

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, AUGUST 20, 1903

NO. 34



Christian Sabbath observance is regulated from within, not from without.

More important than what one does or does not do on the Sabbath is the motive and purpose from which one's actions spring.

In the light of the Christian principle of Sabbath observance decorous churchgoers and ministers who declaim against "Sabbath desecration" may be as great Sabbath desecrators as those who work or play.

One of the greatest evils manifesting itself to-day in American society is the growing disposition of powerful religious interests to use the state in the interests of religion. This is the grand vice of ecclesiasticism, and it is second to none that can threaten the welfare of society.

The right of the workingman, the clerk, the tradesman or any other man to a day of rest ends just when and where it touches the rights of others. When the workingman, the clerk, the tradesman or any other man attempts to compel others to rest, he is not exercising and protecting a right of his own, but is invading and trampling upon the rights of others.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1903

No. 34

A Social Danger and Menace that is Overlooked

According to Cardinal Gibbons "the desecration of the Christian Sabbath, which tends to obliterate in our adult population the salutary fear of God and the homage that we owe Him," and "an imperfect and vicious system of education which undermines the religion of our youth," are two of "five very great evils"—"five radical vices,"—which threaten society in the United States to-day. The first is "a social danger against which it behooves us to set our faces and take timely precautions before it assumes proportions too formidable to be easily eradicated." The second "bodes mischief to our country and endangers the stability of our government." It "arises from our defective system of public schools," which "improves the mind and the memory to the neglect of moral and religious training." There is one great evil, one radical vice, which now "bodes mischief to our country and endangers the stability of our government" as a free, secular republic that the cardinal does not mention. It is an evil and a vice that is characterized by a persistent attempt to make the existence of other and more apparent evils and vices subserve its ends—to so interpret and explain other evils and vices as to make it appear that in it alone is the cure for them. This evil, this vice, is the vicious disregard of the principle of separation of church and state, the growing and persistent assumption that the state must concern itself with religion, by the

representatives of organized religion, as strikingly shown in the demands that "the desecration of the Christian Sabbath" be prevented by law and that religious teaching shall become a part of the system of public instruction supported by the state. Protestant bodies are taking the lead in the first demand, while the body which the cardinal represents is especially active in making the second. That ecclesiastical organization "is earnestly, patiently, persistently, determinedly, making an attack on our public school system, endeavoring to do one of two things—either to get the public schools open to distinctively Catholic teaching, or else to get public money for the support of distinctively Catholic schools." It has been well declared that "if the time ever comes when either of these aims is accomplished, it will be a sad day for the future of the Republic." And the other demand aims at what will mark an equally sad day for the future of the Republic. And yet these demands are being constantly and insidiously made in the interests of society and the state! Against the great evil and vice which they represent, which is second to none of those named by Cardinal Gibbons as a menace to the welfare of society and the state, it behooves all now to set their faces and take timely precautions before it assumes (as it rapidly is) proportions too formidable to be easily eradicated. In connection with the cardinal's inclusion of "the desecration of the Christian Sabbath" among the "five very great evils" and "radic

vices" which to-day threaten society, it should not be forgotten that it has been declared and argued by authority of Cardinal Gibbons himself that "the Christian Sabbath is the offspring of the union of the Holy Spirit with the Catholic Church, His spouse," and that "the claim of Protestantism to any part therein is groundless, self-contradictory, and suicidal." One of the things which the cardinal chooses to name as one of the five very great evils and radical vices which threaten society in the United States to-day is what he himself knows is nothing more or less than disregard of a religious institution which has no authority for its existence but that of his church—the Roman Catholic Sunday, the so-called "Christian Sabbath." The disregard of this institution *is not* a social danger, and the ecclesiastical assumption that it is must be resisted, for that assumption, to the extent of its demand that the law shall maintain and enforce that observance, *is* most decidedly a social danger and menace.

✦

A "Desecration-of-the Sabbath" Sermon

An "earnest sermon against the desecration of the Sabbath," which seems to have been one of several, was delivered by Rev. W. D. Marsh at the First Methodist Church in Syracuse, N. Y., on July 2. His text "was taken from the description of Nehemiah's firm and fearless stand in protecting the sanctity of the first day of the week [*sic*] by closing the gates of Jerusalem and preventing the merchants and hucksters from entering and even from establishing themselves outside the walls for the purpose of trafficking in their wares." He "expressed the wish that there were more mayors and other officials to-day to act as promptly and as energetically." Some of his statements were these:

How rapidly is our Christian Sabbath going. To-day baseball "fans" crowded Genesee

Park, unless rain prevented, in direct violation of the law of God and man. This morning the men employed in the street cleaning were obliged to work, although there was no necessity for it. The Sunday newspaper is a gigantic law-breaker and an influence for evil that can hardly be estimated. Yet we sit silently by while the Sabbath day is being ruthlessly desecrated. . . . The church must not quietly submit to the destruction of one of the foundations of Christianity. . . . I need not re-argue the question of divine authority on which rests the obligation of keeping holy one day in seven. . . . We may rest assured that the Christian religion and all religion is struck a deadly blow when the day of God is profaned. Surely if one of God's laws may be broken with impunity it is an easy step to the infringement of every command of the Decalogue.

There can be no doubt as to the religious nature of Dr. Marsh's appeal for Sunday enforcement. And yet no doubt, if occasion required, he would stanchly deny that he desired the enforcement of a religious observance. He "gave quotations from a number of great and good men, showing their high estimate of the Sabbath and its influence"—the stereotyped quotations furnished by the "National Reform" and American "Sabbath" Union leaders—and declared that "America must restore her Sabbath or she will be ruined." He "gave an interesting instance in proof of the fact that if men will be true to God, God will be true to them."

It was of a Chinese cobbler, who, having been converted to Christianity, decided that his shop should no longer be open for business on the Sabbath, although trade was being carried on on all sides. Soon after he had taken this step his trade on Saturday reached such proportions as to more than make good whatever he had lost on Sunday, and he enjoyed, also, a day of complete rest.

It is a great pity that the "Christian" ministers and laymen in this country who are crying out for Sunday enforcement in order to prevent the "cut-throat competition" of those who would work and do business on the "Sabbath" while they and others are resting, could not imbibe a little of the faith of this Chinaman.

Why do they not learn a lesson from this and other instances that are related when it suits their purpose, and depend upon God instead of upon the law in this matter of "Sabbath" observance?



Sunday Observance In a sermon on
Not a Moral Obligation "Sabbath observance," preached on

June 7, Rev. Alexander Coffin, rector of the "Church of the Holy Communion," Redwood, Minn., declared:

The Fourth Commandment, embodied in the midst of man's moral law, sets forth a divine law to operate throughout human society. It sets apart a weekly rest day. . . . So greatly recognized and cherished is the weekly day of rest that if the civil authority could be imagined as setting it aside or ordering all business resumed on that day, or if the employers universally were to hold their employes to unremitting labor on the seventh day of the week [sic] there would undoubtedly be an overwhelming protest throughout the business world.

This being true, the alarm of the clergy over the "threatened destruction of the day of rest," and their efforts to avert this calamity that they are so sure is at hand, are entirely uncalled for. Mr. Coffin declared that "the observance of the first day of the week as the day of rest instead of the seventh day is a ritual change, not a religious or moral change." If this transfer involved no religious or moral change, nor any flouting of "the divine authority of the ancient moral law" or of "the moral obligation of the Fourth Commandment," which we are told "the Christian church teaches implicitly," then the observance of any particular day is not a religious or moral obligation, and is not required by the ancient moral law and the Fourth Commandment. Consequently the observance of *Sunday* is not a religious or moral obligation, and is not required by the ancient moral law and the Fourth Commandment. The first day of the week then has no precedence whatever over any other day of the week as a day

upon which to fulfil the requirement of the ancient moral law and the Fourth Commandment; its observance is no more of a religious and moral obligation than is the observance of any other day of the week. This knocks the bottom out of the chief contentions of the Sunday champions; at least it calls for a very great modification of their present claims and assumptions.



Churches Need to Get Hold of the Christian Principle

In an editorial called forth by the protests of the churches "against an increasing desecration of 'the Sabbath,'" *The Outlook* well emphasizes the point that the churches very much need to get hold of the Christian principle in this matter of Sabbath or "Lord's Day" observance—to see that it is not by outward, prohibitive precept, but by inward, positive purpose that the observance of the day is to be regulated. This principle, of course, admits of no use of legislation and coercion in the matter. *The Outlook* well says:

Suppose that a prohibitive precept could be enforced, as once, on those whom church conventions charge with doing things that desecrate the consecrated day, what gain thereby? The real desecration is not in the things they do, for things innocent on one day are equally innocent on any other. It is in the repudiation of the high purpose which prizes the day as its helper—Christ's purpose to build a divine manhood by winning men to care for the things he cares for. Decorous churchgoers severely disapproving of Sunday golf-players and cigar-sellers may yet be essentially with them through lack of this regulative Christian purpose.

This inward, Christian purpose, by which alone the Sabbath can be truly observed, cannot be inspired by outward force or prohibition. The churches, in seeking to promote "Sabbath" observance by legislation and emphasis of outward prohibition, are really repudiating the essence of Christianity and making

the observance nothing more than a pagan, righteousness-by-works observance. They do not seem to know that it is more in harmony with Christianity for a person to use the Sabbath as an ordinary working day, if his conscience does not condemn him, than it is for him to "observe" without a vital, personal conviction and purpose in the matter.

An Honorable Exception—Let it Become the Rule

The following petition, signed by thirty-eight men and twenty-one women, has been presented "to the worthy members of the baseball team of Herman, Minn.":

Forasmuch as the quiet of our Sabbath has been recently disturbed by the Sunday ball game, which is a practise not only against the commands of God, but is also detrimental to the moral and religious life of the community, placing temptations in the way of our young people to disregard the moral influence of quiet Sabbath observance, besides lowering an otherwise innocent amusement to such a standard of morality that it cannot be supported by the Christian citizen: Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Herman and vicinity, respectfully petition your honorable body that you refrain from the sport on the Sabbath day, and that you use your influence to discourage the practise in the community. In the name of good citizenship and of pure morality we pray that this petition receive your favorable consideration.

The signers of this petition are to be congratulated. Their method of proceeding against Sunday baseball is an honorable exception to that of most of the religious people who interest themselves in behalf of Sunday observance. They have indeed acted as *Christian* citizens in the matter, which is a thing so unusual on the part of "Christian" citizens that it deserves special notice. They have not gone to the law and the authorities, but they have gone to the parties themselves; and instead of coming with threats of arrest and prosecution, they have in a respectful and Christian manner urged the claims of what they regard as the Sabbath and

sought to have ball playing upon it discontinued. And thus they have not disgraced the religion that they seek to represent, as do many others, whose motives are equally religious, in appealing to "law" and demanding its enforcement in a matter where persuasion and appeal alone should be employed.



Fined for not Observing the "Canadian Sabbath"

The occasion of the declarations quoted elsewhere from two Canadian newspapers to the effect that the "Canadian Sabbath" and the laws enforcing its observance must be strictly observed by the American "stranger within our gates," was no doubt the case described in this item from the Winnipeg (Manitoba) *Telegram* of August 4:

On Tuesday, F. E. Arkell, of Carberry, was called upon as a justice of the peace to deal with a peculiar case. A man arrived in Carberry over a week ago, and being a Seventh-day Adventist did not feel that Sunday should stop his labor, and accordingly he spent Sunday last working on a building. A complaint was laid, and Constable Tidsberry took up the case. The man on being brought before the magistrate stated that he was utterly ignorant of Canadian law, and after he had received a full explanation thereof, Mr. Arkell fined him \$3 and costs, and warned him that any future case of a similar kind would be dealt with to the fullest limit of the law. This is the first case of the kind that has ever come up in Carberry.



After investigation the British vice-council at Odessa, Russia, has officially reported that the Kishineff newspaper, *Bessarabyetz*, was largely responsible for the terrible anti-Jewish outbreak, and that the rioting could have been stopped in its early stages had the authorities been disposed to take resolute action. One point in this Kishineff affair that should not be overlooked is this: One of the products and chief agencies of enlightenment and civilization can be used to outrage civilization—can be used most effectively to

foment religious and race hatred, intolerance, persecution and inhuman massacre. A great newspaper, powerful for good, is also powerful for evil if it chooses to be so. It can employ its potent facilities for the undoing of those upon whom it chooses to pass sentence of excommunication and condemnation. By artful and persistent misrepresentation and accusation it can arouse against a class that has incurred its enmity widespread dislike and hatred, and in the end, as at Kishineff, can cause the passion it has aroused to burst forth in its fury. And this abuse of the press is as likely to occur at the centers as at the outskirts of civilization.



Rev. W. J. Patton of Superior, Wis., objects to Sunday evening performances in the theatres of that place on the ground that they take place "at a time when there are services in the churches, and when there is an effort on the part of the better class of people to gather the people for religious instruction and meditation." He says also that "although it is contrary to the convictions of a large number of our citizens, there has been no general protest against the Sunday ball playing because it takes place on the outskirts of the city and there are no church services Sunday afternoon." The point is plain. There must be no competition with the churches. If they cannot monopolize the day entirely, they must monopolize that portion of it which they choose to devote to religious services. As well might the ball players and theater folks expect the churches to stop operations while they are playing or performing. The thing is as fair one way as it is the other.



A Grand Island (Neb.) paper states that the ministerial association of that place "is an organization among the clergymen, the purpose of which is to unite their efforts along certain lines, re-

gardless of the differences in creed which may exist, lines on which all occupy the same common ground." This states the purpose of ministerial associations in general. And it seems that the chief thing upon which the clergymen thus unite their efforts and find themselves occupying common ground is the matter of Sunday observance and its enforcement. And these organizations of ministers precede and presage like unions of the churches.



"There may be and is an honest difference of opinion between honest men as to what constitutes *Sabbath desecration*, but whatever your opinion, the law must govern," says the Grayling (Mich.) *Avalanche* in quoting the Sunday law for the enlightenment of the people of that place. That is a peculiar notion to obtain in a country where absolute freedom in religious matters is supposed to be the unquestioned right of every individual.



"Prohibition of the sale on the Sabbath" was included among "proper police regulations" for the liquor traffic by Dr. Frederick H. Wines in an address on "Legislative Aspects of the Liquor Problem" at Chatauqua, N. Y., recently. He did not point out the source of and real reason for this particular regulation.



"The head of the Church of Rome can never afford to ignore the politics of the world," says the New York *Tribune*. Though a somewhat contrary opinion is now expressed in high and unexpected quarters, the world could very well afford to have him do it, however.



This number of THE SENTINEL is devoted almost entirely to reporting matters in the line of Sunday enforcement. Other matters deserving consideration will be given attention in succeeding numbers.

An Indictment of New York's Sunday Law¹—I

IT may be proper, before I proceed to speak on the subject proposed to be discussed, to state that I have no intention to impugn the motives of those who have had any agency in enacting, executing, or advocating the law on which I am about to comment. They are doubtless in the aggregate as honest and intelligent as others generally are. But the most honest oftentimes do wrong, and the most intelligent are frequently

¹ Seventy-seven years ago there was published in New York a pamphlet, a transcript of the title page of which is as follows: "The People's Rights Reclaimed; being An Exposition of the Unconstitutionality of the Law of the State of New York Compelling the Observance of a Religious Sabbath Day, and Erroneously Entitled 'An Act for Suppressing Immorality,' Passed March 13th, 1813. Addressed to the People of the State of New York. New York, 1826. A. Spooner, Printer, Brooklyn." Its publication was called forth by the revision of the State laws then taking place and certain attempts that had been made "to affect an extension of the erroneous principles and provisions of the Sunday laws." Although the *excuse* for New York's Sunday legislation has been somewhat changed since then, it being now professedly for the prevention of "crimes against religious liberty and conscience" (although still coming under the general heading of "crimes against public decency and *good morals*"), whereas then it was "for suppressing immorality," it remains the same in principle, object, and effect, and the masterly and unanswerable indictment of the law as it then was made by the unknown author of the above pamphlet is still a masterly and unanswerable indictment of the law as it now is, and incidentally of all other Sunday legislation. The widespread disposition now manifested to uphold and "to affect an extension of the erroneous principles and provisions of the Sunday laws" makes the matter in this pamphlet very pertinent to-day, and hence we shall publish it in full in THE SENTINEL. The somewhat peculiar style of the author in italicizing words will be followed, so unless otherwise indicated words in italics are as they appear in the pamphlet. This first installment of the matter includes the preface and the opening paragraphs of the pamphlet proper.—EDITOR.

in error. The law in question was probably made and advocated by men as honest and intelligent as those who framed our State constitution and interdicted legislative interference with the religious opinions of their constituents. But it has, most likely, happened in this, as in other instances which might be named, where laws which were in operation at the time of the Revolutionary War were, when our State constitution was adopted, permitted to remain in force through a want of due reflection, though adverse in principle to the express provisions of that instrument; and if meddled with at all, have only been modified in their details without comparing or testing them with the provisions of the constitution, or questioning the correctness of the principles on which they have been based; and *time, habit, example, precedent and tacit acquiescence* have operated to silence discussion and sanctify the wrong.

But though the advocates of this law have not been accustomed to hear it denounced for its injustice and unconstitutionality, let their attention be turned to the subject, let them examine it with due attention and candor, let them—I mean such of them as are accustomed to reflect, judge and determine for themselves, and to submit their opinions and prejudices to the empire of reason, to the power of incontestable data and irrefutable deductions—let them see, as I shall prove, that the provisions and operation of this law are hostile to the spirit and genius of our free political institutions, adverse to "the benevolent principles of rational liberty," the equal rights of man, and the express provisions of our constitution—let them understand, as I will demonstrate, that it is at variance with the plainest truths and soundest moral maxims of the Christian system of religion—and no doubt can be seriously entertained that they would be as

willing to expunge it from our statute book as others would be to acquiesce in the wisdom and magnanimity of so just a measure.

It is the *law* alone, not the *motives* which induced its enactment, which I condemn. The law itself is still the same, and equally wrong, be the motives which gave it existence ever so unexceptionable. The purity of the motives may excuse their possessors from uncharitable crimination, but never can justify measures resulting even from *honest error*. That the law in question is a wrong resulting from good intentions I have no reason or disposition to doubt. Because its provisions and its effect are adverse to the Christian religion professed by those who probably influenced its enactment, it is fair, or at least it is charitable, to infer that had its inconsistency with the moral precepts of that religious system been adverted to and duly considered, it would never have become or continued a law after the adoption of the constitution of this State.

I will not deny that in treating on this subject I have, in several instances, run into actual or apparent repetition. Though this is an error, I trust it is not inexcusable. Were an apology deemed necessary and admissible, I would state that the same facts and inductions were found to apply equally to several objections which I have supposed would probably be raised against the positions I have taken, and I chose to leave the acknowledged error uncorrected, rather than hazard or sacrifice *perspicuity* by attempting to repair an excusable breach of the rules of composition.

There has been often manifested a disposition to affect an extension of the erroneous principles and provisions of the *Sunday laws*, so called. Among other measures proposed the interdiction of traveling and transportation on the canals on Sunday has more than once been

attempted to be effected. These and several other occurrences which have happened in the course of several years past have had a tendency to excite the public mind and incline it to the investigation of the religious as well as the political rights of the people. All the statute laws of the State are now undergoing the process of review and revision. These circumstances among others induce me to deem it my duty to give publicity to the following pages, and to choose the present time for that purpose; and in the language of *Junius*, to exhort and conjure the people "never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance might appear, to pass by without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy. This is not the cause of a faction, or a party, or an individual, but the common interest of every man in the community."

On entering upon the subject of investigation I would have it explicitly understood that I disclaim any intention of treating it as a religious polemic. I shall not advocate the sectarian tenets of any one denomination of theologians more than another, but as a just man, willing to award to others rights equal to those I claim for myself, and contending for the equal rights of all mankind to the "free exercise and enjoyment of the benevolent principles of rational liberty," I propose to show:

First, That the act of the legislature of this [New York] State, entitled "An act for suppressing immorality," violates the natural, inalienable and equal rights of man.

Secondly, That it contravenes the ex-

press provisions of the constitution of this State.

Thirdly, That it is inconsistent with the moral maxims and precepts of the religious system on which it purports to be founded.

No religion can be true which upholds "spiritual oppression and intolerance," for spiritual oppression and intolerance are acts of cruelty and uncharitableness. And no civil policy can be just which derogates from the equal rights of all mankind, for unequal laws are acts of injustice, and when their objects or their effects are to constrain one portion of the community to violate their own conscientious religious opinions, or to conform to the religious sectarian tenets of others, they are justly denominated "acts of spiritual oppression and intolerance," and hence cannot be the eman-

By agreement Kendall, Mont., merchants "will close their stores all day on Sundays hereafter."

A report from Seeleyville, Ind., says "a threat to enforce Sunday closing of saloons fell through when the saloonmen threatened to force all stores to close if the matter was pressed."

The grocers' association of Duluth, Minn., recently appointed a committee "to look into the matter of Sunday selling." "It is the desire of the association that all groceries be closed on Sundays."

Davenport makes a silent but eloquent answer to all the charges of wickedness that have been preferred against it by fining a man who sold a pair of socks on Sunday.—*Oskaloosa (Ia.) Herald.*

Disturbed by the news that "a man [presumably an American] living a short distance from town amused himself on Sunday by making repairs on his dwell-

tion of a true religion or the result of a righteous civil policy. If, therefore, the act of the legislature of this [New York] State, entitled "An act for suppressing immorality," passed March 13, 1813,¹ which forbids *labor* and *recreation*—*business* and *pleasure*—on the first day of the week, as *acts of immorality*, shall in its object or effect be found on investigation to coerce one portion of the community, contrary to their own religious opinions, to conform to the religious sectarian tenets of others, I shall not hesitate to pronounce it an act of *spiritual oppression*, *intolerance* and *injustice*—an act incompatible with the natural, equal and inalienable rights of man, adverse to the express provisions of the political constitution of this State, and therefore one that cannot be the emanation of a true religion or the result of a righteous civil policy.

ing," the Saskatoon (Canada) *Phoenix* declares that "both the Canadian law and the Canadian Sabbath are institutions which we cannot afford to cheapen, notwithstanding our liberality of feeling towards the stranger within our gates," and quotes the *Carnduff Gazette* thus:

Canadians have nothing but welcome for the Americans. They are all right. But there is one thing that Canadians don't want, and won't have, and that is American disregard of the Sabbath. The Canadian law says six days shalt thou labor and do all that thou hast to do, but on the seventh day shalt thou not work. This law—because it is the law—has got to be kept. We are no sour Sabbatarian who thinks the Almighty is enraged if a man happens to whistle on Sunday. As a newspaper we are called upon to discuss the theological aspect of the Christian Sabbath; but we stand for the day of rest.

¹The law was then altered, revised and re-enacted. A law similar in its principles and provisions was in existence before that time. [A law identical in its principles and very similar in its provisions has been in existence ever since in New York.—EDITOR.]

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed elsewhere in the paper.

A petition "asking for the enforcement of the Sunday law" was circulated in Jackson, Minn., on August 3. The action was "aimed at the baseball club, which has Sunday games scheduled." An injunction against the playing was obtained, and "placed in the sheriff's hands for service."

+

Charles Tiger, a barber at Rockaway Beach, L. I., was arrested on Sunday, July 19, "charged with a violation of the barber law." He "was found by a patrolman shaving a customer at 3:10 o'clock," and "according to the barber law shops must close at 1 o'clock on Sundays."

+

It was reported from Evansville, Ind., recently that "the citizens' league, under the leadership of the Rev. Dr. Whittle," was threatening "to take matters into its own hands if the law against Sunday opening of saloons is not rigidly enforced." The mayor was about to take action in the matter. "Dr. Whittle says that after the saloons are closed on Sundays he will begin a fight against Sunday baseball."

+

It was reported recently in Des Moines, Iowa, papers that the secretary of the "busy preparing a letter which will be busy preparing a letter which will be sent out to all the grocers of the city, advising them of the law of the State regarding the closing of all stores." With this report the papers printed the text of the State law against "breach of the Sabbath." "The plan is to send to each one of the stores a letter advising them of the law, and then if they do not live up

to it is proposed to enforce it by other means."

+

It was reported from Vancouver, Wash., on July 30, that "the threatened move of the saloon-keepers in regard to the closing up of all business houses has come to pass." The preceding Sunday

was the first Sunday in the history of the city when every business house which comes under the provisions of the State Sunday-closing law was closed, with the possible exception of two lunch counters, the doors of which were open in opposition to the wishes of the saloonmen. Every business man was notified on Saturday not to open his place of business on Sunday, and there was general compliance with the order. All the cigar and confectionery establishments closed, as well as most of the restaurants. Nothing but hotels, livery stables and undertakers kept open. The saloonmen say that so long as they are compelled to keep their doors shut not a single place of business shall run. Baseball games will also be prohibited on Sundays. There may be legal complications.

+

It was reported from Atlantic City, N. J., on August 4, that "the city ordinance passed two years ago prohibiting Sunday amusements is to be enforced, and wholesale arrests are about to be made by the police." On August 1 the chief of police "issued an order to the various amusement proprietors to close Sunday." The order was not strictly obeyed, and on August 4 "the police turned in reports of band concerts on the steel pier and on the ocean pier, running of boats at the Old Mill, Japanese rolling ball games, and various other alleged violations, and complaints were made accordingly." "Captain J. O. Young of the ocean pier and Ed. C. Boyce of the Old Mill were arrested and gave bail." It is said that the

penalty for violating the ordinance "is a fine of \$200 or thirty days imprisonment."



At a "Sunday-observance mass-meeting" called by the Young People's Union of the Presbyterian churches of Superior, Wis., at the instance of "the ministers that have been active in the movement against Sunday theaters," held on July 26, "a committee was appointed to draw up resolutions asking the mayor to instruct the chief of police to stop all Sunday evening theaters and Sunday baseball and present them to him." "If the mayor takes no action, some of the other means proposed at the meeting will be resorted to." Rev. Mr. Payne, chairman of the meeting, in stating the object for which it was called, said "there is nothing more important than that we as Christians live in opposition to the encroachments of Satan," and that "it is the business of a Christian to be fighting against these things." A Christian does not fight against evil via mayors and chiefs of police.



On Sunday, July 26, the journeymen barbers' union of Davenport, Iowa, had out pickets watching for open shops. They were agreeably surprised to find that the circulation of a Sunday-opening agreement among the boss barbers during the week did not result in the resumption of Sunday opening, only the six shops which had refused from the beginning to close being open. The journeymen "have decided to fine every member \$5 for each offense in working on Sundays," and "announce that they will boycott every merchant found patronizing the six shops that remain open on Sunday." They have "appointed a committee to look after these shops and as far as possible take the names of those found patronizing them." A representative of the union explains that the journeymen will "use ev-

ery fair means to enforce Sunday closing before resorting to prosecution"; they "will not prosecute unless compelled to do so in order to win their point."



According to the Boston *Herald* of July 21, "Chief Wade of the State police" had not "finished with Revere Beach yet" in the matter of Sunday enforcement. He still had "his eye open for infractions of the Sunday law, giving particular attention to shows and amusements given under the auspices of religious or charitable societies." He was convinced that "such entertainments were contrary to law," but had "asked the attorney-general for an opinion on this point." If the opinion "bore out his construction of the statute, the managers of these shows would hear from him." Among these would "be included the Rev. George E. Littlefield, who has announced his intention of establishing a 'civic church' at Revere, and of getting support for it from innocent amusements, such as merry-go-rounds, etc., operated on the Lord's Day in behalf of this church." We understand that since this news appeared the question of Sunday-law enforcement has been to the fore at Revere. Mr. Littlefield has discussed the matter in his Sunday talks, and shown the injustice of such legislation and enforcement.



The village of Grayling, Mich., was recently "stirred as never before by an agitation started primarily by the Christian and moral element of the community on account of the desecration of the Sabbath, as defined in all Christian doctrine and pronounced illegal by the statutes of the State."

The direct cause of the movement was the fact of public games of baseball on Sunday. The clergy preached upon the subject, and with others urged the violators of the law to desist, relying for a time on moral suasion, but finding that did not avail gave them notice

that if needs be the law would be invoked for their protection.

On July 12 "several gentlemen who are actively interested in the moral welfare of the place" learned that a game of ball was in progress. They "at once notified the prosecuting attorney and sheriff of the fact, and the sheriff visited the field and ordered the players to desist." This they declined to do, "whereupon complaint was made before Justice Sleight, and warrants were issued for the arrest of eight or nine players whom the complainants knew." We are not informed as to the outcome of the matter. The local paper devoted two columns to the matter, quoting the Sunday law and the opinion of Justice Grant, in the case of Scougale vs. Sweet, as to the application of the law to ball playing and the duty of sheriffs with respect thereto.

✦

"A movement to put a stop to Sunday baseball playing" was recently reported from Minnesota Lake, Minn.—On July 31 it was reported from Superior, Wis., that "a crusade has been started by several church organizations against Sunday baseball games."—A report from Wymore, Neb., says "the clergy have gone after the Sunday ball players to such an extent that the manager of the games has announced his intention of cutting out the Sunday games."—A game of ball having been announced for Sunday, August 2, at O'Neill, Neb., "members of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches circulated a petition asking the city authorities to stop the game." "The authorities assured the committee of church people that they would not allow the game to be played."—It was reported from Baraboo, Wis., on July 27, that "the crusade headed by several ministers of this city against ball playing and other pastimes on Sunday has been declared off by the clergy."

Upon the issuing of several warrants against

the ball players warrants were also issued against the Rev. Jesse E. Searles, Assemblyman Franklin Johnson and City Engineer W. G. Kerchoffer, who attended the ball game in order to procure evidence. The first case against Floyd B. Hook, one of the ball players, was decided against the preachers by a jury. Mr. Alward, of Madison, the ministers' attorney, advised his clients to drop all further proceedings, as the public sentiment is all with the boys.

✦

At Hudson, Wis., on August 1, Jasper Padden, a saloon-keeper, was fined \$25 and costs "for selling liquor on Sunday."—At Dubuque, Iowa, on August 6, James McDonald was fined \$50 and costs "for violating the mulct law by having his saloon open" on the preceding Sunday.—At Hayfield, Minn., on July 27, a saloon-keeper was fined \$100 "for violating the Sunday-closing clause of the liquor law."—At Marshall, Texas, on July 22, W. F. Beck, "charged with selling whiskey on Sunday, was tried in the recorder's court by a jury, and was fined \$50 and costs."—At Des Moines, Iowa, on July 25, F. J. Johnson, a saloon-keeper, was fined \$50 and costs "for selling liquor on Sunday."—The board of police commissioners of Jeffersonville, Ind., recently ordered the enforcement of the Sunday-closing law against saloons.—The president of the anti-saloon league of Sioux City, Iowa, Rev. Wm. Williams, has announced his intention of compelling the Sunday closing of Germania Park, a beer garden of that city. The league has just been waging a law-enforcement crusade upon the saloons of the place, the principal thing being the enforcement of Sunday closing. For this purpose temporary injunctions requiring the proprietors to observe the law were secured. Mr. Williams has announced that "the first man who is caught disobeying his injunction will be prosecuted for contempt of court."

✦

The Minneapolis Commercial Bulletin

says that "Minnesota clerks are becoming more and more interested in the new Sunday-closing law." It says that "there are many towns which would be benefited by its strict enforcement," and that "the clerks are the people to take the initiative." The way to proceed in the matter, it says, "is to get a part of the merchants to agree to close, and if the rest refuse to get into line, petition the county attorney to apply the law." The law is not so satisfactory to the people generally and to the dealers in the smaller places as it is to the clerks' and grocers' associations of the cities, for whom it was enacted. It was recently reported that "protests against the new Sunday-closing law are coming in from every section of the State, particularly from the smaller towns."

The part that is especially obnoxious is the prohibition of the selling of meats. It is the practise in smaller places to open the meat shops for an hour or two Sunday morning. Few of the citizens have ice boxes, and those who have not cannot keep meat over Sunday in the hot weather. So far the law has been disregarded, but there have been many questions about its enforcement. The bill was introduced at the instance of the State Federation of Labor, and with particular reference to retail clerks, and the members from outside the large cities did not seem to realize that it would be obnoxious to their constituents. In effect, the law forbids the sale of any commodities on Sunday except such necessities as tobacco, fruits, confectionery, newspapers, drugs, medicines and surgical appliances. The prohibiting of the sale of bread also causes a great deal of opposition, as many confectionery stores and bakeries do a large business in that commodity on Sunday. In the cities the grocers are practically a unit for the law's enforcement.



At the June meeting of the St. Paul, Minn., retail grocers' association "a committee of four was appointed to cooperate with the law officers of the city and county for the enforcement of the new Sunday-closing law which went into

effect on April 21 last." This committee "secured a conference with Corporation Attorney Michael, and found that officer in sympathy with the purpose to enforce the law, and ready to give the committee any assistance required through his department of the municipal government." He "assigned his assistant, Amel Helmes, to take charge of the cases which it might be desired to prosecute." Following this "letters were sent to the storekeepers calling their attention to the law and stating the intention to bring suits to enforce it." The result of this "joint action of the association and the corporation attorney's office" was that in a short time it could be said that "there is only one store in the city that has not complied with the act." The next move was by the retail grocery clerks' association, which through a representative on July 15 secured a warrant for the arrest of this one grocer, P. G. Hoffman, "charging him with violating the State law against keeping open grocery stores on Sunday." Two representatives of the clerks' association had gone to the store on Sunday and "purchased a can of gasoline and a bunch of radishes." After one or two postponements the hearing of the case took place on August 6. "Hoffman pleaded guilty to keeping open on Sunday, and sentence was suspended for one month." One of the complainants "admitted on the stand that he was employed by J. W. Lanahan's grocery, and was sent to Hoffman's store to make the purchase." A member of the clerks' union thinks "the prosecution of Hoffman will scare the others who might open, so that they will remain closed." The grocers' association "means business, and efforts will not be relaxed to discover those who may think they can defy the law."



The church people of Englewood, Ill., are again, as some ten years ago, attempting to compel a theater to observe the

church institution, the religious Sunday. The following appeared in the *Chicago Tribune* of July 31:

Trouble awaits the Marlowe Theater in Englewood if the playhouse is opened on Sundays. The Englewood Baptist Church, on an adjoining lot, has already issued a protest, and other religious bodies and the Law and Order League have been asked to take up the fight. The first intimation of the intention to have Sunday performances came on Wednesday, when advertising bills appeared announcing the opening night as Sunday, September 6. The assistant pastor of the Baptist church, Rev. Alonzo A. Hobson, presided at a meeting that night at which the Sunday opening was strongly condemned.

On August 7 the *Record-Herald* reported:

The churches of Englewood are uniting in an attack on the Marlowe Theater. The congregations will hold a mass-meeting to discuss plans to prevent Sunday performances. An injunction is talked of. The Englewood Law and Order League is aiding in the fight. Yesterday a committee from the league called on Richard L. Crescy, the manager, and asked that the date of the opening be postponed to Monday, September 7, and that no Sunday performances be given. Mr. Crescy would not accede to that request. As soon as the conference ended the Law and Order League issued a call

In a communication to the *Chicago Record-Herald* in reply to criticisms made by another correspondent upon his position with regard to Sunday legislation, Mr. Clarence C. Gates, of Tuscola, Ill., says the following that is well worth quoting:

My Wisconsin critic has either misunderstood or misrepresented what I wrote as an arraignment of the legislatively and officially enforced observance of Sunday. It was exactly my contention that not only every community, but every individual, should enjoy, not only upon one particular day, but upon every day, not only "any degree of personal liberty," according to just rights, but every degree of "personal liberty," upon every day, whether it be Sunday or any one of the seven days of each and every week. That is the very thing that my critic would prevent if he could. **He wishes to enjoy rights for himself, but would place**

for a mass-meeting Sunday afternoon at the First Baptist Church to protest and discuss plans. The meeting will be addressed by Assistant State's Attorney Frank W. Blair, Rev. Dr. Shepard and William Ferguson, secretary of the league. Legal advice as to the advisability of injunction proceedings will be presented.

On August 10 the *Chicago Journal* reported:

Three hundred citizens of Englewood held a mass-meeting Sunday evening at the First Baptist Church to protest against Sunday performances at the Marlowe Theater. Big yellow posters announce the opening of the show season Sunday evening, September 6. The legal aspect of the controversy is not encouraging to opponents of the theater, and though a fund of \$250 was collected to aid in fighting the Sunday opening, peaceable measures will first be resorted to, and a committee will again call on Manager Crescy and endeavor to change his plans.

Mr. Crescy "asserts that he has a list of 5,000 names, all residents of Englewood, who are desirous of having the theater open on Sunday," and "that he will open the new playhouse September 6, despite the efforts of the Law and Order League and those who are fighting the enterprise."

his wish above the rights of others, as if one's rights were to be determined by another's wish. My purpose was not to arraign the voluntary observance of Sunday as a Sabbath or as a day of rest. Obviously for such a purpose no law would be required, in perfect justice. To observe or not to observe any day is a choice which exists as a changeless right. . . . The "Sunday law" is aimed at those who do not and will not observe Sunday as a Sabbath, they alone being the target. . . . On the very Sunday that my article was published a "law" became effective in Arkansas by which a man was arrested for the extremely innocent act of selling chewing gum, and another was arrested for the even more innocent act of leaving his grocery store door open. . . . My critic fails to state how it is possible to be annoyed more upon one day than upon another, and why the laws against all disturbance and rowdiness, "confusion and noise," that effectually apply from Monday to Saturday inclusive—why these laws cannot be as effective on Sunday as upon any other day.

A Study of Principles

In Alonzo T. Jones' book entitled

"THE TWO REPUBLICS"

is a comparative study of the underlying principles of the two greatest Republics—Rome and the United States.

"The principle of Rome in all its phases is that religion and government are inseparable. The principle of the government of the United States is that religion is essentially distinct and wholly separate from civil government, and entirely exempt from its cognizance.

"As it was Christianity that first and always antagonized this governmental principle of Rome, and established the governmental principle of the United States of America, the fundamental idea, the one thread-thought of the whole book, is to develop the principles of Christianity with reference to civil government, and to portray the mischievous results of the least departure from those principles."

Rome occupies one extreme and the United States the other. Which is right? The question interests every reader of THE SENTINEL, for in its solution and the correct application of the principles lies the salvation of individual as well as nation.

"Two Republics" contains 895 octavo pages and is substantially bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, \$1.75.

Complete catalog of publications mailed on request. Address

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
11 WEST 20th STREET, NEW YORK CITY.**

LEGAL SUNDAY

Sunday laws and their enforcement has become one of the leading questions of the day. The subject is one of absorbing interest and much has been written upon it. Much, too, has been said by the clergy, by the lawyers, by the legislatures and by the courts.

Until recently, however, there seems to have been no very careful inquiry into the merits of the case of the legal Sunday—no open challenge of its right to exist.

In **THE LEGAL SUNDAY: Its History and Character**, James T. Ringgold, a member of the Baltimore bar at his decease, challenges Sunday's legal right to an existence. This book is a clear, logical, forceful presentation of a subject which is of vital interest to every American citizen.

"Legal Sunday" contains 252 pages, is bound in paper covers, and costs the small sum of **25 cents**.

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM

A straightforward discussion of the relation of the Christian patriot to earthly governments, and of the principles which should govern him. An important subject, too, in these days when so many seem befogged and uncertain as to their duties and responsibilities in this respect. **CLOTH, 40 Cents.**

THE GREAT NATIONS OF TO-DAY

In this the author plainly shows that the great nations of to-day are clearly mentioned in the Bible, and their destiny foretold. A most interesting historical and prophetic study, proving incidentally the inspiration of the Bible.

PAPER COVERS, 25 Cents.

THE MARSHALING OF THE NATIONS

This little booklet shows conclusively that the five great Powers actually hold in their hands the *power* and a greater part of the *territory* of the world. But there is a significance to all this that but few understand. Read this pamphlet and the meaning will be plain. Has a double-page, four-color map of the world, showing how it is now partitioned among the various powers. **PAPER COVERS, 10 Cents.**

Address,

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.
11 West 20th Street, New York City.**