men and women in the fields and on the highways. As fast as the prisons could be emptied they were filled with fresh victims brought in by the spies with whom the country swarmed. . . . Aged matrons and pious maidens were executed on the scaffold, or tied to stakes within sea-mark and drowned. The persecution fell with equal severity on all who appeared for the cause of their country's religion and liberty. No eminence of birth, no fame of talent, no luster of virtue, could shield their possessor from the most horrible fate if he opposed the designs of the court. Some of lofty intellect and famed statesmanship were hanged and quartered on the gallows, and the ghastly

spectacle of their heads and limbs met the gazer in the chief cities of the kingdom, as if the land were still inhabited with cannibals, and had never known either civilization or Christianity. It is calculated that during the twenty-eight years of persecution in Scotland, 18,000 persons suffered death, or hardships approaching to it."

Thus heroically did the Scottish Covenanters maintain upon their native heath the contest for the supremacy of that principle long before enunciated by the apostles Peter and John to the Sanhedrim,—“We ought to obey God rather than men.” That they grasped the principle in its full breadth, as separating the sphere of religion from that of the civil power, cannot be said. The views expressed and attitude maintained by them during this period clearly show that they did not. They battled with error in its grosser forms, as was necessary while the world was just emerging from the shadows of the Dark Ages. It was left for a later generation to proclaim to the world the rightful freedom of the conscience from all human coercion, and of man's natural right under it to believe and practice whatsoever he will, so long as he does not invade the rights of his fellows. All this was involved in and justified by the resistance of the Covenanters to the government and the “law;” and it is a pity that their descendants of this day, instead of upholding the doctrine of the inviolability of conscience against coercion by the civil power, are striving to erect in this country the same religio-eivic despotism which brought such a bitter experience to their ancestors two centuries ago. s.

CIVIL GROUNDS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.

IN No. 18 of the current volume of this paper was published an article under this title in which it was shown that “in all ages and in every country religious intolerance has been defended on the ground of public policy,” and that “dissenters have ever been stigmatized as enemies of the State, subverters of social order, and disturbers of the public peace.”¹ The proof of these propositions was conclusive, but by no means as full as it might have been. Indeed, to exhaust the subject would be to review the entire history of the world, for substantially the same arguments have been urged in justification of restrictions of freedom of conscience in every country and in every period.

Speaking of the causes of pagan persecutions, Lecky says that “they were partly political and partly religious.” The same writer explains this statement in this way:—

In the earlier days of Rome religion was looked upon as a function of the State; its chief object was to make the gods auspicious to the national policy, and its principal ceremonies were performed at the direct command of the Senate.²

Of certain repressive measures directed by the Romans against other religions than their own, Lecky says:—

They grew out of that intense national spirit which sacrificed every other interest to the State, and resisted every form of innovation, whether secular or religious, that could impair the unity of the national type, and dissolve the discipline which the predominance of the military spirit and the stern government of the Republic had formed.³

It thus appears that the real motive that led the pagans to persecute the Christians

was a desire to preserve intact their civil institutions; the very motive which to-day actuates the Czar in the persecution of Jews and Stundists, and that is urged in our own country in justification of certain measures of religious legislation. In justification of Sunday laws, Mr. Crafts says, as quoted in our former article:—

It is the conviction of the majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without laws, therefore Sabbath laws are enacted by the right of self-preservation, not in violation of liberty, but for its protection.

This is but a revamping of the old pagan theory firmly believed by the multitude. Lecky says, “that the prosperity and adversity of the empire depended chiefly upon the zeal or indifference that was shown in conciliating the national divinities.” That the Christian religion is true while the religion of the Romans was false does not affect the principle; civil government was as much a divine ordinance in Rome as it is in the United States, and if the preservation of social order justifies religious laws now, it justified them as fully then. Nor is this all; if the preservation of either this or any other nation justifies religious restrictions at all, it justifies such restriction to any extent which in the judgment of those in authority may be necessary for the preservation of that nation. But to maintain such a position would be to justify all the persecution that has ever cursed any land, or disgraced any system of religion.

Another point of semblance between ancient and modern intolerance, between pagan and so-called Christian bigotry, is found in the fact that when Rome reached the point of tolerating professors of all religions in Rome, this liberty did not free the Roman “from the obligation of performing also the sacrifices or other religious rites in his own land.” The parallel to this is found in Tennessee and some other of our American States in which perfect religious liberty is supposed to be guaranteed, notwithstanding the fact that a certain amount of deference must always be paid to the religion of the majority, in the observance of Sunday.

American colonial history is exceedingly fruitful in illustrations of how religious intolerance has sought to shield itself behind civil considerations, and justify persecution on the ground of protecting public morals and preserving the peace and dignity of the State. In “The Emancipation of Massachusetts,” Brooks Adams relates how the clergy of that colony “used the cry of heresy to excite odium, just as they called their opponents Antinomians, or dangerous fanatics,” to stir up the people against them. “Though the scheme was unprincipled,” says Mr. Adams, “it met with complete success, and the Antinomians have come down to posterity branded as deadly enemies of Christ and the commonwealth; yet nothing is more certain than that they were not only good citizens, but substantially orthodox.” Of course the motive of the clergy was wholly religious, yet they made it appear that while they were concerned for what they regarded as the true faith they were equally interested in the welfare of the colony. Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard College, did not believe in infant baptism, and for this he was indicted and convicted on the charge of *disturbing church ordinances*. The disturbance was as real as is the disturbance charged in Tennessee against Seventh-day Adventists—it was all in the minds of those, who, having control of legislation, were determined that the civil power should be used in support, to some extent at least, of their tenets. Dunster

was driven out as an enemy of the commonwealth, and died in poverty and neglect.

In 1651, John Cotton denounced certain Baptists as “foul murderers” because they denied infant baptism. And in “The Emancipation of Massachusetts” page 116, we are told that under the Puritan Commonwealth, the moment a man “refused implicit obedience, or above all, if he withdrew from his congregation he was shown no mercy, because such acts tended to shake the temporal power.” “Therefore,” says the same writer, page 118, “though Winslow solemnly protested before the commissioners at London that Baptists who lived peaceably would be left unmolested, yet such of them as listened to ‘foul murderers’ were denounced as dangerous fanatics who threatened to overthrow the government, and were hunted through the country like wolves.”

Regarding the facility with which civil offenses were for religious reasons charged in Massachusetts against dissenters, Charles Francis Adams says:—

A species of sweep-net was now needed which should bring the followers no less than the leaders under the ban of the law. The successful prosecution of Wheelwright afforded the necessary hint. Wheelwright had been brought within the clutches of the civil authorities by a species of *ex post facto* legal chicanery. Even his most bitter opponents did not pretend to allege that he had preached his Fast day sermon with the intent to bring about any disturbance of the peace. They only claimed that his utterances tended to make such a result probable, and that his own observation ought to have convinced him of the fact. Therefore, they argued, although it was true that no breach of the peace had actually taken place and although the preacher had no intent to excite to a breach of the peace, yet he was none the less guilty of constructive sedition. Constructive sedition was now made to do the same work in New England which constructive treason, both before and after, was made to do elsewhere.⁴

But it mattered not that Wheelwright could be accused only by a legal fiction, and that an extremely attenuated one. Mr. Adams thus relates the sequel:—

The court being now purged of all his friends Codrington only excepted, Wheelwright's case was taken up. He appeared in answer to the summons; but, when asked if he was yet prepared to confess his errors, he stubbornly refused to do so, protesting his entire innocence of what was charged against him. He could not be induced to admit that he had been guilty either of sedition or of contempt, and he asserted that the doctrine preached by him in his Fast-day discourse was sound; while, as to any individual application which had been made of it, he was not accountable. Then followed a long wrangle, reaching far into the night and continued the next day, during which the natural obstinacy of Wheelwright's temper must have been sorely tried. At his door was laid all the responsibility for all the internal dissensions of the province. He was the fruitful source of these village and parish ills; and every ground of complaint was gone over, from the lax response of Boston to the call for men for the Pequot war, to the slight put by his church upon Wilson, and halberdiers upon Winthrop. To such an indictment defense was impossible; and so, in due time, the court proceeded to its sentence. It was disfranchisement and exile. . . . His sentence stands recorded as follows: “Mr. John Wheelwright, being formally convicted of contempt and sedition, and now justifying himself and his former practice, being to the disturbance of the civil peace, he is by the court disfranchised and banished, having fourteen days to settle his affairs; and if within that time he depart not the patent, he promiseth to render himself to Mr. Stoughton, at his house to be kept till he be disposed of; and Mr. Hough undertook to satisfy any charge that he, Mr. Stoughton, or the country should be at.”⁵

Similar facts might be given at almost any length both in the history of Massachusetts and in that of England and other countries, but the reader can pursue the study for himself. Enough has been said to fully sustain the proposition that religious intolerance ever

¹ The article to which reference is here made will appear shortly in tract form as a number of the “Religious Liberty Library.”

² “History of European Morals,” Vol. I, page 308.

³ *Id.* page 403.

⁴ “Three Episodes of Massachusetts History,” Vol. I, page 477.

⁵ *Id.* pages 480, 481.

seeks to hide its hideous face behind some civil law, and to justify its crimes against humanity on the ground of public necessity; but nobody is deceived except the poor bigots themselves. Everybody else knows full well the real motive.

THE MAIDEN MARTYR.*

IN the early summer of 1685, two girls of the name of Wilson, the older of whom was eighteen, and the younger thirteen years of age, were sentenced to be drowned for refusing the Abjuration oath.

The younger sister was saved, upon the payment of a hundred pounds by her father. The elder, and a poor widow named McLaughlin, were tied to stakes within flood-mark in the river Blendnock. The girl saw her aged companion in tribulation painfully perish, as she had been fastened furthest out in the tide. Still her faith failed not; and though impertuned by her friends to save her life by praying for the king and taking the oath, she steadfastly refused. Calmly she awaited death, singing psalms till her voice was choked by the rising water; and, a little after, the slight ripple, and the air-bell rising to the surface, told she had breathed her last. And as though in sympathy, the fast westering sun, too, sank from sight and nature threw over the scene her sable mantle of the night.

A troop of soldiers waited at the door,
A crowd of people gathered in the street,
Aloof a little from the sabres bared
And flashed into their faces. Then the door
Was opened, and two women meekly step
Into the sunshine of the sweet May-morn,
Out of the prison. One was meek and old—
A woman full of years and full of woes—
The other was a maiden in her morn,
And they were one in name and one in faith,
Mother and daughter in the bonds of Christ,
That bound them closer than the ties of blood.

The troop moved on; and down the sunny street
The people followed, ever falling back
As in their faces flashed the naked blades.
But in the midst the women simply went
As if they two were walking, side by side,
Up to God's house on some still Sabbath morn,
Only they were not clad for Sabbath day;
But as they went about their daily tasks,
They went to prison, and they went to death
Upon their Master's service.

On the shore
The troopers halted; all the shining sands
Lay bare and glistening; for the tide had drawn
Back to its furthest margin's weedy mark,
And each succeeding wave, with flash and curve
That seemed to mock the sabres on the shore,
Drew nearer by a sand-breadth. "It will be
A long day's work," murmured those murderous
men,
As they slacked rein—the leaders of the troop
Dismounting, and the people pressing near
To hear the pardon proffered, with the oath
Renouncing and abjuring part with all
The persecuted, covenanted folk.
And both refused the oath, "because," they said,
"Unless with Christ's dear servants we have part,
We have no part with Him."

On this they took
The elder Margaret, and led her out
Over the sliding sands, the weedy sludge,
The pebbly shoals, far out, and fastened her
Unto the furthest stake, already reached
By every rising wave; and left her there,
As the waves crept about her feet, in prayer
That He would firm uphold her in their midst,
Who holds them in the hollow of His hand.
The tide flowed in. And up and down the shore
They passed, the Provost, and the Laird of Lag—
Grim Grierson—with Windram and with Graham;
And the rude soldiers jested, with rude oaths,
As in the midst the maiden meekly stood
Waiting her doom delayed—said "she would turn
Before the tide—seek refuge in their arms

From the chill waves." And ever to her lips
There came the wondrous words of life and peace:
"If God be for us, who can be against!"
"Who shall divide us from the love of Christ?"
"Nor height, nor depth,——"

A voice cried from the crowd—
A woman's voice, a very bitter cry—
"Oh, Margaret! my bonnie Margaret!
Gie in, gie in, and dinna break my heart;
Gie in, and take the oath."

The tide flowed in:
And so wore on the sunny afternoon:
And every fire went out upon the hearth;
And not a meal was tasted in the town
That day.

And still the tide was flowing in:
Her mother's voice yet sounding in her ears,
They turned young Margaret's face toward the sea,
Where something white was floating—something
white
As the sea-mew that sits upon the wave:
But as she looked it sank; then showed again;
Then disappeared. And round the shoreward stake
The tide stood ankle deep.

Then Grierson,
With cursing, vowed that he would wait no more;
And to the stake the soldiers led her down,
And tied her hands; and round her slender waist
Too roughly cast the rope, for Windram came
And eased it, while he whispered in her ear
"Come, take the test." And one cried, "Margaret,
Say but 'God save the king.'" "God save the
king
Of His great grace," she answered; but the oath
She would not take.

And still the tide flowed in,
And drove the people back and silenced them.
The tide flowed in, and rising to her knee,
She sang the psalm, "To thee I lift my soul."
The tide flowed in, and rising to her waist,
"To thee, my God, I lift my soul," she sang,
And the tide flowed, and, rising to her throat,
She sang no more, but lifted up her face—
And there was glory over all the sky;
And there was glory over all the sea—
A flood of glory—and the lifted face
Swam in it, till it bowed beneath the flood,
And Scotland's Maiden Martyr slept in God.

PERSECUTION FOR SUNDAY LABOR AT FORD'S STORE, MD.

BY J. E. JAYNE.

MR. ISAAC BAKER, of Ford's Store, Md., has been arrested, tried, and I suppose convicted, of Sunday labor. Briefly the circumstances are as follows.

On Sunday, May 24, L. T. Vansant, a constable, "chanced to be" at the home of one of his neighbors. They looked across a piece of land and strip of water, a distance of about two miles, and saw what they thought was a man at work in a field. They walked to the water and then rowed about three quarters of a mile and accosted Mr. Baker, who was marking out ground for corn.

The constable laid complaint before a magistrate on Kent Island, who issued the warrant, and set the trial for June 1. Mr. Baker was allowed his liberty, and on the day for trial the constable visited him at his home intending to accompany him to the magistrate's office. Mr. Baker objected to going, stating that he would take the case before a magistrate for their own town, who had been recently appointed. The constable did not require him to appear in court, but himself arranged for the trial to be held before another magistrate on Thursday, the 4th of June.

When the case came to trial the magistrate was very much confused, and the crowd that filled the room did about as they pleased. Mr. Baker employed no attorney. So far as I could learn, no record of the proceedings

was kept, except what I took for my own use. The trial proceeded about as follows:—

Magistrate to Mr. Baker.—"Are you ready for trial?"

Mr. Baker.—"I have not heard the warrant read."

The magistrate then read the warrant and said:—

"I don't suppose there is any use of swearing witnesses, for you will plead guilty of the crime."

Mr. Baker.—"I do not plead guilty of violating any law in harmony with our National Constitution."

Magistrate.—"O, that's no plea."

Mr. Baker was not required to plead, and the constable was sworn.

Magistrate to constable.—"What was he doing?"

Constable.—"He was marking out ground for corn."

Magistrate.—"Anything else?"

Constable.—"No."

Magistrate.—"There were three State's witnesses summoned, are they here?"

Constable.—"All but Mr. Mansfield." (Who is a Seventh-day Adventist.)

The magistrate talked of how he would punish Mr. Mansfield for failing to obey the summons.

Bystanders to Court and constable.—"Mr. Mansfield has not been summoned."

Constable.—"I summoned him."

Bystanders.—"You did not read the summons, nor tell him when or where the trial was to be held, nor who was to be tried."

Magistrate.—"Do you swear that you summoned him?"

Constable.—"Yes."

Bystanders.—"You did not read the summons."

Magistrate.—"Do you swear you read the summons?"

Constable.—"No; I read his name to him off the back of the warrant. I had no summons. You did not give me any, and I am green and do not know how to do this business."

Magistrate.—"Why did you not tell me you had no summons?"

Constable.—"I did try to tell you, but I could not make you understand."

Magistrate.—"Well, there are no witnesses in this case except yourself. I guess we are both pretty badly mixed."

Mr. Baker to magistrate.—"Well, I guess it makes little difference as I should have to appeal the case anyway."

The magistrate then tried to make out an appeal bond but was so confused that he could not do it. He then tried to find a friend who has sometimes assisted him at his work, but this friend had absented himself, refusing to have anything to do with the matter.

Magistrate to Mr. Baker.—"There is one way left for me, you state any day you like within a week and appear here, and we will proceed with the trial."

Mr. Baker to magistrate.—"I am here for trial now and want the matter settled to-day."

Magistrate.—"I can't do it; I don't know how to make out the bond. I am in no condition to proceed with the trial. Who are to be your bondsmen?"

Mr. Baker made arrangements with two of his friends, and then the magistrate proposed that it was not necessary that Mr. Baker again appear in court, but that he (the mag-

* From Frank Leslie's "Sunday Magazine," with slight additions and changes.

istrate) would present himself before Mr. Baker's bondsmen some time within one week and arrange it satisfactorily with them.

Magistrate to Mr. Baker.—"Costs are eighty-five cents."

Mr. Baker.—"I will not pay costs, as I have done nothing wrong. Had I done anything wrong I would not refuse."

Magistrate.—"I have been very lenient with you, but I may not be so in the future; but as you will pay no costs, I will give you my costs."

And then without offering opportunity for defense, and without pronouncing the prisoner guilty or innocent, without imposing any fine, holding him in bail or dismissing the court, the magistrate gathered up his effects and disappeared.

Just what turn matters will take no one seems to know.

I visited both the magistrate and constable at their homes before the trial and talked with them of the matter, and am thoroughly convinced that before the case was heard they had determined to convict Mr. Baker.

The magistrate is an "alldside" Methodist class leader, and the constable attends that church. Religious prejudice is at the root of the difficulty, but without a Sunday law intolerance would be powerless.

A SIGNIFICANT DECISION.

OUR readers are already familiar with the fact that a decision was handed down May 18 by the Supreme Court of the United States affirming the constitutionality of Section 4,578 of the Code of Georgia prohibiting the running of freight trains in that State on Sunday, except under certain conditions and circumstances.

The "law" was assailed on the ground that it was in violation of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce between the States; but the majority of the court held that the said act was only "an ordinary police regulation designed to secure the well-being and promote the general welfare of the people within the State by which it was established, and, therefore, not invalid by force alone of the Constitution of the United States."

Like the Christian Nation Decision.

Like the "Christian Nation" decision of February 29, 1892, this decision is more broad and far-reaching than was really required by the question before the Court. Mr. Justice Harlan who delivered the opinion of the court, seems to have gone out of his way to lay broad and deep the foundation of Sunday "laws."

Judging from this opinion, the power of the several States to enact and enforce Sunday "laws" is not regarded as open to question. Immediately after stating the facts in the case the learned Justice says:—

If the statute in question forbidding the running in Georgia of railroad freight trains, on the sabbath day, had been expressly limited to trains laden with domestic freight, it could not be regarded otherwise than as an ordinary police regulation established by the State under its general power to protect the health and morals, and to promote the welfare, of its people.*

Policy of the State to Protect "the Sabbath."

"From the earliest period in the history of Georgia," continues the opinion, "it has been the policy of that State, as it was the

policy of many of the original States, to prohibit all persons, under penalties, from using the *sabbath as a day* for labor and for pursuing their ordinary callings. By an act of the colonial legislature of Georgia, approved March 4th, 1762, it was provided: "No tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly labor, business or work of their ordinary callings, upon the *Lord's day*, or any part thereof (works of necessity or charity only excepted), and that every person being of the age of fifteen years or upwards, offending in the premises, shall for every such offense, forfeit the sum of ten shillings. And that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose to sale, any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels whatsoever upon the *Lord's day*, or any part thereof, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the same goods so cried or showed forth, or exposed to sale, or pay ten shillings."

The "Law" Cited.

The court then cites the act against the running of freight trains on Sunday, described in the act as "the sabbath day," and then continues:—

In what light is the statute of Georgia to be regarded? The well-settled rule is, that if a statute purporting to have been enacted to protect the public health, the public morals or the public safety has no real or substantial relation to those objects, or is a palpable invasion of rights secured by the fundamental law, it is the duty of the courts to so adjudge and thereby give effect to the constitution. *Mugler v. Kansas*, 123 U. S. 623, 661; *Minnesota v. Barber*, 136 U. S. 313, 320.

In our opinion there is nothing in the legislation in question which suggests that it was enacted with the purpose to regulate interstate commerce, or with any other purpose than to prescribe a rule of civil duty for all who, on the sabbath day, are within the territorial jurisdiction of the State. It is none the less a civil regulation because the day on which the running of freight trains is prohibited is kept by many under a sense of religious duty. The legislature having, as will not be disputed, power to enact laws to promote the order and to secure the comfort, happiness and health of the people, it was within its discretion to fix the day when all labor, within the limits of the State, works of necessity and charity excepted, should cease.

The legislature of Georgia no doubt acted upon the view that the keeping of one day in seven for rest and relaxation was "of admirable service to a State considered merely as a civil institution." 4 Bl. Com. 63. The same view was expressed by Mr. Justice Field in *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal. 502, 520, 529, when, referring to a statute of California relating to the sabbath day, he said: "Its requirement is a cessation of labor. In its enactment, the legislature has given the sanction of law to a rule of conduct, which the entire civilized world recognizes as essential to the physical and moral well-being of society. Upon no subject is there such a concurrence of opinion, among philosophers, moralists and statesmen of all nations, as on the necessity of periodical cessation of labor. One day in seven is the rule, founded in experience and sustained by science. . . . The prohibition of secular business on Sunday is advocated on the ground that by it the general welfare is advanced, labor protected, and the moral and physical well-being of society is promoted."

So, in *Bloom v. Richards*, 2 Ohio St. 387, 392, Judge Thurman, delivering the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio, said: "We are, then, to regard the statute under consideration as a mere municipal or police regulation, whose validity is neither strengthened nor weakened by the fact that the day of rest it enjoins is the sabbath day. Wisdom requires that men should refrain from labor at least one day in seven, and the advantages of having the day of rest fixed, and so fixed as to happen at regularly recurring intervals, are too obvious to be overlooked. It was within the constitutional competency of the general assembly to require the cessation of labor, and to name the day of rest."

"Essential" to the Well-Being of Man.

The same principles were announced by the Supreme Court of Georgia in the present case. . . . That court, speaking by Chief-Justice Bleckley, said: "There can be no well-founded doubt of its being a police regulation, considering it merely as ordaining the cessation of ordinary labor and business during

one day in every week; for the frequent and total suspension of the toils, care and strain of mind or muscle incident to pursuing an occupation or common employment, is beneficial to every individual, and incidentally to the community at large, the general public. Leisure is no less essential than labor to the well-being of man. . . ."

That court further said: "With respect to the selection of the particular day in each week which has been set apart by our statute as the rest day of the people, religious views and feelings may have had a controlling influence. We doubt not that they did have; and it is probable that the same views and feelings had a very powerful influence in dictating the policy of setting apart any day whatever as a day of enforced rest. But neither of these considerations is destructive of the police nature and character of the statute. . . ."

Courts are not concerned with the mere beliefs and sentiments of legislators, or with the motives which influence them in enacting laws which are within legislative competency. That which is properly made a civil duty by statute is none the less so because it is also a real or supposed religious obligation, nor is the statute vitiated, or in anywise weakened, by the chance, or even the certainty, that in passing it the legislative mind was swayed by the religious rather than by the civil aspect of the measure. Doubtless it is a religious duty to pay debts, but no one supposes that this is any obstacle to its being exacted as a civil duty. With few exceptions, the same may be said of the whole catalogue of duties specified in the ten commandments. Those of them which are purely and exclusively religious in their nature cannot be made civil duties, but all of them may be, in so far as they involve conduct as distinguished from mere operations of mind or states of the affections. Opinions may differ, and they really do differ, as to whether abstaining from labor on Sunday is a religious duty; but whether it is or is not, it is certain that the legislature of Georgia has prescribed it as a civil duty. The statute can fairly and rationally be treated as a legitimate police regulation, and thus treated it is a valid law. There is a wide difference between keeping a day holy as a religious observance and merely forbearing to labor on that day in one's ordinary vocation or business pursuit." *Hennington v. The State*, 90 Ga. 396, 397 399.

In quoting and adopting this language of the Supreme Court of Georgia, as he does, Justice Harlan shows a most astonishing lack of appreciation of the essential difference between paying debts and observing a religious ordinance. The payment of debts is not made a civil duty because it is a religious duty; while it is admitted that abstinence from labor on Sunday is made a "civil duty" because it is supposed to be first of all a religious duty. On the other hand, the payment of debts is a religious duty because it is first of all a natural civil duty. Peoples knowing nothing of the ten commandments recognize the obligation to pay debts, and enforce it by civil law; but we find the so-called civil Sabbath only where its observance has first been enjoined as a religious duty. But so well satisfied is the Supreme Court with the reasoning of the Georgia Court on this point, that the learned justice continues:—

Assuming, then, that both upon principle and authority the statute of Georgia is, in every substantial sense, a police regulation established under the general authority possessed by the legislature to provide, by laws, for the well being of the people, we proceed to consider whether it is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

The Contention of the Defense.

The defendant contends that the running on the sabbath day of railroad cars, laden with interstate freight, is committed exclusively to the control and supervision of the National Government; and that, although Congress has not taken any affirmative action upon the subject, State legislation interrupting, even for a limited time only, interstate commerce, whatever may be its object and however essential such legislation may be for the comfort, peace and safety of the people of the State, is a regulation of interstate commerce forbidden by the Constitution of the United States. Is this view of the Constitution and of the relations between the States and the General Government sustained by the former decisions of this court? . . . If the people of a State deem it necessary to their peace, comfort and happiness, to say nothing of the public health and the public morals, that one day in each week be set apart by law as a day when business of all kinds carried on within the limits of that State shall cease, whereby all persons of every race

* All italics in these extracts are ours.—ED. SENTINEL.

and condition in life may have an opportunity to enjoy absolute rest and quiet, is that result, so far as interstate freight traffic is concerned, attainable only through an affirmative act of Congress giving its assent to such legislation?

The court holds that such is not the case, and concludes the opinion thus:—

Local laws of the character mentioned have their source in the powers which the States reserved and never surrendered to Congress, of providing for the public health, the public morals and the public safety, and are not, within the meaning of the Constitution, and considered in their own nature, regulations of interstate commerce simply because, for a limited time or to a limited extent, they cover the field occupied by those engaged in such commerce. The statute of Georgia is not directed against interstate commerce. . . . It simply declares that, on and during the day fixed by law as a day of rest for all the people within the limits of the State from toil and labor incident to their callings, the transportation of freight shall be suspended.

We are of opinion that such a law, although in a limited degree affecting interstate commerce, is not for that reason a needless intrusion upon the domain of Federal jurisdiction, nor strictly a regulation of interstate commerce, but, considered in its own nature, is an ordinary police regulation designed to secure the well-being and to promote the general welfare of the people within the State by which it was established, and, therefore, not invalid by force alone of the Constitution of the United States.

The judgment is

Affirmed.

No Recognition of Individual Rights.

It will be observed that in all this, while there is a careful guarding of "the powers which the States reserved and never surrendered," there is not so much as a suggestion of any rights for the individual. The State is supreme over the time, health and morals of the people. *They have no reserved rights.*

A noticeable feature in this decision is the matter-of-fact tone employed in referring to Sunday "laws." Their propriety is beyond question! "From the earliest period in the history of Georgia it has been the policy of that State, as it was the policy of many of the original States, to prohibit all persons, under penalties, from using the *sabbath as a day of labor and from pursuing their ordinary callings.*" The argument amounts to no more than this: it has long been so, therefore it must be right. And this "policy" and the "laws" enacted in preservice of it are purely "civil," the court asserts, notwithstanding the admitted fact that "religious views and feelings" "had a controlling influence" in the framing of "laws" requiring Sunday observance!

It is assumed that Sunday "laws" are necessary for the preservation of "health and morals." We have not time now to discuss the question of health; but submit that Sunday labor or business cannot be shown to be immoral, and it will not ever be claimed that it is immoral, on any other ground than that it is irreligious. It inevitably follows that the Supreme Court has upheld a "law" prohibiting Sunday work because it is irreligious, for if it were not irreligious it could not be immoral, and if it were not immoral it could not be prohibited by law.

Sunday Receives the Seal of Judicial Approval.

In our opinion this decision from which only two Justices (Justices Fuller and White) dissented, dashes to the ground all hope of a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States adverse to Sunday "laws." The fiction of Sunday sacredness has now received the seal of approval from the Supreme Court, for only on the supposition that it is a sacred day can Sunday labor or business be regarded as immoral; but it is on this very ground that the Supreme Court sustains not only the Georgia statute prohibiting the running of freight trains but the whole Georgia Sunday

"law" as well as the Sunday "laws" of all the States.

The learned Justice delivering the opinion of the Court talks of the power of the State to fix a day of rest for all the people, and intimates that the choice of Sunday was only incidental; but does anybody suppose that the Supreme Court would sustain a statute enacted by any State which would undertake to stop interstate commerce upon any other day of the week than Sunday? Suppose that Utah instead of being settled by Mormons had been colonized by Mohammedans, and that they had passed a "law" prohibiting the running of freight trains on Friday, does anyone suppose for a moment that seven out of nine of our learned Supreme Court Justices would have sustained the "law"? Does anyone suppose that a single justice could have been found to champion such a statute? Certainly not.

We Have a Recognized Religion.

The truth is that while it was the purpose of the founders of this Government to establish on this continent a State without a Church, yea, even without any officially recognized religion, we have to-day and have long had a recognized religion, namely, Christianity, according to the general acceptance of that term. President Washington declared that the Government of the United States was not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion, but a Supreme Court has arisen that knows not Washington. In 1892 it declared that this is "a Christian Nation," and found evidence of this in Colonial Charters and State Constitutions from the very beginning of our history to that very moment; and now in 1896 it is assumed that labor or business upon the "Christian sabbath" is immoral and therefore properly prohibited by the police power of the States!

Leaves no Room to Doubt the Attitude of the Supreme Court on the Whole Question of Sunday Laws.

It is true that no question was raised before the court upon the right of the individual to have and exercise his own individual conscience, being answerable only to God for the abuse of that privilege so long as in so doing the individual does not intrench upon the equal rights of others; but the opinion delivered by Justice Harlan leaves no room to doubt what the decision would have been had the question been upon the right of a State to forbid private Sunday labor by the individual. The court has held that the guardianship of morals is within the legitimate police power of the State, and on this ground the court sustains the Sunday "law" of Georgia; it follows that in the opinion of the learned justices Sunday labor and business are immoral; and as before shown that is the same thing as to hold that Sunday work is irreligious; for on no other possible grounds can it be held to be immoral.

Every department of the Government is now fully committed to the support of the Sunday institution; but the Judiciary has gone further than either the Legislative or the Executive. Until now there has been a question whether Sunday legislation would be sustained by the Supreme Court; whether that tribunal would not hold it to be in violation of the First Amendment; but that question is now settled. The Supreme Court has said that even though it be a religious institution, and even though religious convictions are the potent influence in securing the legislation, it is within the legitimate power of legislatures and must be sustained as a

civil institution. Processes of the mind are alone free from governmental regulation; and religious liberty in the United States is only a name.

McKINLEY ON SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

UNDER the heading of "A Decided Opinion by Major McKinley," the *New York Sun*, of May 25, prints the following:—

At a meeting of the Brooklyn Philosophical Association yesterday afternoon, held in the Long Island Business College in that city, one of the speakers asserted that her father had told her that Major William McKinley had once expressed to him a decided opinion, and this, too, at a time when he was running for governor:

"I am," said Major McKinley to the lady's father, "in favor of Sunday legislation and a strict observance of the Christian sabbath."

Mr. McKinley's prominence in the presidential race makes this utterance especially significant.

THE CLIMAX APPROACHING.

[*Journal (New York), June 9.*]

THE awful tragedy that has been swiftly approaching its climax in Armenia during the past two years is likely to be finished, in one way or another, before the end of this year, or of the next at the latest. Either torture, outrage, degradation and massacre will have wiped out everything that makes the Armenian people worth persecuting, or some means of rescue will have been found.

The hope of European armed intervention is practically extinct. Russia will not consent to a joint interference, and England is not sufficiently unselfish to invite her to interfere alone. Whatever is done for the salvation of the Armenians must be done by peaceful means.

CONSCIENCE AND SABBATH.

BY A. H. LEWIS, D. D.

THE average American citizen has no conscience in the matter of Sabbath-observance. The question has been so long treated as a subordinate one, and the human and utilitarian element has been made so prominent, that even religious men have little conscience in the matter. Customs and prevalent modes of teaching have combined to put Sabbath-observance outside the realm of *religious duty*, in a very large degree. The mere "rest-day" theory is a popular one, *i. e.*, if body or brain need rest, it is well to rest. Upon this theory it is easy to invent methods of resting (?) which will gratify worldly tastes and desires, and benumb conscience. Upon the same low plane is the average notion concerning church going and religious culture. Popular opinion says, if there be a service conveniently near, where music and oratory will entertain one, it is a pleasant way of spending a part of a leisure day; but if the music be second class and the preaching common-place, there is little or no conscience to compel men even to attend service on their "rest-day." The "rest-day" theory does not necessarily, nor usually, involve the idea of *sacred time*, or of a divine obligation in the matter of Sabbath-keeping.

The church and the pulpit are in no small degree responsible for this state of things.

One would think from much of the current discussion on the question that even Christian men are loth to discuss the Sabbath from a religious point of view, so much do men plead with railroads and pleasure seekers about the "utility of a rest-day." We do not object to these lower elements in the discussion, but they are merely secondary; and if men make these the prominent, or foundation idea, all conscience as of duty toward God is at an end. The same is true when the "civil sabbath" is made the prominent thing. Religious conscience is neither awakened nor cultivated by an appeal to civil law. If the church does not take high religious ground, the world will certainly drift far away from it. The work of awakening the latent conscience of the people, if it exists, or of cultivating, creating it, must be done by the church, if it is done at all. Evils do not cure themselves. A revival of Sabbathism will never be obtained on the "rest-day" theory of utilitarianism, nor the testimony of medical experts, and managers of street car service. Conscience toward God alone will form the permanent foundation for such a revival. Even the resolutions of synods and conferences, and the wisdom of creed-makers will prove useless, unless the masses are trained to a higher religious conception of the Sabbath as a divine and especially religious institution. It would not be far from the entire truth to say that one of the first steps toward reform is the creating of a conscience on the Sabbath issues.

Sunday-Law Civilisation Dramatically Illustrated.

Brief Sketch, with Moral.

SCENE is located in the city of Columbus, Ga. Georgia is the banner State for Sunday "laws" (has a "law" which makes the Sunday laborer liable to fine of \$1,000, and a year in the chain-gang). Scene presents to us a negro prisoner in the court room, charged with rape. Judge and court officials are present, and proceeding in legal form to impanel a jury to try the prisoner. (Sudden interruption.) Enter mob of "best citizens" undisguised, who take forcible possession of prisoner and drag him away before the judge's eyes. Mob drag prisoner through the street; shooting him meanwhile, and hang him to tree in prominent part of city. Next proceed to city jail, break in and secure another negro prisoner and hang him to same tree. Mob disperses, leaving bodies. No arrests. "Parties unknown."

Moral.—Give us Sunday "laws" to make the people moral and teach them respect for law and order.



TREAT YOUR CATARRH WITH THE "SUCCESS" NASAL SYRINGE

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

\$1. Address, A. MALLETT, 39 Bond Street, New York City.



THE "CYCLONE" STILL WHIRLS Sweeping Everything Clean Before It.

SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY:

Susanville, Cal. Messrs. Coon Bros.:—The Cyclone Washing machine that I received January 5, 1896, is entirely satisfactory. I like it even better than I had supposed I could. I have some orders now without soliciting. Yours truly, Mrs. E. L. LYSINGER.

Address,

COON BROS., Battle Creek, Mich.

: : BIBLES

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 7¼ 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.

THE STOMACH

Its Disorders and How to Cure Them

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Superintendent of the Battle Creek (Mich.) Sanitarium; Member of the British and American Association for the Advancement of Science; the American Microscopical Society; the Society of Hygiene, of France. Author of the Home Hand-book of Domestic Hygiene and Rational Medicine, etc.

This Book Presents in a Nut-shell What Every Person Ought to Know About the Stomach, Its Functions in Health, the Symptoms Produced by Disease, and the Best Methods of Cure

The Work is Thoroughly Practical.

The work concludes with an explanation of the new and elaborate method of investigating disorders of the stomach, in use at the Battle Creek Sanitarium, and largely the result of researches undertaken there. The following is a list of the leading sections of the book: The Organs of Digestion; Foods; the Digestive Fluids; General View of the Digestive Process; The Maladies of the Modern Stomach; Important New Discoveries Relating to Digestion; Symptoms of Dyspepsia; Quacks and Nostrums; Explanation of the Author's Graphic Mode of Representing the Results of Stomach Work, Obtainable from Examination of the Stomach Fluid by the System of Investigation Employed in the Hygienic and Research Laboratories of the Sanitarium at Battle Creek, Mich., U. S. A.

The work contains over one hundred cuts, including eleven plates, several of which are colored. Price of the book, bound in fine English cloth, with embossed cover, \$1.50. Half-binding, gilt edges, \$2.00.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

39 Bond Street, New York City.

Kansas City, Mo.

Oakland, Cal.

THE INTERLINEAR LITERAL TRANSLATION

OF THE

GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

WITH

The Authorized Version conveniently presented in the margins for ready reference

And with the various readings of the editions of Elzevir 1624, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth.

Price, Postpaid,

\$3.00

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

43 Bond Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, JUNE 18, 1896.

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

No Paper Next Week.

As this number of the SENTINEL completes the first half of the volume for 1896, we shall issue no paper next week. Number 26 will bear date of July 2. It will be a specially interesting and attractive number, containing at least three illustrations, instead of only one as is usually the case.

BETTER order a few extra copies of the SENTINEL of July 2; you will want them for your friends. They will cost you only 1 cent apiece if sent to you, or you can send us five cents for each four copies and we will wrap and mail them to the addresses which you furnish.

A MAN in Jersey City was fined \$2 last week for selling a box of sardines on Sunday.

UNUSUALLY stirring times are just ahead of us, and everybody ought to be reading the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

THE National Reformers were never so active as they are now, and every friend of liberty of conscience ought to be on the alert to counteract so far as possible the influence of their work.

REMEMBER that the SENTINEL of July 2 will be a specially attractive number and ought to have a wide circulation, for it will be filled with matter of interest to everybody.

As our readers are aware, one honest Christian man is already undergoing imprisonment at Tiptonville, Lake County, Tenn., for fidelity to his conscientious convictions of duty in the matter of Sabbath observance. Four other men of like character will appear for trial July 13, and will in all probability not only be imprisoned, but compelled to work in a chain-gang. The SENTINEL is arranging not only to have full reports of these trials and of any subsequent proceedings, but to publish a number of illustrations in connection therewith.

It will be remembered that some months since Ira Babcock, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Greensboro, North Carolina, was arrested, charged with working on Sunday; but as it was not clear that there was any statute in North Carolina forbidding private Sunday work, the charge was changed to one of "disturbing public worship," when it reached the District Court, notwithstanding

the fact that there was not a shadow of ground upon which to base such a charge. We are informed that the case has recently been dismissed. This outcome is doubtless due to the active interest taken in this matter by the International Religious Liberty Association.

When the case was first called in the District Court the latter part of last February, the authorities were not disposed to give Mr. Babcock any show whatever. But when the best attorney in the county was put in charge of the case, and it was seen that Mr. Babcock would not tamely submit to injustice, the program was changed; the case was continued to the next term of court, and has now been dismissed at it ought to have been at first.

"A SIGNIFICANT DECISION."

By all means read the article, "A Significant Decision," on page 197. This is the most far-reaching Sunday-law decision ever rendered by an American court. It is just such a decision as might have been expected to follow Judge Brewer's "casual *obiter dictum*" of February 29, 1892, and is closely related to it in logic and effect. We shall have more to say about it in our next issue.

PERSECUTION FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE.

It will be remembered that in April C. A. Gordon and wife, two Seventh-day Adventists, of Eagle Township, Ark., were arrested for "sabbath-breaking," and were sent to jail by a justice of the peace, notwithstanding the fact that the statutes of that State provide that observers of the seventh day shall have the right to work on Sunday.

These Seventh-day Adventists were hired out with other convicts, and were required to work on the Sabbath. When the facts were brought to the attention of the governor he promptly "pardoned" them. The following letter, which appears in the *Arkansas Reporter*, of May 28, a local Seventh-day Adventist paper, tells the sequel:—

May 11, 1896.

It has been some time since you heard from me. I have had a little trouble in securing a place to work. On being released from prison I returned home only to find my portion of land re-rented and my household goods removed and the house possessed by another family. I had to accept this condition of things or enter a law suit, with all chances against me. I concluded to move. We are now within four miles of the city. I will try to get employment among some Seventh-day Adventist for myself and wife, for persecution still holds up its prejudiced head. My wife was in her house doing some hand-sewing, a woman passed and told her it was against the law to do anything on Sunday, and that she would be arrested if she did not stop.

To reserve the right to not work on Saturday makes it difficult to secure work. For this cause I must work for Sabbath-keepers.

CHESTER GORDON.

It will be seen that while the legal right of Sabbatarian Christians to work on Sunday is recognized in Arkansas, Seventh-day Adventists in that State are by no means free from

persecution. If such a thing as this were to happen to some Sunday-keeper because he worked on the seventh day, what a cry of persecution would go up from the friends of Sunday everywhere!

In order that Sunday-keepers may be "protected," they must even have "laws" forbidding anybody else to work; but the Seventh-day Adventist must suffer not only legal but petty persecution for keeping the Sabbath, and is denied even his legal rights.

J. W. LEWIS, the Seventh-day Adventist, imprisoned at Tiptonville, Tenn., for obeying the fourth commandment just as it reads, writes us that at the conclusion of his trial two ministers were at the jail to see that he was "thrust into the cage, which is the inner prison." We presume if there had been stocks they would have seen to having his feet made fast in them.

One of these ministers has discovered that the International Religious Liberty Association, which has been looking after Mr. Lewis' interests, is composed of infidels, and that Ingersoll ought to be its president! For the information of this minister, as well as others who may not be aware of the facts, we print herewith the Declaration of Principles of the International Religious Liberty Association:—

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ. We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.

We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

The object of the International Religious Liberty Association is thus stated in its constitution:—

The object of this Association shall be to protect the rights of conscience; to maintain a total separation between religion and the civil government; and by means of the platform and the press to educate the public mind on the relations that should exist between the Church and the State.

Article 3 of the same instrument provides that—

All persons approving these objects, and who will subscribe to the Declaration of Principles, may be members of this Association by the payment of one dollar, and an annual due thereafter of one dollar.

Evidently the Tennessee preacher has not been as fully informed concerning the Religious Liberty Association as he ought to have been before attempting to tell others about it.

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.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.