Chapter 3

The Seventh-day Adventist Church and Religious Liberty in Australia: 1885-1900

Donald E. Hansen

Religious liberty is not ordinarily regarded as one of the more significant issues in late nineteenth century Australian history. Most general accounts of the period do not make even passing reference to the subject, and few of the more specialised works dealing with religious developments give it much attention.[1] Nor is this comparative silence unjustified, for on the surface little seems to have happened to suggest that the subject is worthy of greater consideration. Few contemporaries seem to have feared for their basic freedoms, and the legislative operations of the time were not the kind which would arouse feelings of apprehension among ordinary people. But it would be a mistake to confuse absence of change with inactivity, or to assume that a peaceful conclusion implies that the peace was never under threat. For in the period 1885-1900 a small number of militant churchmen, sharing the general clerical dream of a Christian Australia and hoping to bring the dream to reality, adopted tactics which seriously threatened the religious liberty of many, if not all Australians. This paper examines the more repressive actions of these men, and the part Seventh-day Adventists played in frustrating their purpose.

Quite apart from any feelings which the Adventist presence and the spread of Adventist teachings might have engendered, it was almost inevitable that any challenge to religious liberty in Australia would centre on the question of Sunday observance. Three things contributed to this probability. First, there was a solid core of puritanical clergymen in the Australian colonies; men who eschewed evil and were intent on having society conform to their views. These churchmen persistently attacked the worldly pleasures which many Australians seemed to find irresistibly attractive: the consumption of alcoholic beverages, gambling of any kind, and Sunday profanation, the latter being defined as participation in any business or pleasurable activities on what was called the Lord's Day. All these evils were deplored, but Sunday profanation aroused the special indignation of the clergy, for it not only smacked of the dreaded Continental Sunday,[2] but was thought to be inimical to church attendance.[3]

As W. W. Phillips has observed, by the 1880s such churchmen as Archdeacon R. King and his fellow Anglican cleric Dean W. M. Cowper, the Presbyterian J. Walker, and the liberally-minded Congregationalist Dr. T. Roseby were of the opinion that "the

Christian Sunday had lately become essential to the preservation of Christianity itself . . . ."[4] In their estimation, if Australia was ever to become the Christian (by which they meant the churchgoing) country of their dream, Sunday would have to be properly observed by the whole community, not just the faithful few.

The second circumstance which directed attention to the day of worship was that Australia had inherited two very repressive Sunday laws from "merrie England." The first, enacted in 1677 during the reign of Charles II, stated:[5]

> . . . that all and every person and persons whatsoever shall, on every Lord's day, apply themselves thereon in the dutyes of piety and true religion publiquely and privately, and that noe tradesmen, artificer, workman, labourer, or other persons whatsoever shall soe or exercise any wourldly labour, business, or worke of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day or any part thereof (workes of necessity and charity only excepted). And that every person being of the age of fourteen yeares or upwards offending in the premises shall for every such offense forfeit the sum of 5/-
> . . . .

Any persons convicted under this Act who refused or were unable to pay the fine were to be imprisoned in the stocks for two hours. This Act was intended to prevent work on Sundays. The second measure—the 1780 Sunday Observance Act—was intended to prevent pleasure. The relevant section of the 1780 Act stated that any:[6]

> . . . house, room or other place which shall be opened or used for publick entertainment or amusement . . . upon any part of the Lord's Day . . . and to which persons shall be admitted by the payment of money or by tickets sold for money, shall be deemed a disorderly house or place.

Keepers of these houses or places, and certain other persons, could be subject to substantial fines. According to the provisions of the 1828 Australian Courts Act, both these Acts were valid in New South Wales which meant, in effect, all of Eastern Australia.[7]

The third factor which directed colonial attention to Sunday observance was the progressive appearance of a number of inter-denominational associations for that specific purpose. The oldest of these was the aptly if unimaginatively named Lord's Day Observance Society, founded in 1856 to combat contemporary demands for freer Sunday observance. After a few years of sporadic activity the Society fell into decay,[8] but was re-established in 1880, and was functioning in most colonies in 1885 when the Adventist missionaries arrived. Members maintained that Australia was a Christian country and that its laws should therefore reflect Christian values and protect the Christians' day of worship. They wanted all places of amusement to be closed on Sundays, an end to Sunday public transport and all kinds of secular labour, and greater communal respect for the day.[9]

In June 1889 the revived Lord's Day Observance Society was joined by a new association—the Council of the Churches—formed in Sydney in response to a Presbyterian suggestion that the Protestant Churches in Australia unite to urge upon the community "a proper estimate of the sanctity of the Lord's Day."[10] Members, having come to believe like Dean Cowper, that "the right observance of the Christian Sabbath is the bulwark of religion in the land," aimed at suppressing all existing violations of the colony's Sunday laws and resisting any new attempts to secularize the day.[11] The Council included representatives from all the major churches except the Roman Catholic, and within a few years had spread to most of the colonies.

A further inter-denominational association appeared in November 1889 with the founding of the Evangelical Alliance, also in Sydney. The Alliance had a somewhat

broader platform than its contemporaries, aiming to make Christian influences and principles "more strongly felt in moulding the public as well as the social life of the community," but it shared the other associations' concern for the sanctity of Sunday.[12]

The successive appearance of these Church-sponsored organisations, having basically identical objectives, points to the strength of their founders' desire for a more obviously Christian community. Yet their very number suggests either feelings of clerical impotence or fears of community resistance, for if any one of them had been thought likely to be effective, there would have been lttle incentive for the formation of another. And in the event, only the Council of the Churches was to carry any real weight either with politicians or the general public.

As might be inferred from the perceived need for these associations, Australian society in the late colonial era was not noted for religious sentiment. Though statistics indicated that even in reputedly irreligious New South Wales some 49 per cent of adults attended church regularly in 1880, Australians overall were materialistic in outlook and secular in spirit, a people who valued respectability but showed considerable indifference to the higher things of life.[13] The Adventist missionaries' feeling that Australians might prove singularly unreceptive to their message was not, therefore, without foundation.[14]

American experience suggested that the dissemination of Adventist beliefs would arouse immediate opposition from the colonial clergy, and this proved to be the case. And the issue of religious liberty was also raised in the early days of the mission. At the time the Seventh-day Adventist concept of religious liberty and the issues it involved were determined by two things: Biblical interpretation and recent experience. Adventists had long believed that chapters 12 to 14 of Revelation foretold a period of world-wide religious persecution which was to begin in the United States, and occur just before the Second Advent.[15] In America they had witnessed two decades of determined effort "to restore the Christian character of the nation" by legislative action. They had seen the formation of a National Reform Association and its unsuccessful attempt to amend the Constitution. They had seen the "reformers" re-direct their attention to Sunday observance, the subsequent rigid enforcement of State Sunday Laws, the imprisonment of many fellow believers, and the failure of minority groups to secure exemption from oppressive religious legislation. And they had also seen the power of public opinion in dissuading authorities from enforcing Sunday laws.[16] So, when the Lord's Day Observance Society, on the eve of the 1885 Victorian election, appealed to people to vote only for candidates who were "in favour of enforcing by law the observance of Sunday" the missionaries, recalling the tactics their Church had employed in America, set out to educate the Australian people on the dangers of religious legislation.[17] The public-awareness campaign began with a trenchant editorial in what was the fourth issue of their monthly journal *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times,* and they followed this with further articles on religious liberty at more or less regular intervals.[18] Some of these discussed changes occurring in the United States, some explored the general problems of Church/State relations, and some dealt specifically with the developing situation in Australia.

As it turned out, the local situation was not wholly discouraging. Notwithstanding the proliferation of associations demanding stricter Sunday observance, Seventh-day Adventists found that the community was very much opposed to this kind of change. The combination of apathy to religion, antipathy to authoritarian decrees, and fondness

for freedom provided an almost impassable barrier to "Sabbath reform." So the Adventists, somewhat unexpectedly, found themselves backing a relatively popular cause. They had no need to place themselves in the forefront of the battle against the militant churchmen. Unbidden, the liberal-secularist forces assumed that position, leaving the Adventists to publicise the issue and supply the secularists with effective anti-Sunday law arguments.[19]

Reports appearing in the *Bible Echo* during and after 1889 indicate on the one hand a high level of Seventh-day Adventist anxiety caused by the determination of the churchmen to have the Lord's Day more strictly observed and, on the other hand, a comparable level of Seventh-day Adventist satisfaction at the opposition aroused in the community by all such proposals. A typical report told of a boisterous meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall on the night of October 30, 1889. The meeting was organised and supported by the secularists, but attracted large numbers of the reform group as well. A resolution in favour of a freer Sunday was negatived by the reformers, an amendment calling for a stricter Sunday was carried, and the meeting became a near riot. According to the *Bible Echo*, "The wild bulls of Bashan would have been frightened at the roaring and tumult produced by this enlightened and civilized audience,"[20] and the evening ended on a farcical note with the Mayor of the city declaring the meeting closed "in the interests of life and safety," and the chairman declaring it open, and expressing resentment at "the uncalled-for interference of his Honor."[21]

A somewhat less entertaining but rather more significant report appeared in the issue for July 1, 1890. It told how the Supreme Court in Sydney, delivering judgment on *Walker* v *Solomon*, had upheld the 1780 Act. But it also noted that the presiding judge, after passing sentence on Solomon for permitting Sunday concerts in the Criterion Theatre, had ". . . stated it as his opinion that the law had outlived its time, and should be modified so as to coincide with the altered sentiments of 'public feeling.'"[22] The report further observed that when a deputation from the Evangelical Alliance waited on the Minister of Justice to protest against any proposed changes to the law, the Minister informed the group that while an attempt should be made "to provide against the desecration of the Sabbath, . . . the opinions of the people should [also] be respected,[23] and he added pointedly that it was 'Better to allow them to attend some innocent place of amusement than spend the Sabbath in other and worse ways.'"[24]

But while political leaders were prepared to speak straightly to the churchmen, the government was not prepared to risk alienating the religious vote by repealing the 1780 Act. An editorial in the *Sydney Morning Herald* calling for repeal was ignored.[25] When three Sydney newspapers were sued under the same Act for advertising Sunday concerts, the government merely introduced legislation which permitted the penalties to be waived but left the Act intact.[26] This politically expedient but morally weak-kneed attitude led a member of the opposition, J. H. Want, to introduce a private members' bill providing for the Sunday opening of refreshment shops and some places of entertainment. The Council of the Churches responded with a massive campaign against the bill, securing 63,200 signatures for their petitions against liberalising the day. The churchmen made their point. Parliament was prorogued in December 1890; the bill lapsed and was not re-introduced, and notwithstanding further attempts to secure their repeal, the Acts remained law.[27]

Yet victories of this nature did nothing to endear the churchmen's programme to the community in general, and the growing feelings of latent hostility to reform surfaced

again in February 1894, when a deputation of clergymen from the Council of the Churches waited on the New South Wales Premier, Sir George Dibbs, to protest at Sunday entertainment in the Sydney Tivoli. Members of the deputation complained of the desecration of the British Sunday, prompting Dibbs to respond: "What is the British Sunday? I have heard of British beer, but not of British Sunday."[28] Asked if the day derived from "the two tables of stone," the members agreed, only to have Dibbs inform them that this idea was "out of court."[29] He dismissed them with the words: ". . . I tell you this, that, pious Christians as we all are, when we start to straight-lace the Sabbath too much, we do more harm than good."[30] That the Premier's remarks reflected the thinking of a large section of the community is suggested by two newspaper comments on his exchange with the churchmen. An article in the *Daily Telegraph,* scornfully observed that one of the clerics who had been particularly outspoken about the goings-on at the Tivoli did not even know where the theatre was located, while his colleagues, asked to reveal the last time they had been there, had "unanimously denied ever having been near it. They [had] sent others, they said."[31] This was followed by an editorial in the *Australian Star* which answered the Premier's facetious question "What is the British Sunday?" in a way which the Adventists themselves could scarcely have bettered:[32]

> The real British Sunday, or 'Sabbath', as its admirers prefer to mis-call it, means the galleries and museums closed; the churches open for one day in the week, but not filled; the public houses also open, but fairly crowded; every game and healthy exercise forbidden; all music silenced in the public gardens. And therefore, in the large towns, for the majority of people the only alternatives are the church or the tavern; both, perhaps, monotonous, and one almost certain to be dull. The British 'Sabbath', then, is a day of gloom and idleness, to say nothing of hypocrisy. . .
>
> . . . The Sabbath, as we should all know, is the seventh day of the Jews, our present Saturday, the day of rest ordained for God and man. . . . There is no evidence whatever in the Bible that the obligations of the old Sabbath were transferred to the new Sunday; and the evidence from history is all the other way. . . .
>
> A divine law we will obey as far as our frailty admits; but a human tyranny, especially one imposed by an interested class, we shall resist. We only resist at present by demanding the authority on which Puritan and straight-laced divines claim to transfer the obligations of the Sabbath, as well as its name, to another day; and to impose those obligations on a Christian people. We know they are wrong about the name; and now we challenge them about the obligations.

On this, as on most previous occasions, notwithstanding public opinion the Council of the Churches had the law on its side, and after due investigation the Premier ordered the Tivoli and other theatres to be closed on Sundays. But his sympathies were clearly with the secularists, as the sequel to the clerical visit made apparent. In bringing their complaints to the Premier, the churchmen had insisted that their protest was based on the 1780 Act with its provision against charges for Sunday entertainment. Some weeks later Dibbs neatly utilised the same argument against the churchmen. When the Rev. Philip Moses announced his intention of using the Royal Standard Theatre for Sunday night religious services, the Premier graciously advised him that the Act not only precluded him from making any admission charges, but also prevented his sending around the collection plate in the usual way.[33]

With public sentiment becoming more openly hostile to stricter Sunday observance, there was a predictable reaction to the 7 May, 1894, announcement that two Sydney Seventh-day Adventists—William and Charles Firth of Kellyville—had been sen-

tenced to the stocks for working on Sunday.[34] According to Stephen McCullagh, the *Bible Echo's* Sydney correspondent, all Sydney's leading dailies were "unanimous in a vigorous outburst of indignation at the disgraceful prosecution of the Adventists,"[35] while in Melbourne the *Argus*, with intentional overstatement, observed that: ". . . if every [Sunday] offender were punished in the old form, the sorely diminished state forests would soon cease to yield a sufficient supply of timber for the manufacture of stocks."[36] The official Seventh-day Adventist response to the Firths' conviction was to organise two massive protest meetings in the Parramatta Town Hall. About five hundred people attended each of these meetings, and heard a number of Adventist speakers elaborate upon the dangers of permitting churches to exercise civil power, and compel authorities to enforce Sunday laws.[37] But it was the appearance of yet another religio-political association, not the relatively isolated prosecution of church members, that most disturbed Seventh-day Adventists in 1894.

The association in question was the Christian Electors' Association, founded late in 1893 by the Council of the Churches in New South Wales to ensure that persons elected to Parliament be men of Christian character with ". . . a sincere desire for the moral elevation of the nation."[38] Adventists feared the outworking of these ostensibly pious sentiments, and saw the new organization as a serious threat to civil and religious liberty in Australia. Their response was to publish a new quarterly journal, the *Australian Sentinel and Herald of Liberty, (later the Southern Sentinel)*, with the intention of informing the Australian people of the dangers implicit in any union of Church and State. The *Sentinel*, edited by A. G. Daniells, a dynamic American minister, writer and church administrator, reflected the thinking of many Australians, and was an immediate success. The first issue, dated May 1894, attracted unusually favourable comments in the secular press, and by 1897 the journal had the remarkable circulation figures of 4000 per quarter.[39]

Given this additional outlet, and with the recently-arrived W. A. Colcord, an authority in the field of religious liberty to help direct operations, Seventh-day Adventists in Australia intensified their campaign against Sunday legislation. At the same time they assumed an additional and more exacting responsibility: watchdog over the religious portions of the Australian Constitution which was then being drafted.

There were two areas of the Constitution which particularly interested Seventh-day Adventists. One was a demand, backed by the major churches, for a statement in the preamble to the Constitution recognising God's sovereignty over the nations. The actual words of the proposed statement varied according to the source and the time, but the 1897 New South Wales Council of the Churches' version was more or less typical. This version expressed the hope:[40]

> That in the preamble of the Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth it be recognised that God is the Supreme Ruler of the world, and the ultimate source of all law and authority in nations.

The other religious article was a draft statement guaranteeing that the Federal Parliament would not interfere with the religious freedom of the Australian people.[41] Not surprisingly, Seventh-day Adventists opposed the first of these provisions, and supported the second. Their basic problem with a recognition statement was their fear that any such statement would open the way for the Commonwealth to legislate at some future time on matters of religion, and they were not alone in expressing this fear.[42] Edmund Barton, for example, in debate on the recognition issue, commented: "I have all

along thought that it is, to a certain extent, a danger to insert words of this kind in the preamble," adding that it "might be construed as a peg on which to hang such further decision or such further enactment,"[43] and Henry Higgins, well-briefed by Daniells and Colcord,[44] observed: "There is a danger in these words, if we are to look to the precedent of the United States. . . . I find, on looking up a number of decisions in the United States, that it has been held again and again that because of certain expressions, words, phrases used in the Constitution, inferential powers are conferred upon Congress, that go beyond any dream we have at present."[45] There was, therefore, some support within the Convention for the Adventist position, and the Adventists worked mightily to win further support outside.

For the greater part of 1897 they organised public meetings, sent information to the secular press, interviewed politicians, printed and distributed tracts, published a flood of editorials and articles in the *Bible Echo* and the *Sentinel*, and called upon people everywhere to sign the petitions which they had drafted.[46] Of their activities at the time, Richard Ely has written:[47]

> There was about the Adventist campaign a professionalism, an efficient adjustment of small means to large ends, which the recognitionist effort mostly lacked. For a church that so vigorously and with such determination believed in the separation of Church and State, the Adventists played politics very well.

Not that the Adventists were alone in opposing the churchmen's plans; there was also a sizeable liberal-secularist element in society which supported the Adventist position but for very different reasons. Whereas the Adventists feared that a recognition statement might be used as a foundation for religious persecution, the liberals-secularists' opposition was based on principle. Those who believed in God, felt that recognition in the preamble to the Australian Constitution would add nothing to His glory; those who did not believe in Him could see no point in supporting recognition.[48]

Ultimately, the Adventists secured some 22,300 signatures for their petitions, but the Council of the Churches, employing the same tactics and working with the same feverish energy, secured approximately double that number.[49] What motivated such renowned churchmen as the Rev. Prof. L. Rentoul, the Rev. Prof. A. Harper, the Rev. J. Watsford and Archdeacon J. Langley was the perceived threat to their enduring dream of a Christian Australia.[50] They believed it was their God-given duty to safeguard the material and moral welfare of the community,[52] and they felt that the Lord would regard them as having betrayed His interests if they should fail to have Him acknowledged in a document of such fundamental importance as the Constitution. It seemed, therefore, that it was absolutely imperative for them to defeat the unholy secularist/Adventist alliance on this issue. And if the secularists had Higgins to promote their views in the Convention, the churchmen could count on such ardent religionists as the Roman Catholic Patrick Glynn and the Protestant Simon Fraser, as well as a number of others who were sensitive to the size of the denominational vote.[52]

Typically, the ultimate victors in this affray were neither the secularists nor the churchmen, but the politicians. Keen to please the unusually vociferous religious element in society, they deemed it expedient to insert a recognition statement in the Preamble to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, but made sure the statement was effectively innocuous. So they began the final version with the words:

> Whereas the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland and Tasmania, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown. . . .[53]

When this was announced the churchmen, doubtless grateful for small mercies, immediately claimed the victory and professed to be well pleased with the result.[54] Some of the secularists, failing to appreciate that the statement was basically a token gesture, were less well-pleased. Their reaction was indicated by the cynical contributions which appeared in the *Bulletin*, a consistent advocate of "non-recognition." A typically picturesque verse proceeded:

The news was spread at night. Alone
I lifted up my eager eyes,
And saw the constellation blaze
And heard a cheering round the throne.

The article on religious freedom also saw the politicians come out on top. When discussion terminated, what was to become Section 116 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act read as follows:[56]

> The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth.

On the surface, this article appeared to give victory to the secularist/Adventist forces, but its weakness, as the *Bible Echo* promptly pointed out, was that it left the States free to make religious laws and enforce religious observances.[57] Perhaps because of this legal loophole, Section 116 of the Constitution elicited no verses from aspiring Commonwealth poets, secularist or otherwise. So the great issue of the day was resolved to the satisfaction of the politicians and the bulk of the Australian people, leaving the outmanoeuvred combatants to concentrate more fully on the still fruitful field of existing Sunday legislation.[58]

In the circumstances, continued conflict in this area was probably unavoidable. The churchmen, convinced that they were doing God service, were determined to use the law to prevent people from working on Sundays, and the Adventists, determined to obey the divine injunction "Six days shalt thou labour . . . ," and unable to afford two rest days per week, were not disposed to be conciliatory, though they tried to perform their Sunday tasks out of the public eye.[59]

There was, however, little further political confrontation between the churchmen and the Adventists because in June, 1899, Mrs. E. G. White, the enormously influential prophet-figure of the Adventist Church, then resident in Cooranbong, N.S.W., wrote a "Special Testimony Relating to Politics."[60] This testimony referred to those who were using their influence to repress religious liberty and compel Sunday observance, and urged Adventists not to vote such men into office. God's people, the testimony stated, were to take no part in political strife. Rather they were to "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." This admonition was heeded and Adventists in Australia, having lobbied the politicians very effectively to that time, quietly withdrew from the political arena.

What, then, can be said of the Seventh-day Adventist contribution to the controversy over religious liberty in the last fifteen years of the colonial era in Australia? First, it should be noted that they neither initiated the controversy, nor chose its central issues. Their activities were simply responses to the exigencies of the local situation. Thus, while their published statements indicate a clear understanding of the wider implications of religious liberty, in Australia they were compelled, for the most part, to concentrate on its temporal aspects.[61] Freedom to worship on the seventh day of the week and labour on the first became the all-important issue, with most other matters being pushed aside.

Second, it is evident that Seventh-day Adventists did not succeed in having any re-

ligious legislation rescinded. Notwithstanding an increasingly informed public opinion and many expressions of legal and political distaste for Sunday laws, these repressive and outmoded edicts remained on the Statute books. Yet the Adventist publicity which attended all attempts to invoke or strengthen Sunday legislation unquestionably tempered the enthusiasm with which the laws were administered, and encouraged politicians to resist the persistent demands of those who wanted even more stringent regulations.

Third, as a result of their American experience, Seventh-day Adventists were able to provide the secularist forces, and Higgins in particular, with valuable resource material during the battle with the militant churchmen over the Constitution. And if neither side could rightly claim the victory, the resultant compromise clearly ended any thoughts which the churchmen may have had of using the legislature to promote their private brand of righteousness to make Australia a Christian country.

Perhaps, during these formative years in Australia, Seventh-day Adventist attitudes to religious liberty seem to have been somewhat self-centred and inward-looking. This much may be admitted. But it should also be pointed out that in defending their own rights and liberties, Seventh-day Adventists really did speak for the wider Australian community. And by drawing attention to the issues involved in the stricter Sunday campaign, they helped to maintain the religious *status quo*, and thereby rendered the whole country a useful and enduring service.

ENDNOTES

[1] Notable exceptions are R. Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, (Melbourne University Press, 1976) and W. W. Phillips, *Defending "a Christian Country": Churchmen and Society in New South Wales in the 1880s and After* (St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1981). I am indebted to both these authors for material presented in this paper.

[2] The Continental Sunday involved the opening of shops, restaurants, theatres, and other places of amusement and entertainment.

[3] Note that Australian churchmen had long postulated a close relationship between Christianity and church attendance. Hence, when they spoke of a Christian Australia, they also meant a churchgoing Australia.

[4] Cited in Phillips, *Defending "a Christian Country"*, p. 188.

[5] Cited in *BE*, 14 May 1894, p. 146.

[6] Cited in *Halsbury's Statutes of England*, 3rd ed; vol. 8, (London: Butterworth, 1969), p. 35.

[7] Cited in H. B. Bignold, *Imperial Statutes in Force in New South Wales*, (Sydney: Law Book Company of Australasia, 1913), p. 31.

[8] Phillips, *Defending "a Christian Country"*, p. 175.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Minutes of Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia in the State of New South Wales, 1889, Minute 112.

[11] Cited in Phillips, *Defending "a Christian Country"*, p. 188.

[12] Ibid., p. 73.

[13] W. W. Phillips, "Religious Profession and Practice in New South Wales, 1850-1901: The Statistical Evidence," *Historical Studies* 15(1972):388.

[14] See, for example, S. Ross Goldstone, *The Angel Said Australia* (Warburton, Vic.: Signs Publishing Company, 1980), p. 16.

[15] See, for example, U. Smith, *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* (Battle Creek, Mi.: Review and Herald, 1881).

[16] These developments are discussed in E. Syme, *A History of S.D.A. Church-State Relations in the United States* (Mountain View, Ca.: Pacific Press, 1973), Chapters 2 and 3.

[17] *BE*, vol. 1, no. 4, April 1886, p. 56. Note, however, that this recommendation was in no way a response to the Seventh-day Adventist presence in Victoria.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Note that the term "secularist" does not necessarily denote unbelief.

[20] *BE*, 15 November 1889, p. 352.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid., 1 July 1890, p. 197.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Phillips, *Defending "a Christian Country"*, p. 191.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., pp. 191, 192. In N.S.W. there were several unsuccessful attempts to repeal the Sunday Acts between 1894 and 1902. Ultimately the Acts remained on the Statute Books until 1966. See W. Phillips, "The Churches and the Sunday Question in Sydney in the 1880s," *JRH* 6(1970):41-61.

[28] *Daily Telegraph*, 17 February 1894.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid., 19 February 1894.

[32] *Australian Star*, 22 February 1894.

[33] *Argus*, 16 May 1894.

[34] See, for example, the report in *The Age* (Melbourne), 8 May 1894. The sentence was not carried out as no stocks were available for the purpose.

[35] *BE*, 21 May 1894, p. 158.

[36] *Argus*, 9 May 1894.

[37] *BE*, 11 June 1894, pp. 177-78; 18 June 1894, pp. 185-87.

[38] Cited Ibid., 2 April 1894, p. 98.

[39] Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, p. 29. Note that the Australian *Sentinel* was modelled on another Seventh-day Adventist publication the *American Sentinel*.

[40] Cited *Southern Sentinel* (Third Quarter, 1897):34.

[41] See Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, p. 1, for the original version of this statement.

[42] Ibid., p. 27.

[43] Cited in W. A. Colcord, *The Rights of Man*, (Melbourne: Signs Publishing Company, 1913), p. 163.

[44] For an indication of Colcord's contribution to Higgins' arguments, see Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, chapters 8-11.

[45] Colcord, *The Rights of Man*, pp. 163-64.

[46] Note that the actual form of the Adventist petitions changed as the campaign developed. See *BE*, 29 March 1897, p. 97 and Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, p. 43.

[47] Ely, *Unto God and Caesar*, pp. 44-45.

[48] On this point, note the comment of a speaker at an earlier gathering of churchmen: "they might as well be called on to express a belief in the solar system" as support a statement recognising God. Cited Ibid., p. 10.

[49] Ibid., p. 45.

[50] Statements made by these and other clergymen are cited in *Southern Sentinel* 3(Third Quarter 1897):37-39; *Southern Sentinel* 3(Fourth Quarter 1897):50.

[51] Ely *Unto God and Caesar*, p. 40.

[52] Ibid., p. 74.

[53] Cited ibid., p. XI.

[54] Ibid., ch. 13.

[55] Cited ibid., p. 74.

[56] Cited ibid., p. XI.

[57] *BE*, 14 March 1898, p. 88.

[58] Note that the churchmen, increasingly aware of public opinion, became correspondingly cautious regarding their choice of targets. By the late 1890's, Seventh-day Adventists and Chinese nurserymen were deemed to be the most appropriate targets for Sunday laws.

[59] The Seventh-day Adventist emphasis on country living stems largely from this desire for seclusion.

[60] This testimony appears in full in E. G. White, *Fundmentals of Christian Education* (Nashville, Tn: Southern Publishing Association, 1923), pp. 475-484.

[61] For a contemporary Seventh-day Adventist statement (1889) on religious liberty see *SDA Enc*, rev. ed., s.v. "Religious Liberty."