

The Sabbath Sentinel

JANUARY, 1981

"Go set a watchman,
Let him declare what he seeth."
ISAIAH 21:6





Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Defines Religious Discrimination More Clearly



THE SABBATH SENTINEL is published monthly by the Bible Sabbath Association, Route 1, Box 197, Fairview, Oklahoma 73737. USPS 474-580. Single copy, 50¢; year subscription (in the U.S.), \$5.00. Bible Sabbath Association members receive this magazine as part of their annual membership dues. Second class postage paid in Cleveland, Tennessee 37311. **Postal Employees:** Send forms 3579 to Box 1207, Cleveland, Tennessee 37311. Vol. 33, No. 1; Issue No. 285.

THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION of the U.S. Government, after a two-year study that began with public hearings on religious discrimination held in several cities, has issued Religious Discrimination Guidelines 3970. These became effective last November 1, replacing prior guidelines.

While the new rules reduce possible remedies for accommodating Sabbathkeepers, they spell out more clearly how these accommodations are to be accomplished. The obligation on the part of an employer starts when an employee notifies management that he needs to be accommodated. Only the fact that "undue hardship" to the employer would result from granting the request is considered justification for refusing it.

The main areas covered by the new ruling include:

1. Pre-employment questioning—Employers are obligated to attempt to accommodate prospective employees to the same extent that they accommodate those who are already employed.

2. Flexible work schedules are recommended wherever possible.

3. Making up lost time—Employers should arrange for an employee to do this if practical.

4. Lateral transfers. Employers should, wherever possible, arrange for lateral transfers if they cannot arrange make-up time.

5. Voluntary substitutes—Employers and labor organizations, along with the employee, bear some of the responsibility for seeing if voluntary substitutes can do the work.

6. Sabbath tests—If practical, employers should make arrangements for Sabbatharians to take them another day.

7. Cost of arrangements for accommodating—If the employer has to pay premium wages or has temporary costs for a brief period, these are not to be considered as

exceeding the *de minimus* provision of the rules.

8. Seniority—Employers and labor organizations are urged to provide accommodations in collective bargaining agreements where seniority systems would otherwise prevent them.

During the previously mentioned hearings commission members learned, among other things, that the *Trans World Airlines v. Hardison* case had caused widespread confusion concerning how much an employer must accommodate the religious practices of employees. In some cases, employers were not recognizing the need for time off to observe a holy day, the commission discovered. Though many employers testifying at the hearings voiced their concern regarding such accommodations, very few problems came up in actual practice.

Realizing the importance of this document, we are publishing it with only a few minor omissions. We urge readers to file it for reference if they are faced with discrimination because of their belief. We feel, however, that this plea for Sabbatharians to use the Golden Rule, sounded in the November 27, 1980 issue of *Advent Review*, is wise:

"If genuine undue hardship exists . . . [Sabbatarian] workers should not try to force accommodation. But where inflexibility and arbitrary rules are used by employers to avoid accommodation of Sabbath privileges the new EEOC guidelines can be used to help employers see their obligations. Remember, always apply Christ's golden rule."



Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Religious Discrimination Guidelines

13970

[¶ 3970.01]

§ 1605.1 “Religious” nature of a practice or belief.

In most cases whether or not a practice or belief is religious is not at issue. However, in those cases in which the issue does exist, the Commission will define religious practices to include moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views. This standard was developed in *United States v. Seeger*, 380 U.S. 163 (1965) and *Welsh v. United States*, 398 U.S. 333 (1970). The Commission has consistently applied this standard in its

decisions. The fact that no religious group espouses such beliefs or the fact that the religious group to which the individual professes to belong may not accept such belief will not determine whether the belief is a religious belief of the employee or prospective employee. The phrase “religious practice” as used in these Guidelines includes both religious observances and practices, as stated in Section 701(j), 42 U.S.C. 2000e(j).

[¶ 3970.02]

§ 1605.2 Reasonable accommodation without undue

hardship as required by Section 701(j) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(a) Purpose of this section.

This section clarifies the obligation imposed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, (sections 701(j), 703 and 717) to accommodate the religious practices of employees and prospective employees. This section does not address other obligations under Title VII not to discriminate on grounds of religion, nor other provisions of Title VII. This section is not intended to limit any additional obligations to accommodate religious practices which may exist pursuant to constitutional, or other statutory provisions; neither is it intended to provide guidance for statutes which require accommodation on bases other than religion such as § 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The legal principles which have been developed with respect to discrimination prohibited by Title VII on the bases of race, color, sex, and national origin also apply to religious discrimination in all circumstances other than where an accommodation is required.

(b) Duty to accommodate.

(1) Section 701(j) makes it an unlawful employment practice under § 703(a)(1) for an employer to fail to reasonably accommodate the religious practices of an employee or prospective employee, unless the employer demonstrates that accommodation would result in undue hardship on the conduct of its business.

(2) Section 701(j) in conjunction with § 703(c), imposes an obligation on a labor organization to reasonably accommodate the religious practices of an employee or prospective employee, unless the labor organization demonstrates that accommodation would result in undue hardship.

(3) Section 1605.2 is primarily directed to obligations of employers or labor organizations, which are the entities covered by Title VII that will most often be required to make an accommodation. However, the principles of Section 1605.2 also apply when an accommodation can be required of other entities covered by Title VII, such as employment agencies (§ 703(b)) or joint labor-management committees controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining (§ 703(d))....

(c) Reasonable Accommodation

(1) After an employee or prospective employee notifies the employer or labor organization of his or her need for a religious accommodation, the employer or labor organization has an obligation to reasonably accommodate the individual's religious practices. A refusal to accommodate is justified only when an employer or labor organization can demonstrate that an undue hardship would in fact result from each available alternative method of accommodation. A mere assumption that many more people, with the same religious practices as the person being accommodated, may also need accommodation is not evidence of undue hardship.

(2) When there is more than one method of accommodation available which would not cause undue hardship, the Commission will determine whether the accommodation offered is reasonable by examining:

(i) The alternatives for accommodation considered by the employer or labor organization; and

(ii) The alternatives for accommodation, if any, actually offered to the individual requiring accommodation. Some alternatives for accommodating religious practices might disadvantage the individual with respect to his or her

employment opportunities, such as compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment. Therefore, when there is more than one means of accommodation which would not cause undue hardship, the employer or labor organization must offer the alternative which least disadvantages the individual with respect to his or her employment opportunities.

(d) *Alternatives for Accommodating Religious Practices.*

(1) Employees and prospective employees most frequently request an accommodation because their religious practices conflict with their work schedules. The following subsections are some means of accommodating the conflict between work schedules and religious practices which the Commission believes that employers and labor organizations should consider as part of the obligation to accommodate and which the Commission will consider in investigating a charge. These are not intended to be all-inclusive. There are often other alternatives which would reasonably accommodate an individual's religious practices when they conflict with a work schedule. There are also employment practices besides work scheduling which may conflict with religious practices and cause an individual to request an accommodation.... The principles expressed in these Guidelines apply as well to such requests for accommodation.

(i) *Voluntary Substitutes and "Swaps."*

Reasonable accommodation without undue hardship is generally possible where a voluntary substitute with substantially similar qualifications is available. One means of substitution is the voluntary swap. In a number of cases, the securing of a substitute has been left entirely up to the individual seeking the accommodation. The Commission believes

that the obligation to accommodate requires that employers and labor organizations facilitate the securing of a voluntary substitute with substantially similar qualifications. Some means of doing this which employers and labor organizations should consider are: to publicize policies regarding accommodation and voluntary substitution; to promote an atmosphere in which such substitutions are favorably regarded; to provide a central file, bulletin board, or other means for matching voluntary substitutes with positions for which substitutes are needed.

(ii) *Flexible Scheduling.*

One means of providing reasonable accommodation for the religious practices of employees or prospective employees which employers and labor organizations should consider is the creation of a flexible work schedule for individuals requesting accommodation.

The following list is an example of areas in which flexibility might be introduced: flexible arrival and departure times; floating or optional holidays; flexible work breaks; use of lunch time in exchange for early departure; staggered work hours; and permitting an employee to make up time lost due to the observance of religious practices.

(iii) *Lateral Transfer and Change of Job Assignments.*

When an employee cannot be accommodated either as to his or her entire job or an assignment within the job, employers and labor organizations should consider whether or not it is possible to change the job assignment or give the employee a lateral transfer.

(2) *Payment of Dues to a Labor Organization.*

Some collective bargaining agreements include a provision that each employee must join the labor organization or pay the labor

organization a sum equivalent to dues. When an employee's religious practices do not permit compliance with such a provision, the labor organization should accommodate the employee by not requiring the employee to join the organization and by permitting him or her to donate a sum equivalent to dues to a charitable organization.

(e) *Undue Hardship.*

(1) Cost

An employer may assert undue hardship to justify a refusal to accommodate an employee's need to be absent from his or her scheduled duty hours if the employer can demonstrate that the accommodation would require "more than a *de minimis* cost." The Commission will determine what constitutes "more than a *de minimis* cost" with due regard given to the identifiable cost in relation to the size and operating cost of the employer, and the number of individuals who will in fact need a particular accommodation. In general, the Commission interprets this phrase as it was used in the *Hardison* decision to mean that costs similar to the regular payment of premium wages of substitutes, which was at issue in *Hardison*, would constitute undue hardship. However, the Commission will presume that the infrequent payment of premium wages for a substitute or the payment of premium wages while a more permanent accommodation is being sought are costs which an employer can be required to bear as a means of providing a reasonable accommodation. Further, the Commission will presume that generally, the payment of administrative costs necessary for providing the accommodation will not constitute more than a *de minimis* cost. Administrative costs, for example, include those costs involved in rearranging schedules and recording substitutions for payroll purposes.

(2) Seniority Rights. Undue hardship would also be shown where a variance from a bona fide seniority system is necessary in order to accommodate an employee's religious practices when doing so would deny another employee his or her job or shift preference guaranteed by that system. *Hardison, supra*, 432 U.S. at 80. Arrangements for voluntary substitutes and swaps (see paragraph (d)(1)(i) of this section—do not constitute an undue hardship to the extent the arrangements do not violate a bona fide seniority system. Nothing in the Statute or these Guidelines precludes an employer and a union from including arrangements for voluntary substitutes and swaps as part of a collective bargaining agreement.

[§ 3970.03]

§1605.3 Selection practices.

(a) Scheduling of Tests or Other Selection Procedures. When a test or other selection procedure is scheduled at a time when an employee or prospective employee cannot attend because of his or her religious practices, the user of the test should be aware that the principles enunciated in these guidelines apply and that it has an obligation to accommodate such employee or prospective employee unless undue hardship would result.

(b) Inquiries Which Determine An Applicant's Availability to Work During An Employer's Scheduled Working Hours.

(1) The duty to accommodate pertains to prospective employees as well as current employees. Consequently, an employer may not permit an applicant's need for a religious accommodation to affect in any way its decision whether to hire the applicant unless it can demonstrate that it cannot reasonably accommodate the

applicant's religious practices without undue hardship.

(2) As a result of the oral and written testimony submitted at the Commission's Hearings on Religious Discrimination, discussions with representatives of organizations interested in the issue of religious discrimination, and the comments received from the public on these Guidelines as proposed, the Commission has concluded that the use of preselection inquiries which determine an applicant's availability has an exclusionary effect on the employment opportunities of persons with certain religious practices. The use of such inquiries will, therefore, be considered to violate Title VII unless the employer can show that it:

(i) Did not have an exclusionary effect on its employees or prospective employees needing an accommodation for the same religious practices; or

(ii) Was otherwise justified by business necessity.

Employers who believe they have a legitimate interest in knowing the availability of their applicants prior to selection must consider procedures which would serve this interest and which would have a lesser exclusionary effect on persons whose religious practices need accommodation. An example of such a procedure is for the employer to state the normal work hours for the job and, after making it clear to the applicant that he or

she is not required to indicate the need for any absences for religious practices during the scheduled work hours, ask the applicant whether he or she is otherwise available to work those hours. Then, after a position is offered, but before the applicant is hired, the employer can inquire into the need for a religious accommodation and determine, according to the principles of these Guidelines, whether an accommodation is possible. This type of inquiry would provide an employer with information concerning the availability of most of its applicants, while deferring until after a position is offered the identification of the usually small number of applicants who require an accommodation.

(3) The Commission will infer that the need for an accommodation discriminatorily influenced a decision to reject an applicant when: (i) prior to an offer of employment the employer makes an inquiry into an applicant's availability without having a business necessity justification; and (ii) after the employer has determined the applicant's need for an accommodation, the employer rejects a qualified applicant. The burden is then on the employer to demonstrate that factors other than the need for an accommodation were the reason for rejecting the qualified applicant, or that a reasonable accommodation without undue hardship was not possible.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Auto repair facility, service station and home for sale—within ten miles of Spring Vale Academy, Owosso, Michigan. Also have a janitor supply business for sale. If interested in buying either business or entering partnership with Sabbath keepers, write Edwin Coulson, 5014 N. M52, Owosso, MI 48867. Live near while your young people are attending Spring Vale Academy.

CHRISTMAS—Greatest Story **Never** Told. Send for free copy. Lakewood Church Activities, P.O. Box 621, Lakewood, Ohio 44107.

Also there is a full sermon tape cassette program by Church of God International. For information send for list—H.T. Brunner, Rte. 2, Box 1306, Burleson, Texas 76028

What About The Sabbath?



WILBER M. FOOR

WHAT about God's original Sabbath day? Is it still in effect or does it matter?

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God . . ." (Exodus 20:8-10).

Was this abolished along with the old covenant, as many believe; or as others claim, is it still in full force? On both sides of the issue are many sincere folks who are thoroughly convinced that they are right. Yet who is right? Which side produces the strongest evidence in support of its claims?

Objections to the Sabbath

On one hand we have various beliefs of those who oppose keeping the Sabbath. They claim—

1. The Sabbath was given only to and for the Old Testament Jew. This is so because there is no reference to anyone's keeping it prior to the time it was given to them by Moses (approximately 2500 years) (Exodus 16:5-30).

2. It was given to the Israelites, not to us, as a reminder of their Egyptian bondage and deliverance (Deuteronomy 5:15; Ezekiel 20:10-12).

3. It was given to them (Israelites or Jews) as part of their law under the old covenant, which was terminated by Christ when He fulfilled (finished) the law (Matthew 5:17).

4. No one can keep the commandments; God never really intended that we should.

5. Only the moral precepts of the law were carried over into the New Testament, and because the Sabbath was ceremonial, it naturally was dropped. This is why New Testament writers, when writing about the Ten Commandments, always left out the Sabbath one; it no longer was to be observed.

6. All the commandments are a part of the law and because we are no longer under the law but under grace (Romans 6:14) they no longer apply.

7. The Sabbath was only a shadow of things to come and was nailed to the cross (Colossians 2:14-17).

8. Now under the new covenant, it doesn't matter which day we keep or if we keep any. "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it" (Romans 14:5, 6).

9. We keep all days holy, not just one; this eliminates the whole issue.

10. The Sabbath is not intended to be universal. In a very cold climate one could not keep it, because building a fire on that day was forbidden (Exodus 35:3). This proves again it was only for the ancient Jews.

11. Jesus didn't keep or care about the Sabbath while here on earth; He defended His disciples when they violated the Sabbath by unlawfully gathering food to eat on that day.

The only reason Jesus went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day was to preach to the Jews, who He knew would be there at that time.

12. We must still keep the Commandments, which include keeping the Sabbath day holy; only now the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh day (Saturday) to

the first day (Sunday) of the week for the New Testament church.

Others: We also keep the day (Sunday), but it's the Lord's day with no relationship to the Sabbath whatsoever. This new day of worship was started by Jesus and followed by the disciples and the early church. The fact that Jesus arose, the greatest event of all time, on Sunday morning and also chose Sunday instead of the Sabbath for the first two past resurrection meetings with His disciples was His endorsement of Sunday as the new day of worship.

This change was confirmed by the disciples who preached on Sunday and by the early church, which held meetings on Sunday (Acts 2:1; 1 Corinthians 16:2).

The Holy Spirit was given to the church first on Sunday (Acts 2:1-4). This was on the day of Pentecost, which always follows the Sabbath (Leviticus 23:15, 16). On the same day, Sunday, 3,000 were added to the church as a result of Peter's preaching. John also was a Sunday-keeper, stating that was in the spirit on the Lord's day (Revelation 1:10).

Answers to Objections

From the other side we hear shouts of "Not so." They claim:

1. The Sabbath was given not only to and for the Jew, but to everyone. Jesus said, "The sabbath was made for man [collectively]" (Mark 2:27).

There is a record of the Sabbath being kept before it was given to the Israelites through Moses: God kept it (Genesis 2:3), and no doubt Adam kept it. Would God create a day of rest for man, the very first day after he was created, then neglect to tell him about it for 2500 years?

The Israelites, while slaves in Egypt, were not permitted to keep the Sabbath, and after many years lost it completely. It was

reestablished (not started) soon after they left Egypt (Exodus 16:1-4).

2. When God gave the Sabbath commandment, He stated very clearly the paramount purpose for its observance. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore [for this reason] the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it" (Exodus 20:11).

Any other reason, then, for keeping it, like a reminder to the Israelites of their bondage and miraculous deliverance from Egypt, could only be secondary.

3. When Jesus said He came to fulfill the law, He had no intention of terminating it. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law . . ." (Matthew 5:17). He meant that He came to satisfy the law's requirements, just as we fulfill the law of Christ (do what He requires) by bearing one another's burdens (Galatians 6:2). Following in this same chapter—Matthew 5:17-28—Jesus, instead of doing away with the law (commandments) gave them a more stringent interpretation and proclaimed heaven's disapproval upon anyone who breaks even the least commandment and teaches others to do likewise (Matthew 5:19).

4. We can keep the commandments, and God intended that we should. His commandments are not hard (grievous) and keeping them is necessary to love God (1 John 5:3).

5. The Sabbath commandment is not ceremonial, but definitely moral. Would stealing from a man (eighth commandment) be more immoral than to deny Him a day of rest? Also, what could be ceremonial about giving working animals a weekly rest day (Exodus 20:10)?

Failure to mention specifically each commandment when reference was made to them in the New Testament scriptures did not imply intentional omission and rejection of those not mentioned.

Jesus did not intend that the "rich young ruler" would be free to have other gods, take the Lord's name in vain, etc., because he hadn't specifically mentioned each of these commandments along with the others (Matthew 19:18, 19).

6. Under the old covenant, "The law," as related to man, consisted primarily of two parts:

One part, often referred to as the moral law, informed man what God required of him in order to maintain a proper relationship to God and man. Included here are the Ten Commandments. "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law [Ten Commandments] had said, Thou shalt not covet" (Romans 7:7).

The other, often referred to as the ceremonial law, informed man how this proper relationship must be restored, should man sin by disobeying God's laws for proper conduct (1 John 3:4).

Grace replaced this latter part only, and does not give us a license to sin; God forbid (Romans 6:15).

7. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come" (Colossians 2:16).

It is hardly possible that Paul here could have meant the weekly (Saturday) Sabbath, but rather the many special sabbaths of Pentecost, Passover, Trumpets, Tabernacles, and atonements. I believe these were observed in connection with the above meats, drinks, etc. (Leviticus 23).

God implied the relatively less important, or temporary nature of these other sabbaths when he failed to include them along with the weekly Sabbath in the Commandments; thus Paul could accurately declare them but shadows ceasing at the cross.

8. Those who claim that Romans 14:5, 6, "One man

esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. . .” releases them from observing the Sabbath have the inspired pen of Paul in trouble; they have him who stated the importance of keeping God’s commandments and who praised them as being holy just and good (Romans 7:12; 1 Corinthians 7:19; Ephesians 6:2, 3), here saying that they are not important, and that some may be disregarded.

The fact that some early Christians may have already started to keep also the first day as a day unto the Lord, while others did not, might have been the basis for Paul’s statement.

9. Claiming to keep all days holy does not eliminate the issue. From all the week God chose just one day to be His special day. This was the Sabbath. This day He blessed and hallowed, raising it far above all the others, and he who vainly attempts to put all days on the same plane is opposing God.

10. Some things under the old covenant were different than originally intended. The Jews were permitted divorce, but Jesus said, from the beginning it was not so. God’s stern disciplining of the Israelites for their persistent rebellion could easily be the explanation why they were not permitted to build even a fire on the Sabbath. Because of their rebellion God said, “Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live” (Ezekiel 20:25).

11. Jesus did keep the Sabbath while here on earth. If not, He could not have said, “I have kept my Father’s commandments” (John 15:10).

His custom of going into the synagogue on the Sabbath day (Luke 4:16) was very much in line with keeping His Father’s commandments. While there he *also* preached to the Jews.

He didn’t keep the Sabbath as the Jews thought He should; but surely He, Lord of the Sabbath (Matthew 12:8), kept it as God intended, Jesus knew and acknowledged God’s law governing the Sabbath and declared His subservience to this law, stating that His acts of goodness on the Sabbath were not violations (Matthew 12:12).

When the disciples were hungry on the Sabbath day, He permitted them to acquire food. Those who were suffering He healed. In line with this, He surely would say to a cold person, “Do that which is necessary to get warm.” He said “The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath” (Mark 2:27). This was the original intent.

12. Discontinuing the Sabbath or changing it to Sunday would entail violating and tampering with the Ten Commandments. Jesus would never have done this. He condemned the religious leaders for presumptuously doing this very thing. For this He told them they were hypocrites and that even their religion was in vain (Matthew 15:1-9).

He told the rich young ruler that keeping the commandments is necessary in order to inherit eternal life. He stated that the law would last ‘till all be fulfilled” (Matthew 5:18). “Think not that I am come to destroy the law” (Matthew 5:17).

The disciples, having heard Jesus say these things, would not have taken it upon themselves to tamper with the Sabbath. They also heard the solemn warning, “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 5:19).

Paul, having come later, didn’t hear Jesus say these things; yet he wouldn’t have done it either.

If by his own admission, the tenth commandment told Paul that

it is sin to covet, surely the fourth commandment told him as faithfully and forcefully, which day is the Sabbath that he must keep (Romans 7:7; Exodus 20:8-11).

James strongly implied that to do such a thing (change the Sabbath) would be spiritually disastrous; stating that the Ten Commandments were all included in a one-package deal and if we break even one we have broken them all (James 2:10, 11).

As for religious meetings being held on Sunday by the early church—far more were held on the Sabbath.

One meeting often credited to Sunday (Acts 20:7) was in reality—because the days then started at sundown (Jewish time)—held on Saturday night. “On the Saturday night, in our assembly for the breaking of bread, Paul who was to leave the next day, addressed them.” (New English Bible). This being true, we find Paul taking a 20-mile cross-country hike and not preaching on the next day, our Sunday (Acts 20:13).

The other scripture, 1 Corinthians 16:2, “Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store,” was part of Paul’s instructions to the Corinthians regarding a collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. This does not suggest a religious meeting but rather working efficiency, “. . . that there be no gatherings when I come.”

John “in the Spirit”

Upon which day was John in the spirit? Because the term “Lord’s day,” was used in the Bible only this once (Revelation 1:10) and the meaning is not indicated, we can only speculate as to its intent. If a day of the week was intended, it most likely would have been referring to the Sabbath. No claim was ever made for Sunday, but

Jesus declared Himself Lord of the Sabbath (Matthew 12:8); also the Sabbath is the only day of the week ever selected, blessed and hallowed by the Lord (Exodus 20:11).

From reading the books of John, one can only conclude that he was a very strict commandment keeper.

Though seriously challenged, yet if there were sufficient Scriptural evidence to suggest a basis for keeping Sunday in memory of Jesus’ resurrection, could this be used against the Sabbath? The two come on different days and are entirely unrelated, like New Year’s and the Fourth of July. Because the Sabbath is primarily the memorial of creation, any argument used against it, to be at all valid, should show why God’s work of creation no longer warrants a memorial, where God has withdrawn His blessing from that memorial (the Sabbath day), or where He releases us from observing it.

One person will say “If the Old Testament Sabbath were still to be observed some place in the New Testament would surely have said so. Another person says “If it were not to be observed, they surely would have had to say so.”

Charges and counter charges go on and on. Possibly you have still other reasons why you should or should not keep the Sabbath. If so, why not add them to those already given. Then, like an honest jurymen, carefully and prayerfully weigh and compare one side against the other.

After having determined in your own mind which side preponderates, you may find that you have a new responsibility: “. . . Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock . . . and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock” (Matthew 7:24, 25).



BY JOHN TRECOTT

TODAY many descendants of Israel think they are Gentiles. The reason is that they fail to keep the one sign that would directly identify them as the people of Israel. That one sign is the weekly Sabbath from Friday sunset until Saturday sunset. The observance of it was to be a perpetual covenant as stated in Exodus 31:12-17. Read that passage for yourself and notice in verse 13 the word *sabbaths* is plural, which can mean the annual sabbaths, or holy days. Of course we should also notice and pay particular attention to the word *my* in verse 13 showing these belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and *the* in the other verses denoting a specific day of the week, the seventh day. Lastly it is a "perpetual covenant" in verse 16.

Gentiles

One of the primary differences that identified someone as Gentile was that the Gentiles did not keep all of the Ten Commandments, especially the Sabbath day. When a stranger, a Gentile wanted to live in the nation of Israel, to become a citizen, that would require keeping the commandments—one law for both Israelite and Gentile. "One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourns among you" (Exodus 12:49).

If the stranger wanted to partake of Passover, all the males

*Whether Gentile or Israelite,
you may have eternal life as a gift.*

The Sabbath Is For Gentiles, Too

were to be circumcised, (verse 48). Therefore the Gentile could become a member of God's congregation of Israelites, the Church of God in the wilderness, by the act of physical circumcision and by obedience to God's Law.

Today when any person, Gentile or Israelite, turns to the living Savior, becoming His true disciple, the Scripture testifies that that person becomes a seed of Abraham, a spiritual Israelite. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Galatians 3:29).

True Sabbath For Gentiles

Whether a person feels he is an Israelite or a Gentile by birth, God has pronounced the fabulous blessing of eternal life on anyone who would choose His sabbaths (plural). Let us carefully examine this amazing prophecy found in Isaiah 56:1-7 for our day which gives great hope to "the stranger" (Gentile).

"Thus says the Lord..."

Who is this? This "Lord" is the very personage of the God family who became Jesus Christ. (Compare Revelation 22:6 and 16.)

"Keep ye judgment, and do justice." How we need this beautiful action from all of our people today,

from the President down to the laborer.

"For my salvation is *near to come*, and my righteousness to be revealed." There is the *time setting*—the time just prior to the second coming of the Messiah to bring salvation to all.

"Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it." This is a pronounced blessing on anyone who would grab hold of something and do it.

What was this person to grab hold of and do?

"...that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it." The Sabbath commandment is the longest of the ten. It is right and good, and anyone can do it and be blessed for so doing. The blessing is also for one who not only keeps the Sabbath, but "keepeth his hand from doing any evil."

"Simply stated, obey God's Law. The breaking of the Law of God is evil, and that has produced and is producing every wrong result—cause and effect.

"Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord has utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree."

I believe that the basic stock of America are Israelite, of the children of Manasseh. Yet in

America most people regard themselves as Gentiles. Even if they were Gentiles, if they would even now, in this end time, join themselves to the Lord by keeping His Commandments and hallowing His Sabbaths, they could feel right at home and actually be spiritual Israelites. Remember Galatians 3:29 earlier in this article.

"For thus says the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths [plural], and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant." Again it speaks of those who keep the holy Sabbaths, which God regards very highly, not the first day of the week. And since "sabbaths" is plural, I believe it refers also to God's holy annual feast days.

Now notice the fantastic promise of eternal life, "and everlasting name": "Even unto them [all, Gentiles included] will I give in mine house [John 14: 2, 3] and within my walls a *place* and a *name* better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an *everlasting name*, that shall not be cut off."

Time and again in this passage Gentiles are referred to. Anyone can be blessed with eternal life if he gives up his own traditions and follows Christ, obeying Him and keeping the Sabbath.

"Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, *every one* that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant."

How glorious is this precious truth regarding all people. They who finally obey and keep God's Sabbaths will dwell in the holy mountain. "Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: . . . for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people."

Let us all rejoice in the truth. Whether you are Gentile or an Israelite, you may have eternal life as a gift. All anyone need do is turn from his own way, surrender to Christ as King, keep His commandments, keep His Sabbaths, and live.

BSA Member Writes Letter To Newspaper

Mark Sweat, of Garner, N.C., wrote the following letter to the Raleigh *Times*. It appeared in the "Letters to the Editor" section on October 24.

Sunday never intended to be observed as Sabbath

Editor, The Times:

I am responding to something I read on your religious page recently regarding attending church every Sabbath.

Most Christians think Sunday is the Sabbath and that everyone

should rest on that day. They are wrong.

Sunday is the first day of the week, not the seventh. The seventh day of the week, Saturday, is the day Jesus went to church. Paul, the apostle, also attended services on that day.

Nowhere in the Bible did any church hold services on Sunday as churches do today. Sunday worship is a Roman Catholic tradition, not a commandment of God. All the blue laws ever passed will not make Sunday sacred.

Let's not confuse people by calling Sunday the Sabbath. Most people are already confused enough.

J. Mark Sweat
Garner

Sister Jones Forgot, But. . .



ONE of the most active members of my home church in Marion, Indiana, was (we'll give her a fictitious name, though she died many years ago) "Sister Jones." Whenever the church folks did missionary work, you could count on her being in the middle of it, toiling harder than anyone else.

But as she grew old her memory began to fail. One Friday she came to church, waiting at the door for a couple of hours and wondering why no one else came to the Sabbath worship service. Another day she did not come to church. As I went home from the service I saw her walking home from the grocery, with a big bag of groceries. She had a smile that indicated her soul was at peace with God.

I'm not worried about her eternal fate. She was a saint, and we serve an understanding Lord.

But I do worry about folks I see each Sabbath who are using it as a work day. My first thought is, "Shame on them! They should 'remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.' They are not like Sister Jones, whose memory failed her."

Then a disturbing thought intrudes: How can they remember if they've never heard? And how can they hear if no one tells them?

Perhaps that's where I should come in.

Eugene Lincoln

THE SABBATH SENTINEL

(USPS 474-580)

EDITOR Eugene Lincoln
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR Gilbert Sanford

The object of this non-sectarian, nondenominational association is to bring together into one strong organization all believers in the Biblical seventh-day Sabbath (Saturday) regardless of sect, creed, or denomination, for the sole purpose of spreading knowledge of, belief in, and observance of the Creator's Holy Day. The only qualification is belief in the seventh-day Sabbath.

Annual member contribution: Regular or subscribing members, \$10.00; family membership \$10.00 (individual certificates issued but only one set of records maintained and only one copy of the Sentinel and other mailings sent); supporting members \$10.00-\$24.99; sustaining members \$25.00-\$99.00; life members, \$100.00 or more during any one year.

WRITERS: Please type manuscripts double spaced and leave wide margins on all sides. Use only one side of paper. If you wish your manuscripts returned, include stamped, addressed envelope. Address to the editor, 1109 Holton Lane, Takoma Park, Md. 20012. We invite manuscripts on various aspects of the Sabbath, but cannot pay for them.

Opinions in articles are those of the writers and not necessarily endorsed by the Bible Sabbath Association.

Early Sabbathkeepers in England and United States

JAMES MCGEACHY

ENGLAND was under the rule of King Charles II, who had been restored to the throne in 1660. His father, Charles I, has sought to enforce uniformity of worship throughout the kingdom according to the Prayer Book of the Church of England, causing much dissatisfaction. This led to revolt by the Dissenters under Oliver Cromwell. Charles I was put to death in 1649 after a long conflict between King and Parliament. Cromwell had raised the New Model Army, which by its new tactics was able to overcome the Royalists; and so it became the great power in the land, opposing even the Presbyterians who held power in the Long Parliament. This was because the Presbyterians wanted to enforce their form of church government upon the national church and do in England what they had succeeded in doing in Scotland. They would have abolished episcopacy and the rule of bishops altogether and have made the national church Presbyterian.

Cromwell and his army were opposed to this conception of the church and wanted all to have complete freedom of worship as they thought right, to set up independent churches if they so desired. His army was largely composed of Independents, now known as Congregationalists, and Baptists; and so they fought for freedom of conscience and worship and asserted that the civil power had no right to interfere in any way with religious matters.

Early Sabbathkeeping in England

Thus it came about that under the Commonwealth established by Cromwell the greatest amount of freedom was allowed in this respect. He set up Triers who examined the lives of the clergy in the pulpits of the national church, and this resulted in the ejection of "ignorant and scandalous" ministers. Most of the parish churches were still occupied by Episcopalian clergymen, but there was a shortage, so nonconformist ministers were given other parish churches. Mostly Presbyterians undertook this task, but also some were occupied by Independents and Baptists. This is no doubt how Thomas Tillam, a Baptist chaplain with Cromwell's army, came to occupy the parish church of Colchester and, upon accepting the Sabbath, closed the church on Sundays and opened it for Sabbath services about 1656.

Needless to say, this was too much for the authorities. His career there did not last long. There he baptized about 100 people by immersion. It is possible that he was influenced by Theophilus Brabourne, the Episcopalian clergyman of Norwich, who had advocated the claim of the seventh day in 1628 in his book on the subject that he dedicated to Charles I. Both were acquainted with Christopher Pooley, to whose Seventh Day Baptist Church in Norwich Brabourne left 10 in his will, doubtless pleased to see a church practicing what he had advocated in the national church so long before.

When Oliver Cromwell died in

1658, he was succeeded by his son Richard, who was not strong enough to hold the Commonwealth together. So General Monck, who was in charge of Cromwell's Army in Scotland, opened negotiations with the exiled Prince Charles, son of Charles I, for his restoration to the throne.

Reaction and Violence

The Scots had already proclaimed Charles II king in 1651, but his army had been defeated by Cromwell at Worcester and so he had to flee abroad again. Now, however, he was recalled by Monck, and he promised in the Declaration of Breda to give a general pardon and religious freedom. On this assurance he was welcomed back, sailing from Scheveningen in Holland with a great fleet of ships and arriving in Dover. The mayor of Dover presented him with a Bible, which Charles declared was the Book he loved more than anything in the world. He was crowned in 1661.

Perhaps Charles really intended to give much latitude in religion, at least for a time, till he was secure on the throne. But circumstances did not favor this course, because of the action of the extremists in Cromwell's old army, which, of course, had to be disbanded. Its officers had to promise good behavior; otherwise they had the choice of emigration or being imprisoned. This was hard for them, and rebellious spirits began to plot against the new government of Charles II, encouraged by the Fifth Monarchy men who thought they should overthrow Charles and set up the kingdom of Christ by force.

It was a party of these led by Thomas Venner, who sallied forth from his meeting place in Coleman Street with an armed band of 50 men in January 1661, and, no doubt with the assistance of others, terrorized the city of London for about four days. Venner was an Independent,

but there was also a Baptist church in the same street and others not far away. Venner indeed was opposed to the Baptists, and promised that when he succeeded in his revolution "the Baptists would know that infant baptism is an ordinance of Jesus Christ." However, it was not long before he was captured and put to death with others of his deluded followers.

Naturally this experience did not encourage the king to carry out his promise of religious tolerance, for it became evident that many Dissenting meeting houses were used for political plotting as well as preaching, and Baptists unfortunately were not all free from blame. The famous Col. Thomas Blood, who plotted against the government and later tried to steal the Crown Jewels from the Tower of London, was a Baptist. During the war which Charles declared on Holland, Baptists passed information to the Dutch; and if the Dutch had succeeded in landing in England they would have had 30,000 men from Cromwell's old army to help them. They saw no more harm in doing so than Charles himself saw in being in league with the French king, Louis XIV, to please whom he had declared war on Holland, which was then the home of religious liberty and had shown Prince Charles hospitality while he was in exile.

John James

Venner's rebellion led to the martyrdom of John James, pastor of the Seventh Day Baptists in Bullstake Alley, Whitechapel, on November 26, 1661. John James was a believer in the views of the Fifth Monarchy men, who were looking for the setting up of the kingdom of Christ. This would be the Fifth Monarchy, the Stone Kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar's dream which was to follow the four great monarchies of Babylon, MedoPersia, Greece and Rome.

John James belonged to the moderate section who were content to preach about the Fifth Monarchy and not seek to establish it by force. He contended vigorously for the idea that the millennial kingdom of Christ would be a literal kingdom like the previous monarchies, and his great text was Rev. 11:15, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." He greatly emphasized the point; and that, in the circumstances of his time, was a highly dangerous thing to do, with the consequences that he was arrested and condemned for his belief.

Efforts at Conformity

In the same year, 1661, the Earl of Clarendon, chief minister of Charles II, introduced the first Act of the series which became known as the Clarendon Code and which was aimed against Roman Catholics and Dissenters. This was the Corporation Act, requiring that all members of corporations such as mayors and aldermen should take communion according to the Prayer Book of the Church of England, and take the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance. The second act was introduced in 1662 and was the Act of Uniformity, which excluded from the parish churches all ministers who refused to be ordained by bishops and conduct services according to the Prayer Book. This resulted in the Great Ejection of 1662, when the conscientious dissenting ministers introduced by Cromwell into the parish church pulpits were compelled to leave and the former clergymen removed by Cromwell were brought back. So about 2,000 Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptist ministers were expelled with such harshness that it created a deep gulf between the Episcopal clergy and the Nonconformists for many years.

The third Act was the Conventicle Act of 1664, which forbade the assembly of more than five people in addition to the family of the house for religious services except according to the Prayer Book under penalty of fines and transportation. For the third offense they could be banished to the American plantations, excepting New England and Virginia. If they should return or escape, death was the penalty.

Many were sent to the West Indies, where they endured great hardship. Vast numbers suffered in all parts of England and Wales. It is said that 8,000 perished in prison during the days of Charles II. It may have been this act which led Stephen Mumford to decide to migrate to Rhode Island, to banish himself by so doing rather than wait for the Government to do it. This act was meant to silence the clergy ejected in 1662.

The fourth Act of the Clarendon Code was the Five Mile Act, which forbade any preacher or teacher who refused the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy to come within five miles of any important town.

Migration in Search of Freedom

Many Baptists besides Stephen Mumford were led to migrate to the New World even before the troublous times we have mentioned, and these had been persecuted in New England and Connecticut. Led by Roger Williams, they had found a haven in the Island of Aquidneck which they bought and named Rhode Island. John Clarke was their leader at Newport and conducted worship. When the First Baptist Church of Newport, R.I., was organized in 1644, he became its ruling elder. It was with this church that Stephen Mumford connected himself and made known his convictions concerning the Sabbath, convincing quite a

number who joined him in its observance. Later four of them returned to Sunday-keeping, and this created such tension with the church leaders preaching against the Sabbath that the only solution was for the seventh-day keepers to withdraw and form a church of their own in 1671.

Before this the Bell Lane Church in London, which seems to have been gathered by John Belcher, a bricklayer, in 1662, kept in touch with Stephen Mumford at Newport. Their letter was dated March 26, 1668, four years after he had migrated, and signed by eleven members of Bell Lane. Among these signatures appear the names of Belcher and William Gibson, who later came to Newport and was the second pastor of the Seventh Day Baptist Church there. A month before this on February 2, 1668, Edward Stennett wrote to Newport from his place in Abingdon, Berkshire.

Another Sabbathkeeper in England wrote to those in Newport Newport two years later. This was Joseph Davis, Sr., who had accepted the Sabbath in 1668 and was in prison at Oxford Castle in 1670 as a result of a fresh wave of persecution for attending conventicles. It would seem that those in Newport had heard of him because they wrote to him on July 4, 1669, and to this letter he replied January 26, 1670, bemoaning the fact that Baptists and Independents were preaching against the Sabbath. He exhorted the Sabbathkeepers on Rhode Island not to be discouraged by opposition. He seems to have written another letter on February 7, 1670, which he mentioned that he had kept the Sabbath for two years. This was the Joseph Davis, who later bought the Mill Yard property and erected the old chapel and other buildings in 1691 and endowed the cause with his charity for Sabbatarian Protestant Dissenters.

Further Persecution

Meanwhile, soon after Stephen Mumford's departure from England in 1664, other developments were taking place that greatly promoted the Seventh Day Baptist cause in the old country. In 1665 Francis Bampfield was a prisoner in Dorchester Jail, having been one of the ministers ejected in 1662 from his church at Sherborne, Dorset. In this year someone wrote to him enquiring about the Sabbath question, and this led him to study the Bible carefully on this point so that he came to the conclusion that the seventh day should still be kept. He made known his conclusions among his fellow prisoners and won a good number of them to its observance. In this prison he remained for eight years, and it is said he organized a Sabbathkeeping church there.

In 1671, the year of the founding of our Newport church, we find Bampfield at Salisbury, where he formed another congregation; but this resulted in his imprisonment in Salisbury Jail for 18 months. After his release he came to London and there at Bethnal Green he organized a third church on March 5, 1676. This congregation he moved to the famous Pinners Hall in 1681, and from this hall his congregation took its name. This church sent him out as a messenger to five or more churches in Wiltshire (Salisbury), Hampshire, Dorset, Gloucestershire, and Berkshire (Wallingford). He also wrote a letter of brotherly love to churches in Holland and New England.

Francis Bampfield was arrested at Pinners Hall in 1683 and died in Newgate Prison, London, on February 16, 1684. Edward Stennett succeeded him as pastor of the Pinners Hall Church in 1686 and ministered there for three years, followed by his famous son, Joseph Stennett in 1690.

Ten Commandments Cannot Be Posted in Schools

The Supreme Court last November outlawed the posting of the Ten Commandments on classroom walls in public schools.

By a 5 to 4 vote, the court struck down a Kentucky law that required such postings. The narrow-majority unsigned opinion said that the law violated the Constitution's guarantee of religious freedom.

"The pre-eminent purpose for posting the Ten Commandments on schoolroom walls is plainly religious in nature," the court ruled in reversing a Kentucky Supreme Court ruling. "The Ten Commandments is undeniably a sacred text in the Jewish and Christian faiths, and no legislative recitation of a supposed secular purpose can blind us to that fact."

The 1978 law provided for each posted copy to contain, in small print, this notation concerning the display's purpose:

"The secular application of the Ten Commandments is clearly seen in its adoption as the fundamental legal code of western civilization and the common law of the United States."

Under the law, no tax money could be spent for the posted copies. Private donations were called for.

Monday's decision did not totally ban the Ten Commandments from public schools, just as the court's controversial 1963 ruling did not ban all Bible reading from the schools.

"This is not a case in which the Ten Commandments are integrated into the school curriculum, where the Bible may constitutionally be

used in an appropriate study of history, civilization, ethics, comparative religion or the like," the court said. "Posting of religious texts on the wall serves no such educational function."

The court's majority relied heavily in a 1971 decision that fashioned a three-pronged test for determining whether a state law violates the First Amendment's "establishment of religion" prohibition.

In the 1971 ruling, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger said, "First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principal or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion, and finally the statute must not foster an excessive government entanglement with religion."

Monday's decision said the Kentucky law "has no secular legislative purpose and is therefore unconstitutional."

The law was challenged by four Louisville residents represented by the Kentucky Civil Liberties Union.

Voting to strike down the law were Justices William J. Brennan Jr., Byron R. White, Thurgood Marshall, Lewis F. Powell Jr. and John Paul Stevens.

Burger and Justice Harry A. Blackmun dissented, voting instead to hold off any decision until examining the arguments more closely.

Justices Potter Stewart and William H. Rehnquist said the Kentucky Supreme Court was right in upholding the law.

BIBLE SABBATH ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

John D. Bevis, President
P.O. Box 2133
Florence, Ala. 35630

Recording Secretary,
Mrs. Violet Rodgers
Rt. 1, Box 163A
Hatfield, Ark. 71945

Secretary-treasurer,
Lawrence Burrell
Rt. 1, Box 197
Fairview, Okla. 73737

1st Vice President
Eugene Lincoln
1109 Holton Lane
Takoma Park, MD 20012

2nd Vice President,
Terril D. Littrell
1840 Falcon Drive
Cleveland, Tenn. 37311

3rd Vice President,
Calvin Burrell
640 East 78th Place
Denver, Colo. 80229

DIRECTORS-AT-LARGE

Leroy Bass
1743 Park St.
Middleton, Wisc. 53562

Jerome Boyd
New Enterprise, Penn. 16664

John Kiesz
820 Woodlawn
Canon City, Colo. 81212

Joseph M. McGuire
4642 Avenue R
Birmingham, Ala. 35208

Gilbert Sanford
804 East 6th Street
Kennett, MO 63857

M.O. Flanery
Warsaw, Mo. 66355

Sabbath Promotional Aids

1981 CALENDARS	\$1.00 ea.
Attractive pens, printed with: "The Seventh Day Is The Sabbath"	\$3.00 per doz.
Bumper stickers	\$1.00 ea. or \$7.00 per doz.
Bible on Cassette .. for loan for payment of postage both ways	
Home Bible Study Series (13-lesson book)	\$1.50 ea.
	\$12.00 per doz.
Back issues of <i>The Sabbath Sentinel</i> (1980)	\$10.00 per 50
Tracts and leaflets (some 25 titles)	Sample copies free
THE SEVENTH DAY is the SABBATH	FREE
Book, <i>From Sabbath to Sunday</i> (Bacchiocchi)	\$8.00
Letter Stickers	100 for \$1.00

THE BIBLE SABBATH ASSOCIATION

Fairview, Oklahoma 73737

It's still not too late to order your Sabbath Calendars.

But better not
wait any longer!



Only
\$1.00
each

Don't delay—Order today
from

**THE BIBLE SABBATH ASSOCIATION
INTERNATIONAL**
FAIRVIEW, OKLAHOMA 73737