

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 10, 1903

NO. 37



*"In religious things the majority are generally on the wrong side."*

*In the realm of morals right and truth are always in the majority, and he who would be in the majority must ally himself with them.*

*The religion of a person has to do with the relation of his soul, not of society, to God, and it is therefore not a matter for social or majority control, but should be left to the individual and to God.*

*A law which forbids labor on Sunday on the ground that it is immoral, and which at the same time gives permission to some to labor on that day, is either founded upon falsehood or is in rebellion against moral law. Most Sunday laws do both these things.*

*If it is right to exempt seventh-day observers from the legal requirement of Sunday observance, then it is wrong not to exempt all who do not conscientiously believe Sunday observance to be a moral and religious duty; and if all who do not conscientiously hold to the day as the Sabbath are exempted from the requirement to observe it (as they must be, or else suffer a flagrant interference with their rights of conscience), then there is no need for a Sunday law at all, for those who conscientiously hold to the day as the Sabbath will observe it without the compulsion of the law.*



# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1903

No. 37

### Two Communica- tions

We have received the following communication from Rev. Alexander Coffin, rector of the "Church of the Holy Communion," Redwood, Minn., some of whose statements on the subject of "Sabbath observance" we quoted and commented upon three weeks ago:

*Editor of The Sentinel:*

In quoting from my sermon on Sunday observance a typographical error crept in. Where it reads "the seventh day" it should read "the seven day," that is, the entire week. With the correction the passage would read: "If employers universally were to hold their employees to unremitting labor on the seven days of the week [that is for the entire week] there would undoubtedly be an overwhelming protest throughout the business world."

The transference of the weekly rest day from the "seventh" to the "first" day of the week must be considered, it seems to me (and in this I think you agree with me) to be merely a ritual change, and the religious and moral obligation pertaining to the weekly day of rest still holds good, but attaches to the first day of the week, not the seventh, for *Christendom*. The obligation and benefit of the Fourth Commandment is for us now and for all men through all time. And this obligation and benefit it seems to me lies in the possibilities which the Christian Sunday affords (all business and servile work suspended as far as possible) for worship and re-creation.

I hold with you, if I understand you rightly, that the law should not be invoked with any thought of enforcing the *religious* observance of the Sunday. There is more in the weekly day of rest than a religious institution. It touches man's physical and mental as well as his spiritual nature—he needs it, his whole nature needs the day of rest. And if the law

can guarantee the day of rest, if it can be invoked to protect it, then surely the enforcement of a Sunday law is called for by the humane spirit of the times, not particularly for religious reasons, unless we hold that to be humane is to be religious. We have our Christian Sunday; shall not an enlightened people preserve it intelligently, freely, religiously, and thus promote our best interests?

The typographical error, which we are glad to have Mr. Coffin call attention to, occurred in the local newspaper from which we quoted. The correction removes the implication that he considered Sunday to be the seventh day of the week. In one sense, yes, "the transference of the weekly rest day from the seventh to the first day of the week must be considered to be merely a ritual change," for it certainly could not have been a transfer of religious and moral obligation. But the difficulty is that the change is assumed to have been a transference of religious and moral obligation. This Mr. Coffin assumes in the very sentence in which he says it was merely a ritual change. He says "the religious and moral obligation pertaining to the weekly day of rest still holds good, but *attaches to the first day of the week*, not the seventh, for *Christendom*." Now the religious and moral obligation pertaining to the weekly day of rest is now just exactly what it was before the transfer from the seventh to the first day took place. The authority which assumed to make this change was not competent to alter or transfer moral obligation in any degree. Therefore if the religious and

moral obligation pertaining to the weekly rest day did not attach to the first day of the week before this change was made it does not since; and if this obligation attached to the seventh day before this transfer took place it attaches to it still. That it did attach to the seventh day, not the first, before this transfer took place cannot be denied without impeaching the authority that is relied upon for the obligation itself. The Fourth Commandment is no more clear and explicit with respect to Sabbath observance than it is with respect to the Sabbath *day*, and if it imposes a religious and moral obligation in the matter of a weekly day of rest it must be that obligation pertains and attaches to the day that it expressly designates. It is therefore not clear how "the religious and moral obligation pertaining to the weekly day of rest" derived from this commandment can be held to attach "to the first day of the week, not the seventh, for Christendom" or any other part of the world, notwithstanding the transference mentioned. The change in question, whether it be considered as merely ritual or otherwise, is one for which there is absolutely no sanction whatever from the authority which must be relied upon for the religious and moral obligation with respect to the observance of a weekly day of rest. We are glad that Mr. Coffin holds "that the law should not be invoked with any thought of enforcing the *religious* observance of the Sunday." Few avowedly hold otherwise. But again there is a difficulty, and it is that there can be no enforcement of the observance of the day without enforcing its religious observance, or without enforcing a religious observance, for "the Sunday" is a religious institution. That it is such to Mr. Coffin is very evident from his letter. It is to him the "*Christian Sunday*," and its observance a *religious and moral* obligation resting upon the *Fourth Com-*

*mandment*. If the argument that it is more than a religious institution is to justify its enforcement, then there are few religious institutions and observances the enforcement of which would not be justified. Every religious institution is necessarily in some respects a social institution; so it can be said that in every religious institution there is something more than religion. But can that be allowed to justify their support and enforcement by law? Does not religion itself touch man's physical and mental as well as his spiritual nature? and does not his whole nature need religion as much as it needs "the day of rest?" Are we therefore to conclude that it is proper and humane to "guarantee," "protect" and enforce religion by law? We do not say that "the Sunday" is not from one standpoint a social institution, but we do say that it belongs to that class of social institutions which are debarred by the principle of separation of church and state from support and enforcement by the state. If the Sunday institution can be made out to be a civil as well as a religious institution, then there can be no distinction between the civil and the religious, and the idea of the separation of church and state simply amounts to nothing at all. An *enlightened* people should not expect and attempt to preserve "our *Christian Sunday*" by law, and they will not if they preserve it *intelligently and freely*, and in accord with the best interests of society. In connection with the above communication we will present another which came about the same time. It is from Mrs. Eliza Gaily, Joseph, Ore. After ordering her paper discontinued, she said:

I cannot see your paper as anything but a wolf trying to appear in sheep's clothing. Where would Christianity in our beloved land rank in the coming generations if no day is compelled to be remembered and set apart for the worship of God and the study of the

Bible? I believe there should be strenuous laws to prevent the open desecration of the day set apart for God's worship, and accepted by a majority of the people. The spirit of the law (one seventh of the number of days in the week) can be observed in worshipping on the first day regularly. Where no legislation compels the prevention of it, it is the natural tendency of man to do wrong. It has been so since the beginning of time. There must be a "Thou shalt not" to keep matters right.

We cannot comment on this, except to say that the fact that there are so many people who have the same ideas and take the same position as does Mrs. Gaily is what makes necessary the publication of such a paper as *THE SENTINEL*.



The *Christian Register* says that the assertion of papal infallibility by the Catholic Church "really undermined its authority because most of the world regards it as a huge blunder." That was most certainly a huge blunder in some respects, but it is a blunder that "the Church" seems well able to survive. From the way things have been going since that assertion was made it seems doubtful if most of the world does regard it as a huge blunder, or that it was a blunder so far as the growth and influence of "the Church" is concerned. The number of those who bow to her authority has rapidly grown since this pronouncement was made, and nowhere more rapidly than in this country, where if anywhere the blunder named should have been fatal to such progress. The blunder of papal infallibility lies further back than the decree of 1870. It is in the doctrine itself, and that doctrine is of the very essence of the papacy and has been throughout her whole career. The Papacy herself is a huge blunder, but she has flourished and does flourish wonderfully nevertheless. Huge blunders of this sort do not seem to be sufficient to alienate the deference, allegiance, and admiration of the world.

Although it has been treated with contempt by the press not a single prosecution has been made under the "press muzzle" law enacted in Pennsylvania a few months ago. It is said that "except that it is exerting a malign influence on the political fortunes of those who voted for it and secured its passage, the law is a dead letter." And what are the clerical champions of "law and order," those gentlemen who so constantly and tragically tell us that "the non-enforcement of law endangers the rights and liberties of every citizen," that "the integrity and dignity of our social and civil order depends upon the literal enforcement of law," doing? There are plenty of them in Pennsylvania. Surely they will not quietly allow such a terrible state of affairs to continue. Will they not arise in their might and insist that "the law must be enforced as it is found on the statute books," and that "the issue raised by its non-enforcement strikes at the very foundation of our free institutions"? And if objection and protest is made, will they not declare that "if the law works hardship recourse must be had to the legislature, and not to the public officers whose business it is to enforce the law as they find it"? No, they will do nothing of the kind. The reason is that the law in question is not a *Sunday law*.



With regard to the recent action of the Lutheran conference at Utica the *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* says:

We have never heard of those gentlemen objecting to the Protestant chaplain of Congress, though it is much nearer to the idea of church and state connection than a Presidential expression of condolence at the death of a Pope.

This is doubtless true, but two wrongs do not make a right. Governmental chaplains and governmental condolences on the death of a Pope are both seriously out of harmony with the idea of separation

of church and state. That the first is such is evidenced by the fact that it can be cited as an excuse for the other.

✱

In a recent sermon Rev. Lindsley of Benton, Wis., "denounced Sunday baseball in no uncertain terms," and took the local paper to task for publishing accounts of such games. The paper pleaded in response that "a publisher may not be in favor of Sunday desecration in any manner, any more than he would be in sympathy with the acts of a street brawl, a burglary, assassination or incendiarism, yet in his line of business it is expected of him that he give a true account of all these public happenings." It would be a happy thing indeed if the newspapers had nothing worse than Sunday ball playing to report. It seems, though, that to some people this is about the worst thing they can report.

✱

"The question of the Sabbath and its Observance in Appleton" was the subject of a sermon by Rev. A. G. Washington at Appleton, Minn., on August 16. Before "a large audience" he "showed that the Sabbath was a divine institution, clearly set forth in the Scriptures and its observance commanded by God, who as the constructor of the universe and the creator of man had the right to mark off time in periods and seasons for man's observance," and declared that "Sunday excursions and baseball tend to secularize the Sabbath, rather than hallow it, and hence are an offense to the enlightened Christian conscience of the community."

✱

It is reported that "Rev. Geo. L. McNutt, the 'labor preacher,' is a firm believer in Sunday baseball." He asked a saloonkeeper in Marion, Ind., recently, "if he was not glad when a ball game was played on Sunday," and the reply was: "Well, I should say not. When we have a ball game on Sunday in the city we have

scarcely any business. Everybody is at the game"! Mr. McNutt "holds that the want of suitable recreation is more to blame than anything else for the vice found in the cities," and there is much truth in his point.

✱

"The negotiations regarding the Vatican's participation in the St. Louis Exposition, interrupted by the illness and death of Pope Leo, have been resumed at Rome," and again the Vatican has indicated that "it will be favorable to the project of having the Holy See represented, *if officially invited by the United States government* by means of an invitation similar to those sent to the European powers."

✱

The *Winnipeg (Manitoba) Telegram* of August 22 published in full under display heading the portion of the report of the May business meeting of the New York State Law and Order Society containing the excellent remarks of the secretary on the Sunday-enforcement and Sabbath questions. The question of street-cars on Sunday is again being agitated in Winnipeg.

✱

At the police court hearing on August 25 of the cases of the three St. Paul, Minn., grocers whose arrest for Sunday selling was reported last week, "preliminary steps were taken to test the constitutionality of the law passed by the last legislature which requires the closing of all grocery stores on Sunday." The case of P. G. Hoffman "will be taken to the supreme court for a decision."

✱

The funeral of Roman Catholic Archbishop Katzer at Milwaukee, Wis., on July 24, was "attended by Governor La Follette and staff, and Mayor Rose and the city council, and judges and other officials." It was "the most elaborate Catholic demonstration in the history of the city."

# An Indictment of New York's Sunday Law<sup>1</sup>

## IV

WE have seen that the statute under review is condemned by the very authority quoted and appealed to in his justification—the alleged command of God. But it may be said of it, “Out of its own mouth it stands condemned.” It contains within itself the clearest evidence that the grounds or principles on which it is alleged to be based are altogether indefensible. In truth, its provisions amount to a full confession that to keep

the *first* day of the week as holy time is *not a moral obligation*, and that *labor and recreation on that day are not acts of immorality or licentiousness*.

Let it be observed that the statute of which we are speaking is entitled “An act for suppressing immorality.” The first enacting clause of this law forbids labor and recreation on the first day of the week as “*acts of immorality*,” and the second enacting clause permits those to labor on the first day who keep the seventh “as holy time.” This partial toleration of the seventh-day sabbateans<sup>1</sup> was *right* or it was *wrong*. If *wrong*, it could only be so because it was *immoral* to labor on that day, and then the law granting that permission would be an *immoral* law. If *right* to grant it, and the passing of the second enacting clause of the law concedes that truth, it is *right* because it was not deemed *immoral* to labor on that day; and then the legislature had no right to interdict any one from laboring on religious grounds. Allowing the seventh-day sabbateans to labor on this statutory sabbath day is a virtual acknowledgment that the first day of the week is neither a sabbath by divine appointment, nor its observance as holy time a matter of *moral obligation*; for were it *either* the legislature could possess no righteous authority to enact a law granting indulgences to any one, dispensing with its obligations. These two enacting clauses of the law in question can no more be reconciled to each other than they can be made to accord with the rules

<sup>1</sup> 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 are publishing 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.—EDITOR.

<sup>1</sup> [Note by the writer.] Perhaps the critics will take offense at the use of this term. It is true I do not find it in any vocabulary. But if there is no such word I think there ought to be. It answers my present purpose, and for that reason I use it, taking for its radix the Hebrew word *Sabbat*, which signifies *cessation* or *rest*.

of correct logical reasoning or the righteous principles of equal justice.

The enacting clause last quoted admits it to be unrighteous and oppressive, although it is the sabbath day of a majority of the Christian sect, to oblige the seventh-day sabbateans to abstain from labor on the first day of the week and keep it as a day of rest from labor—a religious sabbath day. Its being the sabbath day of a majority of the Christian sect is admitted by the second enacting clause under consideration not to be a sufficient reason why those should not labor on it who do not conscientiously hold to it as a religious sabbath day. The seventh day sabbateans are therefore exempted from the observance of Sunday as a sabbath *because they do not conscientiously hold to it as such*. And because the second enacting clause does *not* deem it immoral for those to labor on Sunday who do not conscientiously hold to it as a religious sabbath day, the seventh-day sabbateans are allowed to labor on it. If, therefore, it is *not* immoral for those to labor on the Christian sabbath day who do not religiously hold to it as such, and if it is for that reason *righteous* to excuse the seventh-day sabbateans from the legal obligation to observe and keep it as holy time, is it not *unrighteous*, is it not *oppressive* to oblige *others* to abstain from labor on that day and keep it as a sabbath who, like the seventh-day sabbateans, also disclaim it as their sabbath day? Is it not an act of “spiritual oppression and intolerance,” which, though it tolerates the seventh-day sabbateans in their *infidelity* of Sunday as a sabbath by divine appointment, and concedes their *moral* and *religious* right to entertain and exercise that opinion, does *not* tolerate any other persons who accord with the seventh-day sabbateans in their *unbelief* of Sunday as the “Sabbath of the Lord,” nor allow them to exercise the moral and religious right to act ac-

ording to their own conscientious opinions “in respect to the sabbath days”?

And why not extend this act of toleration to *all others* who, as well as the seventh-day sabbateans, do not conscientiously believe the first day of the week to be a sabbath by divine appointment? This clause of partial toleration was enacted because the other bore hard upon the seventh-day sabbateans. Besides abridging their equal liberty of conscience it infringed their rights in other respects. They could not conscientiously labor on their own sabbath day, and the first day sabbateans would not suffer them to work on their's. Instead, therefore, of having *six* days to labor to support their families and themselves, they had only *five*, in contravention of the command which they honestly and religiously believe to be of God: “*Six days* shalt thou labor and do all thy work.” The second enacting clause of the law in question was interposed to relieve the seventh-day sabbateans from the unrighteous and oppressive operation of the first, admitting thereby that the first enacting clause, coercing the observance of the first day of the week as a sabbath day, is unrighteous and oppressive to the seventh-day sabbateans. *Then it is equally so on every individual in the State who does not conscientiously believe Sunday to be the “Sabbath of the Lord.”* Allow me to repeat: If it was right and just to relieve the seventh-day sabbateans, it was *wrong* and *unjust* not to relieve *all other persons in the State who do not hold to Sunday as a religious sabbath*. They yet are as much oppressed by the law in question as were the seventh-day sabbateans and are as much entitled to be exempted from its unrighteous operation. And until they are relieved it will continue to be, as it has been and now is, an uncharitable, unjust, oppressive and intolerant statute law.

I may run the risk of becoming tedious,

and perhaps will incur the imputation of too much repetition, but I am not willing to leave this part of the subject matter of my argument without attempting its further elucidation.

If it is *immoral* to labor on the first day sabbath, it was *immoral before* the passing of the law in question; otherwise that law could never make it so; and then the law permitting labor on it would be *immoral*. If it was *immoral before*, it can be no less so *after* the passing of that act, for civil governments have no more right or power to alter or repeal a *moral* law than they have to make it; and then it follows, as before, that a legislative act can neither sanctify the act or absolve aggressors from its moral obligation. If the law is *right* in forbidding labor on the *first day* sabbath as *immoral*, it is *wrong* to allow it to be profaned by servile labor by *any one*, for *all* are equally bound by moral obligations. If it was *right* to permit those to labor on the *first day* sabbath who keep the *seventh day* as *holy time*, it could be right on no other principle than that it was *not immoral* for them to do so. *Then it could not be immoral in any others to do so*

*who do not believe the first day of the week to be appointed a sabbath by divine authority.* The laws of morality, as I have before remarked, are obligatory on *one* as much as another, and equally so on all. No one can excuse himself, nor can any legislative act or any human power absolve him, from the performance of his moral obligations. For moral laws, like the God who made them, are universal, omnipotent, omnipresent, unchangeable and eternal. They are consistent with themselves, and accordant with the "benevolent principles of rational liberty." They enjoin *good will*, and award the equal rights of conscience to all mankind. But the statute law in question, by forbidding labor, etc., to be done on Sunday as *immoral*, and then permitting it to be done, may well be likened to "a house divided against itself"; it "cannot stand" the test of logical disquisition.

Inconsistency is a certain and indelible mark of error, and the provisions of the law in question are so palpably and irreconcilably at variance with each other that they cannot be sustained on any righteous or consistent principles.

**Sunday Ball Playing**  
Promotive of  
Morality

Sunday ball playing is receiving endorsement that is likely to prove troublesome to those clergymen who denounce it as a great evil and seek to suppress it as a crime. Elsewhere we make note of its endorsement by "Rev. Geo. L. McNutt, the labor preacher." Before an audience of divinity and sociology students at Chicago University Professor Chas. R. Henderson, formerly a Baptist clergyman, and now chaplain of the university, professor of sociology, and "an international authority on criminology," recently made these statements that have been widely reported:

Sunday baseball following participation in

Sunday religious exercises as a valuable and an easily available means of promoting morality among young men and boys of limited opportunity. I know that in taking this position I shall be considered unorthodox, and that other Protestant ministers will criticise the stand that I take. But after going over the entire situation the conclusion that I have reached is inevitable. We have here in Chicago, or anywhere else for that matter, a great group of boys passing through the years of adolescence. They do not know what to do with themselves. They must therefore be kept busy. They must be given constant and active outdoor occupation every day, including Sunday. We Protestants are doing nothing adequate for the boys of our slums. On Sunday those boys, like all other boys and young men, will do something, they will go somewhere—to the saloons if nothing better engages their attention. How infinitely better it is to have

them either participate in or witness baseball games. The Roman Catholic clergy all over this country, as well as abroad, are right in the position they maintain on this question. Catholic priests even more than Protestant ministers get their boys to church Sunday mornings, and then they encourage them to play ball and engage in other sports Sunday afternoon. They know the boys better than do the Protestant pastors. The thing to do for boys and young men is to give them healthful recreation. Keep them busy and they will be kept away from vice and crime.

It is said that "many of the divinity students heard these statements with wonder and astonishment," but that "so accurate was the professor's knowledge of conditions among working boys and men, and so strong his arguments, that they acknowledged before the lecture was over that they saw Sunday baseball in a new light." Of course those who wish, even "boys passing through the years of adolescence," can spend Sunday afternoon

in ways more profitable to them spiritually and more in accord with the assumed sacred and religious character of the day than that of ball playing, but there can be no question whatever that under existing conditions the course of the Catholic clergy in endorsing and encouraging healthful sports on Sunday afternoons is much more sensible and conducive to the moral welfare of boys and young men than is the "Protestant" method now so widely in vogue of attempting by law to make the boys and young men refrain from such "desecration of the Sabbath." Of course this means the "Catholic Sunday," but the Catholic Sunday is to be preferred to the Puritan Sunday *enforced by law*. And it should not be forgotten that Sunday observance is a Catholic observance anyhow. What consistent objection can be made to the Catholic way of observing a Catholic observance?

## What Majority Rule in Religious Things Means

By W. A. Colcord

THERE is another consideration worthy of notice in considering the question of majority rule. Civil governments are controlled by majorities; but *in religious things the majority are generally on the wrong side*. This the Scriptures teach. Says Christ: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14. If there were no other means than this by which to determine what is true and what is false in religion, the only safe course one could pursue would be to take the side of the minority every time.

Furthermore, it being true that in relig-

ious matters the majority are generally on the wrong side, to adopt the principle that the majority shall rule in religious things would be equivalent to saying that error shall prevail, and wrong be the law of the land. And this is by no means a mere theoretical conclusion drawn for the sake of argument. Lord Macaulay, in his review of Mr. Gladstone's work on "Church and State," gave expression to a great truth when he asked, "Have not almost all the governments in the world always been in the wrong on religious subjects?" Where one has used its power for the propagation of truth, he adds, a thousand have used their power for the propagation of falsehood.

Alexander Campbell has well said: "The man who seeks the truth by the test

of sincerity, majority, or antiquity, will never find it on earth. This is amply true of the present and all past ages. There are sincere Turks, Jews, pagans, infidels. There are many ancient errors, heresies, and sects. And as for majorities, from Enoch till now they have generally, if not always, been wrong in religion. Where was the majority when Noah was building the ark? when Abraham forsook Ur of the Chaldees? when Lot abandoned Sodom? when Moses forsook Egypt? when Elijah witnessed against Ahab? when Daniel and his companions were captives in Babylon? when Malachi wrote? when the Baptist preached? when Christ was crucified? when the apostles and many of the first Christians were persecuted?"<sup>1</sup> Let those ponder this who have been wont to insist that the majority should rule in religious things.

John Locke, the great Christian philosopher, says: "An error is not better for being common, nor the truth for having lain neglected; and if it were put to vote anywhere in the world, I doubt, as things are managed, whether truth would have a majority, at least while the authority of men, and not the examination of things, must be its measure."<sup>2</sup>

This doctrine of majority rule is the strength of error but the weakness of truth. God says: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment." Ex. 23: 2. Each one has the right and is commanded to prove all things, and hold fast that which is

good. And the test by which all beliefs and doctrines are to be proved is not the voice of the multitude, but the word of God. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8: 20. If the opinion of the majority settles what is right in religion, then the pagans should keep to their creed, Protestants should go back to Catholicism, and Catholicism to the paganism out of which it came. But to reason thus is unworthy any one with a Bible in his hand or a head on his shoulders.

But such is the logic, and such the practical and inevitable conclusions, of the principle that the majority should rule in religious things. It destroys individual responsibility and ignores the right of private judgment. It implies the right to use force in religion, and to coerce the conscience. It can result only in religious persecution, or in habits of hypocrisy and meanness. It is utterly inconsistent with the principle of religious liberty, and with the numerous and well-attested examples in which God has vindicated those who utterly ignored it. It is unworthy any one who prizes his rights and his liberties, or places any real value upon the religion which he professes. In civil affairs the majority of to-day may be the minority to-morrow. Therefore, he who adopts the principle of majority rule in religious things thereby places himself under the obligation to change his religious profession and opinions with every change of political or national fortune. He gives up his rights; he sells his soul.

A clergyman in Chicago recently addressed these words to his Sunday congregation:

I would have every Christian man go to the polls to-morrow as much from a sense of

Christian duty as he would go to a prayer meeting, and record his ballot as an act of worship before the great God of justice and truth.

An election contest, as a general rule, simply offers a man an opportunity to be a co-worker with a political party, not with the Lord. The candidates for office

<sup>1</sup>"Debate with Bishop Purcell," p. 295.

<sup>2</sup>"Essay on 'Human Understanding.'"

are nominated not by the Lord, but by the party leaders. The Lord has nothing to say about it. Is God thus left out of account where Christian duty is concerned?

God has His ways of working and His agencies, but they are not those of the politician. They are of His own devising, not of man's. God's agencies are spiritual; man's are not. What men often seek to do through politics and legislation, God purposes to do through the Gospel. God's agencies alone can reach the fountainhead of the stream of evil which pollutes the earth; and therefore they alone are effectual for true reform. At the polls Christ's followers are mere voters, in a hopeless minority. But as co-workers

with God they are the salt of the earth. Politicians—"Christian" politicians especially—proceed on the idea that the world can be reformed. God's work proceeds on the idea that the world cannot be reformed; that it is doomed to perdition, and that the only thing that can be done is to save people out of it. Man's methods and schemes to establish righteousness in the earth will fail, but God's will succeed. God's idea is the true one, and all others are wrong and futile. God is not in partnership with any political party, and the methods and agencies for His work are such as He alone, and no man nor party, has devised, and such as He alone controls.

L. A. SMITH.

## 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 "new ordinance in regard to the stores closing on Sunday" is in effect in Garden Grove, Iowa. It has "provoked considerable comment, both favorably and adversely," but "nearly all stores have complied with it."



The Winnipeg (Manitoba) *Press* reports that "all game wardens and mounted police of the Territories have received instructions from the government to rigidly enforce observance of game laws in regard to Sunday shooting."



It is reported from Atlantic City, N. J., that the "amusement men have talked the matter over among themselves and cannot figure out any gain by bucking the authorities and the sentiment of the masses" in the matter of Sunday opening, and so will "observe the Sabbath strictly."

Four proprietors of amusement places at Revere Beach, near Boston, were on August 11 "served with summonses to appear in the Chelsea police court to answer to the charge of keeping open a public diversion on the Lord's Day, contrary to law."



H. Stahl, Mrs. Solomon Cohen, and E. Epstein, storekeepers of St. Paul, Minn., were arraigned in the police court of that city on August 26 "charged with violating the Sunday-closing law." They were arrested on complaints sworn to by a representative of the retail clerks' union.



While members of a New Haven, Conn., lodge of the I. O. O. F., out for a day's recreation, were engaged in "a harmless game of baseball" at Sunset Beach on August 23 "a sheriff from Branford, clothed with the authority of the law,

swooped down on the party, and the game was called off." It is announced that "there will be no more baseball at Sunset Beach on Sunday hereafter."



At Pensacola, Fla., on August 22 "the Sunday League sent letters to the sheriff and mayor demanding a rigid enforcement of the Sabbath observance laws which had become gradually relaxed since the temporary enforcement a few months ago." The mayor "replied that the laws were State statutes and that he had no authority for their enforcement," and the sheriff "refused to do anything in the matter unless those who called for the enforcement of the laws would swear out warrants for the arrest of the offenders."



A Sunday-closing agreement among the union butchers of St. Louis, Mo., was to go into effect on September 6, and it was expected that it would bring about "a fight to the finish between the union and non-union butchers." Although the union butchers constitute less than 50 per cent. of the whole they seem to regard their agreement as mandatory upon the whole trade, and have begun a "fight to compel the non-union men to close Sunday." For one thing they "are seeking to enlist the union teamsters for packing houses and produce dealers in the fight, by having them refuse to deliver goods to those who do not close."



"Plans for conducting a systematic campaign against Sunday law breaking" were to be formulated at a "citizens' meeting" in the parlors of the First Methodist Church of Kankakee, Ill., on the evening of August 25. The meeting was called by the pastor of the church, who, together with the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, had preached on "Sunday Desecration" on the preceding Sunday. The movement appears to be due to

the sale of liquor on Sunday, and its clerical leader announces that "strong measures will be resorted to unless the proper officers see that the laws regarding Sunday closing of saloons are enforced."



The journeymen and boss barbers' associations of Council Bluffs, Iowa, have, through arbitration, settled the Sunday-closing controversy that has been on for some time. The matter was submitted by both parties to Mr. Frank Levin, a business man, as arbitrator, who "decided in favor of the barber shops being opened on Sunday mornings until 11 o'clock, and that they close Saturday nights at 9.30 o'clock, and that the barbers have a half holiday each week in return for working Sunday mornings." It is said that both parties are well satisfied with this arrangement, and have agreed that it shall remain in force for three years. Now, woe unto those barbers who venture to open after 11 o'clock on Sunday.



A recent issue of the *Saturday Review*, Phoenix, Ariz., contained this information:

All territories are under the immediate supervision of Congress and amenable to its laws. On the statute books of the Federal government is a Sunday-closing law that is said to be applicable to all the territories and that will soon be enforced. In Alaska the United States marshal has been instructed to close all saloons and business houses on Sunday, and the same order is to be given in Oklahoma, New Mexico and Arizona. In Juneau several saloon-keepers have already been arrested for keeping their business places open on the Sabbath. A few years ago Arizona had a Sunday law that applied to incorporated cities, but it was not observed to any extent.

We have never before heard of a Federal Sunday-closing statute. It seems that the Arizona Sunday law referred to was enacted at an extra session of the legislature which was afterwards declared illegal by the courts, thus invalidating the legislation enacted during the session.

There were ninety-nine arrests for Sunday liquor selling in Greater New York on August 30.—A saloonkeeper at Warren, Minn., “kept his saloon open on Sunday,” August 16, and “it cost him \$30.”—An information “charging him with keeping his saloon open on Sunday” was filed against James Cahill in Dubuque, Iowa, on August 24.—County Attorney Kilpatrick of Council Bluffs, Iowa, has announced that he proposes “to secure an injunction against every saloon that keeps open on Sunday.”—J. F. Martinek, a

saloonkeeper of Owatonna, Minn., was arrested on August 23 for having his saloon open on Sunday.—It was reported from Waco, Texas, on August 21 that “the officers are after persons violating the Sunday-opening law, and many of the saloonmen are anxious to see examples made, as they do not want to open on Sunday, and yet dislike to have customers taken away at that time.” On the previous day “several fines were assessed,” and “other cases were on the docket.”

English papers report the commencement of legal proceedings in over fifty places against persons who refuse to pay the rates assessed under the new Education Act.



A resident of Webster City, Iowa, recently complained through the *Tribune* of that place that on a recent Sunday “two worshiping congregations were disturbed by men working on electric light poles near by during the time of service.” He says “the noise consisted in pounding,” and that it was a violation of the law in two respects: “First, by breaking the Sabbath; second, by disturbing a worshiping congregation.” The latter only should be a violation of the law; the first is something that the law has no business to concern itself with.



“Many are urging the rectification of society as such. They claim that there has been too much attention paid to the conversion and salvation of individuals. There is no sanction for any such method in Christ’s ministry. Indeed, it is preposterous in itself if the method is to be taken literally. Society is composed of individuals, and though individuals associated are something vastly more and greater than a mere aggregated mass, yet society can never be reached except

through its members. It is not to be understood that Christ placed no value, or small value, on the increase of power that comes through association. Society is one of the chief facts of humanity, and no one can, without great disadvantage, ignore or underrate it. But it must always be understood that individuals in society are more important than society itself. Society is a means to an end.”



“It is no longer a question of liberty to labor, but a question of human liberty, in this land of the free,” declares the *Brooklyn Eagle*. It also says:

Compared with all the people of the country, the unionists are a handful. The opinion—the good opinion of the people of the country—is worth cultivating. The unions have in no small degree alienated it. They have affronted the American sense of fair play. For the proposition that a man may take the ground that he will neither work nor permit another to take his place, the people will not stand. If the principles, the legitimate and rational principles, of unionism are to survive, the fungus growth of despotism and corruption must be amputated, cut off as with a knife. There are rights which must be respected, and which, being overthrown, convert the Constitution itself into a phantom guarantee of liberty, to say nothing of the sacredness of life. And the longer these truths are overlooked or flouted, the more crushing will be the force of the blows with which they will finally be driven home.

Take it all in all, the story of the papal power is a dismal drama—the gloomiest that darkens history! The noon of the Papacy synchronizes with the world's midnight.—*J. A. Wylie, LL.D.*



Political aptitudes and political sentiments are the gift of nature and the acquisition of personal experience; they cannot be donated by one person or nation to another.—*President J. G. Schurman.*



Many of our reformers are disposed to cure the ills of the state by tinkering at the machinery. . . . Nothing of the kind will help. The evil is in the spirit of the people. There must come a spiritual change, an inner change, or we shall not be helped.—*Dr. Felix Adler.*



The Catholic Church is earnestly, patiently, persistently, determinedly, making an attack on our public school system. It is 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. And if the time ever comes when either of these aims is accomplished it will be a sad day for the future of the Republic.—*Dr. Minot J. Savage.*



It is impossible to deny that the policy of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. In truth, nothing but such a policy could against such assaults have borne up such doctrines. The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved it to such perfection, that among the contrivances of political abilities it occupies the highest place. The stronger our conviction that reason and Scripture were decidedly on the side of

Protestantism, the greater is the reluctant admiration with which we regard that system of tactics against which reason and Scripture were arrayed in vain.—*Macaulay.*



It is probable that because of the very calm and conciliatory policy of the late Pope the struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism may be more strenuous than it would otherwise have been. . . . The support given by Leo XIII. to the doctrine of papal infallibility has no doubt increased the confidence of Catholics, and made them eager to extend the dominion of the Church. But more and more the conflict must be one of principles, and not of the carnal weapons which were once so readily used in fighting the battles of religion. The very assertion of papal infallibility, while increasing the claims of the Catholic Church, has really undermined its authority because most of the world regards it as a huge blunder.—*Christian Register.*



The Reformation was accomplished in the name of a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher, the Word of God; for salvation, faith; for king, Jesus Christ; for arms, the Holy Ghost; and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements. Rome had been established by the "law of a carnal commandment"; the Reformation, by "the power of an endless life." . . . Thus one of the greatest tasks of the sixteenth century was to restore the spiritual element to its rights. The gospel of the reformers had nothing to do with the world and with politics. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and of court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise no other influence over princes and people than that which proceeds from the gospel of peace.—*D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation."*

A TWENTY-FIVE CENT EDITION  
OF  
POWER FOR WITNESSING

Heretofore the 75 cent edition of this remarkable volume on the work of the Holy Spirit has been the only one obtainable; but a new edition in paper covers is now ready, the price of which is 25 cents, postpaid.

We believe the mere announcement of this fact will induce hundreds to secure a sufficient number of copies to supply their Sabbath-school classes and friends who are interested in the subject. It is so filled with incidents resulting from the operation of the Spirit on hearts that it will be eagerly read by all.

AN ILLUSTRATED DESCRIPTION WILL BE SENT ON APPLICATION.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 West 20th St.,  
New York City.

Oakland,  
Cal.

18 West 5th St.,  
Kansas City, Mo.