

Last Issue

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XIX

WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1904

NO. 6



“Loyalty to God means liberty for man.”

Rome believes in religious liberty only for Romanism.

When the “rights” of Catholicism are protected the rights of man are invaded.

It is just like Rome to insist that “the law of religious liberty is unnecessary” for those who “do not profess any” religion.

It is the nature of the disciples of intolerance to insist that their rights are not protected unless the rights of others are invaded.

The attitude of Rome with regard to religious liberty in the Philippines is instructive as to her real attitude with regard to religious liberty everywhere else.

If religious liberty in the Philippines is “adverse to the public peace” it is because Catholicism is adverse to the public peace when, wherever there is a possibility of having it done, other religions are not proscribed in its interests.

If “the preservation of the Christian Sabbath” requires that “our salutary Sunday law” shall be upheld and enforced, then “our salutary Sunday law” exists to uphold “the Christian Sabbath.” But that civil statute which exists to uphold a RELIGIOUS institution is not a salutary law by any means.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

A weekly publication devoted to the maintenance and defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore opposed to any violation or compromise of the principle of separation of church and state. Non-sectarian and non-partisan in the application of principles.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Published by
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.,
222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.

To whom all communications of a business nature should be addressed.

PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT

After giving the matter careful consideration, and taking counsel with representative brethren, the publishers of The Sentinel have decided to suspend the publication of the paper with this issue. It is proper that a statement should be made giving the reasons for this action. They will be found in the following facts:

1. For causes which it is not necessary to enumerate, the subscription list has been gradually falling off for several years, until the present circulation is so small that the paper is not meeting the purpose for which it was established.

2. A very large part of the subscribers are now members of our own denomination who can be reached through our other periodicals.

3. The publishers do not feel warranted in incurring the heavy loss which is now sustained by the publication of the paper when the instruction can be given to a large majority of its readers through other channels.

4. The effort necessary to increase the subscription list so that the paper would be self-supporting, would, it is

believed, yield larger returns if expended in behalf of our other publications.

5. The publication of the paper can readily be resumed, if a change of circumstances should render it advisable.

More attention will hereafter be given in the *Review and Herald* and the *Signs of the Times* to those subjects which have been presented in the columns of *The Sentinel*, and the publishers of the *Signs* will consider the advisability of issuing occasional special numbers devoted to these questions as occasion may demand.

The subscribers to *The Sentinel* are hereby given their choice of either of the following ways of securing what is due them on unexpired subscriptions: (a) the amount due may be applied on a subscription, new or old, to the *Review and Herald*; (b) the amount due may be applied on a subscription, new or old, to the *Signs of the Times*; (c) the amount due will be allowed in payment for any of our denominational books, or for any Bible advertised by our circulation department; (d) any subscribers who are not willing to apply the amount due them in either of these ways will be paid in cash. It seems to the publishers that this basis of settlement with subscribers will remove any just ground for complaint. A statement will be sent to each subscriber indicating the date to which his subscription is paid, and a blank form will be supplied on which each one can state his choice as to the method of settling the indebtedness.

The publishers desire to express their appreciation of the co-operation of those who have aided them in the past either by contributions or by extending the circulation of the paper.

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XIX

WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1904

No. 6

As will be seen by the announcement made on the opposite page, the publication of The Sentinel is discontinued with this number. This information will no doubt be received with some regret by many readers and friends of the paper, and it is with regret that note of the matter is made here, but it seems that under the circumstances the publishers were obliged to take this action. Of course the discontinuance of the paper does not signify that there is no call for work in the direction in which the paper has sought to be of service. We think that no one can read even this number of the paper without realizing that there is a call to-day for such work as The Sentinel was established to do and has striven to do during the past eighteen years; we are certain that this would be realized did this number contain what it might contain. But of course the cause to which the paper has been devoted is greater than any agency that may have been or may be enlisted in its service, and though The Sentinel may no longer be one of the agencies of its promotion the cause it has represented remains the same and should appeal no less strongly to all whom the paper may have been instrumental in interesting in it. We trust and know that the discontinuance of the paper will not cause those who are interested in this work and watching the trend of affairs to lose their interest in nor slacken their efforts in behalf of the maintenance of

the principles which the paper has advocated. To those friends who have so kindly co-operated with us in this work we hereby express our sincere appreciation.



Rome and Religious Liberty in the Philippines If there is any agency of the Roman Catholic Church which should show forth the fact, if it is a fact, that the principles which have brought about and are the safeguard of the freedom, civil and religious, which is enjoyed in the more enlightened nations of the present time, especially in the United States, and which principles have become fundamental in the civilization of these times, have the endorsement, support and allegiance of that church, it is that of the "Paulist Fathers" in this country, which order is devoted to the work of presenting Catholicism in the best light possible to Protestants and non-Catholics. Yet nevertheless the magazine published by this order, the *Catholic World*, one of the leading Roman Catholic publications of the country, styled a "magazine of general literature and science," presented to the American public in its January number an astonishingly plain and undisguised appeal and demand for the adoption by the American government of a policy of utter disregard and violation of one of the most important and sacred of those principles. It was presented in connection with an extract from the report

of the first Philippine Commission and an utterance of a bishop of the Episcopal Church, which affirmed that the only religion of the Filipino people was the Catholic religion, that it was almost universally accepted and believed in with the utmost confidence, and that the Filipino people generally were pure, moral and devout. And there was also a slight intimation that a disturbance of the confidence of the people in that religion might produce evil results with a class of the people. The whole was published as a leading article under the heading, "A Useful Reminder on the Philippines from the Philippine Commission," and was so printed that but for the internal evidence to the contrary which it affords, the reader would be led to suppose that the portion written by the editors of the magazine, which we quote here, was a part of the Philippine Commission's report:

Therefore religion—and, consequently, morality—being so universal in the Philippines, **would it be advisable to introduce liberty of religious worship in this country?** If by freedom of religion is understood religious toleration in fact, by virtue of which no one can be compelled to profess Catholicism, or be persecuted for not being a Catholic, but each individual may privately profess the religion that suits him best, then this liberty has always existed in the Philippines; and no Filipino or foreigner has ever been forced to embrace the Catholic religion. **But if by liberty of religions is understood the granting to all religions—for example, the worship of Confucius or Mohammed—and to all the Protestant sects equal rights to open schools, erect churches, create parishes, have processions and public ceremonies, with the Catholic Church, we believe that it would not only not be advisable, but it would be a lamentable measure for any government which may rule the destinies of the Filipinos:** In fact, **if this government should concede the liberty of religions, it will make itself**

hateful to 6,500,000 of Filipino Catholics; because, although said government may not profess any religion, the Filipino people would hold it responsible for all the consequences of this measure, and so it could not be regarded favorably by these 6,500,000 Catholics. They are fully convinced that their religion is the only true one, the only one by which man can be saved; and if any government should try to deprive them of this religion, which is the most precious jewel and the richest inheritance that they have received from their superiors, **although it may not be more than permitting Protestant or heterodox propagandism publicly and boldly, then they could not help complaining, and disturbance of public order might even result from it, with all the fury and all the disasters which, as is well known, this kind of war usually entails.**

Two serious difficulties may oppose the rights of Catholicism in the Philippines. The first is the Americans who are governing there, and the second is the Filipinos themselves. The Americans enjoy in America the most complete religious liberty. Why, then, should they not enjoy the same liberty on moving to the Philippines? **We answer that each citizen should conform to the laws of the country where he lives.** The Chinese enjoyed the most complete liberty to erect temples to Buddha or to Confucius; but for three centuries they have not had such liberty in Manila. On the other hand, no Chinese has been obliged to become a Catholic; and we may say more, no Chinese has needed to make a show of his religion in order to trade, become rich, and return to die in China. **The same may be said of Englishmen and Americans.** If, in the Philippines, for the good order and good government of 6,500,000 Catholics, besides which there are only 1,500,000 inhabitants, idolaters and Mohammedans, who are still to be civilized, it is necessary not to permit nor to encourage liberty of religions, **the government which rules the destinies of these islands should legislate in this direction, for the laws should be adapted to the necessities of the majority of the citizens. And**

Americans themselves who make their residence here should accommodate themselves to this law, without any temporal or spiritual injury resulting to them from it; because, **privately** they could profess the religion which their conscience dictates to them to be the true one. The English in Malta do this, where the Catholic religion flourishes; and although the island is very small, there are more than 2,000 Italian priests there, better satisfied and content to live under the English government than under the Italian government.

The other difficulty against the Catholicism of the Filipinos arises from the Filipino rebels themselves, who in their congress at Malolos proclaimed liberty of religions and separation of church and state. Why, then, should not this religious liberty be granted to the Filipinos if they themselves demand it? **We answer they also ask for independence.** Will the Americans therefore give it to them? The majority of the Philippine insurgents were addicted to Masonry. They had agreed a long time ago to work for the expulsion of the friars, and, drunken with the wine of liberty, they asked also for all liberties, including religious freedom. These revolutionists, who have abjured Catholicism, how many are they? They do not exceed two dozen. **For them the law of religious liberty is unnecessary, because they do not profess any.** The Filipino people—that is to say, the 6,500,000 Catholics inscribed in the parochial registers—these do not ask for nor want religious liberty nor the separation of church and state; these are content with their Catholicism, and they do not desire anything more, **nor would they suffer this government to overthrow the Catholic unity.** This we have heard from qualified and accredited defenders of Philippine independence, who even deny that the Malolos platform was the true expression of the will of that congress; that, on the contrary, it was far from being the total and proper representation of the Filipino people. This people have a horror of heresies and of all religious disturbances. Whoever should introduce them would commit an offense.

Therefore it is demonstrated that religious liberty in the Philippines is not only not advisable but adverse to the public peace.

In conclusion, if it be said that as regards the state of religion in the Philippines there are points of public interest which demand some reform, we shall not deny it; but the church has the desire and the means to remedy these supposed or recognized evils. If by chance she does not remedy them because she is ignorant of them, then any one interested may make them known, and the government of the country sooner than anybody else. On the other hand this has nothing to do with religious liberty.

And this is published by one of the most liberal of Roman Catholic orders in the leading city of America, the land of religious liberty, in the year 1904! We shall make no comment upon it more than to say that it is a pronouncement fit for the Dark Ages and thoroughly representative of the Roman Catholic Church, and that it shows what the policy and attitude of that church is and has been and will be with respect to the putting into effect of the principle of separation of church and state in the Philippines. She has fought that all along, and she will continue to fight it. We have collected during the past year and longer a large number of clippings from Roman Catholic publications and other sources bearing on this matter, and should be glad if the substance of them could be, as it has been our intention should be, presented to the readers of *The Sentinel*. One of the important points has been the decided enmity of the Catholic Church to the administration of Governor Taft because of his integrity in the matter of separating church and state and refusing to yield to the wishes and demands of that church in the matter. Persistent denunciation of Governor Taft in this matter has been carried on

by Roman Catholic journals in this country, it being viciously contended that he was violating the rights of "the Church" and robbing the people of their religion. The clippings that we have show that it was desired by Roman Catholics in this country that Governor Taft should be superseded by General Wood, and that this was because it was believed or known that General Wood would pursue a policy much more satisfactory and agreeable to "the Church" than was being pursued by Governor Taft, and also that this was believed or known because of the manner in which General Wood had dealt with "the Church" in Cuba. It is not at all unlikely that the assignment of General Wood to the Philippines was with that in view which Roman Catholics in this country desired, but although there has come a change of governors for some reason this desire has not been realized as yet. But evidently Rome feels that the change of governors that has recently taken place is to her advantage and that the time is opportune for coming out strongly and unmistakably for what she wants in the Philippines. This is the meaning, evidently, of this astonishing "reminder" in the *Catholic World* magazine. In an editorial note which introduced the subject-matter of the article it was stated that the extract from the report of the Philippine Commission was considered "of such timely importance and interest as to merit republication," and that it related to "a problem which is yet unsolved," and also that it might "lead some to change their adverse judgments both on certain past events and on present claims of the Catholic body, and perhaps throw considerable light on the policy which, as a nation, we ought to pursue toward the Filipinos if we would do them justice." It is a

reversal of the policy that has been pursued by Governor Taft that the Catholic Church is after, and for that purpose the *Catholic World* has thrown considerable light—from the Dark Ages—on the matter of "the policy which, as a nation, we ought to pursue toward the Filipinos" in the great matter of religious liberty. The policy that it boldly advocates is one that should not receive favor for a single instant in any quarter. We confess that we are surprised to see even in a Roman Catholic publication what we have quoted from the *Catholic World* magazine.

4

Rome and the Public Educational System There is no need of any one being in ignorance of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church in this country is determined to bring about a revolution in the system of public education in the interests of the teaching of the Roman Catholic religion. Utterances and facts which frequently come to public notice continually attest that she is "earnestly, patiently, persistently, determinedly making an attack on the public school system, and endeavoring to accomplish one of two things—either to get the public schools open to distinctively Catholic teaching or else get public money for the support of distinctively Catholic schools." One of the principal and specific purposes for which the American Federation of Catholic Societies exists is to bring about this result. In Detroit on January 31, at a mass-meeting which marked the close of the semi-annual meeting of the advisory board and executive committee of this organization, its leader, Bishop McFaul, in speaking of the aims of the federation, declared that it was designed to "accomplish much in the direction of doing away with two great deficiencies of the

Catholic Church—the lack of a recognized and organized Catholic opinion, and the lack of an organ to disseminate such an opinion.” The federation, he said, would “crystallize and disseminate the opinions of the Church on such questions as divorce and education.” It is unnecessary to say to those who are at all informed in the matter that the “dissemination” of an “organized Catholic opinion” by the American Federation of Catholic Societies will not be the mere dissemination of the opinions of “the Church;” it will be to compel, by political methods, acquiescence in these opinions and their adoption in practise. As to the aim of the federation in the matter of “education,” the bishop said:

Retain the present public school system, but do not bar Catholics out of their rights as citizens. The federation has taken an admirable stand on this question. Its platform is: That there shall be no public moneys paid out for religious instruction in any school. But let the state examine our schools, and if on examination it is found that we are giving the children an education which comes up to the requirements of the state, then let the state pay for it.

The comment made by the New York *Times* on this is to the point:

We are convinced that the principle advocated by the confederation is essentially unsound. Logically applied it would require a division of the school fund among all sects that choose to maintain schools of their own, Catholic, Protestant, Hebrew, Christian Scientist, Mormon, and even Atheistic, if a society of Atheists should care to found schools. The state provides secular education for all whose parents choose to send their children to the public schools. The education of those schools should be absolutely secular, leaving religious training to such agencies as the parents may prefer to employ at home or elsewhere. That is the only ground on which the schools

can be made available for all on equitable conditions.

However, the *Times* thinks “this explanation by Bishop McFaul of the policy of the American Federation of Catholic societies is entitled to respect and to candid consideration,” and “is a policy which the confederation clearly has the right to propose and to promote by public discussion and by all the legitimate methods of influencing public opinion,” and adds:

We do not in the least question the sincerity or the patriotism of those to whom this policy appeals, and we can quite understand the feeling of resentment they harbor toward the opposite policy, which seems to them one of injustice, since they are obliged to aid in supporting schools to which they cannot conscientiously send their children.

We can quite understand this feeling too, and do not question the sincerity of those who advocate this policy, but could hardly grant their patriotism in the matter. Certainly Roman Catholics clearly have the right to propose and to promote by public discussion and by all the legitimate methods of influencing public opinion this policy, but what people have the right to do and what they should do are not always the same. Catholics have the legal and social right to do this, but they should not do it. But the policy which the American Federation of Catholic Societies has now openly announced to the American people as one which it shall do everything in its power to have adopted in this country, is the Catholic scheme in its mildest and least offensive form; it is the head of the camel of state support of Roman Catholic teaching. And this camel will never be satisfied until he is entirely within the tent. What the Catholic Church is aiming at and proposes to secure in this matter was boldly declared by

Archbishop Quigley of Chicago in an address before the Catholic Woman's League in that city on December 20. After asserting that "to-day the state is encroaching on the rights of the Church," and lamenting "that God is not recognized in any of the modern constitutions," and attacking "liberalism" as "the supreme and fundamental error of the age," and declaring that "it began in rebellion against the divinely established authority of the Church and its visible head," that its "assertion that the state is supreme in human affairs is denial of the authority of God and his Church" and "atheism," and that by the secular system of public instruction it now "banishes God and religion from the education of the child," this leading prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States said:

Non-sectarian schools are not schools which Catholics can use. If not actually Protestant, then they are logically what they should be, godless. Protestants and non-Catholics are undertaking through the present public school system to prevent the Catholic children from becoming firmly cemented to their church, and to keep the Catholic Church from getting a stronger foothold. The purpose of the non-Catholics is to prevent the growth of the Church. They will scruple at no violation of justice to gain their ends. The cry all over is for non-sectarian education. The Catholic schools are recognized by the state, but they are not supported by the state because non-Catholics believe that it would be dangerous for the state to support them. The state must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority. **The state should divide the public school system and maintain a separate system for the minority — separate in the sense of religious teaching.** The two systems could be under one control, but **in the Catholic division Catholic principles should be taught.** This would give the minority an equal

chance with the majority. This would be just and equitable, but not satisfactory to the Protestants.

We do not flatter ourselves that infidels and Protestants will grant us the justice of giving us our proportion of the public schools, or relieve us of the tax now levied upon us to maintain schools from which religion is excluded or in which a false religion is taught. . . . **But the New World was discovered by Catholics and taken possession of in the name of the cross, and we cannot get it out of our heads that the cross will yet come to into the possession of its own. . . .** Whatever our present difficulties may be, and they are many and great, we must ever continue to assert the rights of the Church as the representative of God. **The time will come when we shall be listened to;** for He in whom we trust will not permit His Church to go down before onslaughts of men and theories whose triumph would mean the revival of paganism.

The archbishop also "declared that the security of the national Constitution increases proportionately with the increase in the number of Roman Catholics in the country." To get the real significance of this, and also of some of his other statements, one should recall a fact that is of very grave importance and meaning, namely, that it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States (in the Rector, Church Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. the United States, Feb. 29, 1892) that "this is a religious people" **politically**, that the American nation "is a **religious nation**," "a **Christian nation**," and that included in the "the mass of organic utterances" which the court cited in support of this almost revolutionary affirmation by it, and which the court declared "affirm and reaffirm" that affirmation, were "the commission to Christopher Columbus . . . from Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God,

King and Queen of Castile," in which those devoted children of "the Church" piously sent him forth on his mission of discovery, and "the Constitution of the United States." Before that time Roman Catholic prelates in this country were not anxious about increasing "the security of the national Constitution;" they regarded it as an atheistical and "godless" document set up in defiance of "the Church." But since that time there has been displayed by high representatives of the Roman Catholic Church a very different attitude toward that instrument, the first conspicuous example being the papal delegate Satolli. Although of course the Roman Catholic papers generally approved and echoed Quigley's sentiments, we are glad to note that the *Chicago Citizen*, a newspaper published in his own diocese and edited by a prominent Roman Catholic and officially representing the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the United Irish Societies of Chicago and Cook County, did not do so, but on the contrary said:

We believe in the American non-sectarian public school, and we believe in educating the youth of all races side by side, so that they may grow up as friends, trusting each other, not as enemies suspicious of one another. We believe it would be a fatal mistake to have the American public schools run, or controlled, by ecclesiastics of any creed. . . . The supremacy of the state, with all due respect to the able archbishop, is not denial of God. . . . The glory of America is that there is no state church—that abomination of true religion—within its borders; no sectarian college of any kind maintained at the expense of the national government.

It would be well if many Protestants who are not were as well grounded as this on the principle of separation of church and state. The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* sees in the utter-

ances of Archbishop Quigley "another evidence" that "Roman Catholic ecclesiastics" are determined upon "a serious effort to secure a division of the public [school] funds for the support of Roman Catholic schools," and declares that "the un-American utterances of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Quigley should open the eyes of the people to the importance of an amendment to the Constitution that will prohibit the use of public funds for the support of sectarian institutions." The *Examiner* (Baptist, New York) says:

The archbishop has stated the issue fairly and squarely. He makes it perfectly plain that the Roman hierarchy is antagonistic to our public-school system, and intends to overthrow it if it can. But "forewarned is forearmed," and the American people are less shrewd than we think they are if they can be taken in by such specious pleas. The public schools are by no means perfect, but they are serving a good purpose—not the least of which is that very alienation of the young from the bondage of medieval superstition of which the archbishop complains—and the good sense of the community will not suffer them to be overthrown.

We shall see. What we shall see is this: When the adherents of the Roman Catholic Church have become numerous enough in this country and she has become powerful enough, as there are the strongest indications will be the case, Protestants will see her do in this matter just what they say she will never be allowed to do, and in doing it the Roman Catholic Church will point them for justification to the "Christian nation" decision of the Supreme Court which so many of them so gladly welcomed and so thoroughly approve. She will ask them, in view of positions which they themselves have taken, what possible objection they can make; and they will not be able to answer her.

Sunday Enforcement in Philadelphia Again

“Not within a century has such persistent, illiberal and unjust Sunday-law enforcement been attempted,” says the *Sabbath Recorder* with regard to the Philadelphia Sunday-enforcement crusade. But such another crusade will not be seen there in the immediate future. To the vigorous opposition of the *Public Ledger*, the rebuke of the grand jury, and the decision of the Court of Quarter Sessions holding the method of obtaining evidence to be unlawful, must be added now one other impediment which has been placed in the way of the “Sabbath” Association. Even the magistrate in whose court the wholesale prosecutions have been made throughout the crusade has now decided to wash his hands of such work. In a statement which was reported in the *Public Ledger* on January 22 Magistrate South declared that he had “seen enough of this persecution,” and that he would “have no more of it.” He went on to describe how the poor and the blind had been arraigned before him by the agents of the “Sabbath” Association, and declared that they would obtain no more warrants from him, and that had he known to what the thing was to lead he would have issued no warrants for them at the beginning. He said the whole thing had become repugnant to him, and that he would have nothing whatever to do with such work in the future. But the “Sabbath” Association has not given up, though it evidently feels that there is need of justifying itself to the public. On January 25 it issued the following “public declaration of principles,” and, because of the very clear light which it throws upon the motive not only behind this Philadelphia Sunday-law crusade, but behind Sunday-law enforcement in general, we reproduce it here:

The preservation of the **Christian Sabbath** requires that Christian people must organize for the purpose to resist the powerful organizations which are formed to blot out our salutary **Sunday law**. This law is by no means intended to compel anybody to attend church or accept the Gospel. It **simply protects the Christian element** of our population to which the nation owes its existence and its perpetuation, in its inalienable right to **worship God on this holy day, unmolested by secular traffic and distraction of the world**. It also guarantees to laboring men a day of rest each week, which unscrupulous, powerful corporations dare not ruthlessly ignore.

The Philadelphia Sabbath Association cannot be justly condemned for not devoting its efforts to the suppression of speakeasies, gambling dens and brothels. . . . It has all it can do to endeavor to **preserve** to the present generation and to their future posterity the **sacred heritage of the Lord’s Day** for rest of body and strength of soul.

No impression could possibly be more false than that the Sabbath Association exists to prosecute the unscrupulous shopkeepers who take mean advantage of their God-fearing, law-abiding neighbors to steal their trade by illegally doing business on Sundays as on other days. The Sabbath Association does not prosecute anybody, but it does exert every effort in its power to encourage and co-operate with the various trades to use the aid of the law for the very purpose for which it was framed in protecting themselves against the iniquity of the ruin of their business by foreigners and infidels, and in preserving to themselves the divine right of having one day in every seven for rest and worship.

Chief Justice Woodward, in *Johnson vs. the Commonwealth* (1853), said in regard to the Sunday laws of 1794: “These statutes were not designed to compel men to go to church or to worship God in any manner inconsistent with their personal preferences, but to compel a cessation of those employments which are calculated to interfere with the rights of those who choose to

assemble for public worship. The day was set apart for a purpose, and the penal enactments guard it; but they leave every man free to use it for that purpose or not. The law protects him from the annoyance of others if he do not; it restrains him from annoying those who do so use it."

Thus the law without oppressing anybody, becomes **auxiliary to the rights of conscience**. And there are other rights intimately associated with the rights of conscience which are worth preserving. The right to rear a family with a becoming regard to **the institutions of Christianity**, and without compelling them to witness hourly **infractions of one of its fundamental laws**; the right to enjoy the peace and good order of society, and the increased securities of life and property which result from **a decent observance of Sunday**; the right of the poor to rest from labor without diminution of wages or loss of employment; the right of beasts of burden to repose from unrequited toil—these are real and substantial interests which the legislature sought to secure by this enactment. With a profound conviction in its wisdom and value we are resolutely opposed to a course of judicial construction which would cheapen its demands and impair its power for good.

✦

Clericalism in Colombia and in the United States Much has been heard of late in this country to the discredit of the South American country Colombia. This has been in connection with its failure or refusal to ratify the treaty with the United States for the construction of an interoceanic canal at the Isthmus of Panama, and the subsequent events by which the United States is to obtain what it desires in this respect. It has been declared, and no doubt with much truth, that the government of Colombia is republican only in name, but despotic in reality, that its policies and courses of action are determined not by regard for the interests and well-being of the people

and country, but by the selfishness, cupidity, and ignorance of those controlling the government, and that in general the people and their rulers have very little to recommend them to civilized, honorable peoples. It is interesting in this connection to note where one who thus writes regarding Colombia places the responsibility for the state of affairs which has been alleged and denounced so freely of late in this country. We quote from an article in the *World's Work* for January by Mr. T. S. Alexander, who has spent several years in Colombia:

Under the cloak of a republican form of government Colombia is despotically ruled. The despots are the priests, who are mostly Jesuits. President Marroquin and his cabinet and congress are their puppets. All the recent troubles of the country may be traced to their intrigues and the repressive, retrograde legislation they have inaugurated. The ruin of their country, the death of nearly 200,000 men in battle and by disease, the murder of many thousands of women and children, the misery, ignorance, and poverty of the whole people—all lie at their door. Clericalism is the curse of the country. It is the direct cause of the recent revolution, which caused such a holocaust of lives. It is the real cause of the secession of Panama. From practically every pulpit in the interior the priests preached against the canal. They brought every influence in their power to bear in order to secure the rejection of the Hay-Herran treaty. . . . Their motive was simple enough. They knew that the construction of the canal would lead to the building of railways, the introduction of foreign capital and foreign ideas, and the speedy opening up of the entire country to a civilization and progress that would put an end to their absolute power. In proportion to its size Colombia contributes more to the Roman Catholic Church than any other Latin-American country. She does not pay her foreign debts, but she sends huge sums to Rome every year. The official

subsidy to the church is \$200,000 (gold) per annum, but the private contributions and the money drawn from the public treasury in indirect ways exceed that sum a hundredfold. The priests who control affairs do not mean to lose the handling of this money if they can help it. They were re-enforced recently by a large proportion of the Jesuits expelled from France by the associations' law.

While leading Americans are denouncing Colombia for the condition of affairs which obtains in that country, they should not overlook nor fail to very carefully note the principal cause of that state of affairs. This is needed in the interests of their own country, for the very influence which Mr. Alexander tells us is the curse of Colombia and the cause of her backwardness and decadence is growing in power in the United States, and is being exerted in political and governmental affairs. We note this in the *Watchman*, Boston, on this point:

It is very easy to deny the influence of any particular church in our politics, but it is not too much to say that today the majority of American cities are under the control of Roman Catholics. The influence is less obtrusive than it was twenty-five years ago, but it is immensely more effective. And in the national government since the war with Spain the influence of Romanism has advanced by leaps and bounds. The acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and the American dominance in Cuba, made it very easy for the Washington government to give Romanism an official recognition it has never had from us before. The honors paid to Archbishop Chappelle at Manila by American officials was entirely unprecedented, but the administration has felt that it must deal very tenderly with the representatives of the dominant faith in the Philippines. And when Cardinal Gibbons has proffered or endorsed a request at Washington the administration has realized that he represents fifteen million more people than before the Spanish war.

This does not begin to state all that in connection with the acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippines and the American dominance in Cuba has plainly evidenced the fact that the American government is to-day by no means independent of the influence which is the curse of Colombia. Of course that influence is far from being dominant in governmental affairs to-day, but it is perfectly certain that if there is not a decided reversal of a tendency that has been plainly in evidence for some time that the time will come when it can be said of the government of the United States as it is now said of Colombia that the President and his cabinet and Congress are the puppets of Roman ecclesiastics. The United States, or some of her statesmen, need to learn a lesson from Colombia, and to cease improper dalliance with ecclesiastics. Ecclesiastics, of whatever sect, Roman Catholic no more than any other, should have no recognition nor influence as such in governmental affairs, and American statesmen and officials should uncompromisingly maintain this rule, no matter how great may be the "constituency" represented by an ecclesiastic.

+

An Australian Incident

Absolute separation of church and state and establishment of religious freedom for every individual by provision and mandate of the fundamental law is not sufficient even at this late day in the most enlightened nations (and none others have such provision and mandate in their fundamental law) to prevent religionists from indulging in the old, old game, to which religionists have ever been so prone, of attempting to bring politicians and the state under the dominance of their particular brand of religion. This is seen to-day in the new Australian Com-

monwealth as well as in the United States. An instance is thus noted by the *Australian Signs of the Times*, Melbourne:

We are now passing through the exciting time of an election of the second Federal Parliament, and opportunity is being given to people of all shades of opinion to ventilate their ideas. The great political issues which are now agitating the minds of the electors we leave to the consideration of the secular press; but we cannot refrain from commenting somewhat upon the action of certain persons who are attempting to import a religious bias into the campaign. At a meeting held in one of the Victorian electorates a candidate was asked to "prove his bona fides as a broad-minded Christian by attending the Church of England and Presbyterian churches the next Sunday and the Sunday following." This the candidate declined to do on the ground "that such an action would be a deliberate attempt to hoodwink people, and sooner than sacrifice his self-respect, he said he would retire." At a subsequent meeting his action in refusing to make certain pledges and attend certain churches as a test of his broad-mindedness was indorsed by his audience. With regard to the religious views of this candidate for Parliamentary honors we know nothing, but whoever is responsible for the attempt to induce him to attend certain churches in order to secure political support is acting in direct opposition to the 116th clause of the Federal Constitution, which says:

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

When this clause was under the consideration of the Federal Convention strong opposition was manifested by a section of the community to its provisions, because it cut off the very thing which they wished to secure — legislation in matters of religion.

Their demands were evidently intended to give the majority power to coerce men in religious matters by civil law. Such power, however, always has been used most unrighteously, and, recognizing the danger of accentuating "old-world differences" in this new community, the framers of the Constitution wisely guarded the religious rites and privileges of every class in the Commonwealth. Yet in spite of this certain individuals publicly demand a religious test of a candidate for Parliamentary honors. That such a questionable proceeding should take place in the face of the declaration in the fundamental law of the new nation that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth," is strong evidence of the existence of an undercurrent that is drifting toward a future demand for an established religion. The amalgamation of the great religious bodies, the formation of federated councils of churches, the demands which are made upon the government from time to time by various religious denominations for due recognition in public functions in proportion to their numerical standing, all tend to confirm the opinion that a certain class of people are determined that this new nation shall be inflicted with that same thing which has produced so much ruin and misery in the past — a state religion.

✦

An Old Assumption
in a Mild Form

A leading religious paper enters a vigorous criticism because "when President McKinley, himself a devout Christian man, and President Roosevelt, a strong and earnest advocate of religion and a church member, were hunting the country over for able men to represent and establish American ideals and civilization in the Philippines, they could not find at least one man who honored the Sabbath day and publicly recognized the claims of religion by being present in some house of God on the Lord's Day."

It is declared that "there is not a church-going man among the able men and statesmen whom our government has sent to represent and establish American civilization in the Philippines." This criticism implies that there is an especial obligation on the part of statesmen and governmental representatives to "honor the Sabbath day" and "recognize the claims of religion," and that there should be some sort of a religious test applied in the selection and appointment of men to service under the government. It is a manifestation in a mild way of the same old vicious assumption to which the church has always been prone—the assumption that the state should serve and promote the interests of the church. It is time that church people in this country were learning that they have exactly the same reason and right to expect honor for religious observances and regard for the claims of religion from public officials that they have from private individuals, and not one whit more. And they have no reason nor right whatever to expect such honor and regard from any one because he is a public official. To expect this of a public official as such is contrary alike to the principles of Americanism and of the Christian religion. The claims of religion are incumbent upon human souls, not upon governmental officials, and the church either does not know what her mission is or is disloyal to it when she concerns herself with governmental officials instead of with human souls.

+

"We have heard from the church; we will now hear from the army," said Ex-Secretary of State John W. Foster, in presenting Gen. Nelson A. Miles, at the conclusion of an address by Cardinal Gibbons at a mass-meeting under the auspices of the National Arbitra-

tion Conference in Washington, on January 12. The speaker probably intended nothing of the sort, but the statement would seem to imply that "the church" and the army are co-ordinate national institutions, and goes to justify the statement of a correspondent of a leading American newspaper who wrote last spring: "I am inclined to think that the state church [of the United States] is the Roman Catholic Church at present." This mass-meeting was addressed by six distinguished men, and Cardinal Gibbons was given the precedence, he being the first speaker. In presenting him Chairman Foster said: "No man in this country can speak for a larger constituency than he." This no doubt accounts largely for the great deference that is shown him by statesmen and public men. The meeting had for its special object the promotion of an arbitration treaty between the United States and England, and the cardinal spoke of the ties of friendship between the two nations that should preclude war between them. In concluding this portion of his address, he said: "In both nations the citizens enjoy the inestimable blessings of civil and religious liberty. Our respective governments hold over us theegis of their protection without interfering with us in our God-given rights of conscience." We should be glad if we could feel assured that these nations have now and will have in the future the hearty and genuine support of the ecclesiastical system represented by the cardinal in securing to all their citizens the enjoyment of the inestimable blessings of civil and religious liberty. But there is nothing to warrant such an assurance.

+

An interview published on January 4 in Mr. W. T. Stead's newspaper, *The*

Daily Paper, London, credited this utterance to Pius X, in response to a request that he "use his influence with the powers in behalf of the Macedonians:" "I do not wish to interfere in politics unless I know it will be effectual for good. Only the other day, when there appeared to be a prospect of war and bloodshed in Colombia, I communicated with President Roosevelt, and received a most courteous and cordial reply from him." It seems that great courtesy and cordiality toward the Pope and his representatives is coming to mark the American Presidential office. It would have been eminently proper for President Roosevelt to have informed the Pope that the American government was capable of conducting its own affairs without any interference on his part. The representative of any other religious system would have been so informed; why not the head of the Roman Catholic system? It is evident that in these days the Papacy believes that that interference in politics on her part which will be most effectual for good is that which brings her into communication and relations with the government of the United States.

+

A recent report of the grand jury in St. Louis "called attention to the large number of murders and affrays which occur on Sunday by reason of the connivance at [disregard of] the Sunday-closing law." Perhaps the fact that Sunday is made a day of idleness, and that by law, better explains the large number of murders and affrays on that day than does the mere violation of the Sunday-closing law. If Sunday were not made a day of idleness there would not be so many men resorting to saloons on that day, nor so much violation of a law requiring saloons to

close. Idle hands cannot be kept out of mischief, and the Sunday saloon affrays are but one form of the mischief which the idle Sunday is bound to entail.

+

Liberty of conscience, freedom of religious belief and practise, cannot excuse acts of licentiousness, and therefore cannot excuse interference with liberty of conscience, freedom of religious belief and practise. Those who in the name of religious rights and freedom seek to make others bow to their religious observances and customs are indulging in too much liberty, or, in other words, are licentious, and need to be made to know that there is no excuse, not even in the high plea of religious freedom, for their unlawful course.

+

At a late convention the Massachusetts Baptists "sent an appeal to the legislature for 'a stricter observance of Sunday, not only for the religious, but for the civil, welfare of the people.'" Baptists are untrue to their best traditions when they do such a thing as this.

+

It is not Sunday work, but Sunday idleness and the mischief that it entails, that, in the minds of people who think and who care for the real welfare of society, constitutes the Sunday question in the United States to-day.

+

The idle Sunday, which is the legal "Sabbath," is a very good thing for the saloon and kindred evils, but a very poor thing for the moral welfare of society.

+

"The contradictory and absurd Sunday laws"—it is thus that the *Philadelphia Record* refers to the Pennsylvania Sunday laws.

THE Sunday=Law Question

Is one of growing importance. Enforcement of the old laws is reviving, and demand for the enactment of new laws is increasing. The issue presented is vital, and the principles involved fundamental and far-reaching. The publications below should be read by all who would be informed on the question. They deal with it from the broad standpoint of the accepted principles of civil and religious freedom, and will commend themselves to every impartial and candid reader.

THE LEGAL SUNDAY: Its History and Character

BY THE LATE JAMES T. RINGGOLD, OF THE BALTIMORE BAR

This is a very able treatise on the history and character of the Sunday as an institution protected and enforced by the civil law. It is divided into four parts, as follows: Part I. "The Historical Aspect of the Question," including a very rare history of the Brownists, who set up an established church and the Sunday laws in America. Part II. "The Moral Aspect of the Question," including six chapters on the various features of Sunday laws. Part III. "The Constitutional Aspect of the Question," containing five chapters on the enforcement of Sunday laws, and deals with the grounds and arguments on which Sunday laws have been upheld. Part IV. "Supplementary," drawing the distinction between immorality and incivility, also between vice and crime, together with some observations on "Clerical Slumming." This work covers its topic thoroughly, and will appeal especially to lawyers, judges and others desirous of a semi-legal treatise on the question. The book contains 252 pages; bound in cloth and paper, at 50 and 25 cents respectively, postpaid.

"DUE PROCESS OF LAW" and the Divine Right of Dissent

BY ALONZO T. JONES

It is said that until 1891 the judicial branch of the United States government had never been called upon to take cognizance of the Sunday-law question. In that year the question of enforced Sunday observance was brought before the Circuit Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee by the appeal of the celebrated King case from the State courts. In remanding the prisoner Judge Hammond attempted to justify Sunday legislation and its enforcement, even to the extent of "persecution," and limited and denied the American doctrines of civil and religious freedom. The dictum in this decision was probably the most remarkable and astonishing expression on the question that has ever come from any American court, certainly from any Federal court, and it should be examined by every American citizen. This pamphlet is a masterly review of the decision in the light of American and Christian principles. In an appendix the decision is given verbatim. The appendix also includes the decision of the Supreme Court of California in *Ex-parte* Newman, declared by the author of the pamphlet to be "the only judicial decision ever rendered upon the question of Sunday observance by law that accords with the common principles of right or justice." He desires that "the principles of this masterly decision might become ingrained in the intellectual make-up of every person in the United States." It alone makes the pamphlet one of special value on this question. Pamphlet, 120 pages, 15 cents, postpaid.

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

BY ALONZO T. JONES

This is an enlarged report of the argument made by the author before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor of the Fiftieth Congress on the Blair national "Sunday-Rest" bill. The arguments then presented and called forth by the questions and arguments of members of the committee, are good for all time on the Sunday-law question, and as has been declared by a leading Sunday-law advocate, make "mighty interesting reading." The whole range of the question is covered. The argument is based on Scripture and history, Constitution and law, showing the limits of civil authority, the unconstitutionality of Sunday legislation, and analyzing Sunday laws and showing their practical workings in various States. "The positions taken will bear the severest test of every form of just criticism." Another national Sunday bill is certain to come before Congress before long. Read this pamphlet and be prepared to pass judgment upon the wisdom and justice of such a measure. Pamphlet, 192 pages; price 25 cents, postpaid.

ADDRESS THE PUBLISHERS OF THE SENTINEL.