

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, APRIL 9, 1903

NO. 15



Must a people wait till they constitute a majority before they have the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, and when they get to be the majority are they to legislate for the minority in religious matters?

See Page 236.

The principles of our government do not recognize in the majority any authority over the minority, except in matters which regard the conduct of man to his fellow-man. . . . The Constitution regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian, and gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a solitary individual than that of a whole community.

—Committee on Postoffices and Post-roads, U. S. House of Representatives, 1830.

The obligation of government is the same on both these classes [first and seventh-day observers]; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority. . . . What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small.

—Committee on Postoffices and Post-roads, U. S. Senate, 1829.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States especially devoted to the maintenance of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state. The Sentinel is not a periodical of abstractious and speculation; it discusses live issues that deeply concern every individual.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Editorial Contributors:

A. T. JONES, A. G. DANIELLS, M. C. WILCOX,
L. A. SMITH, C. P. BOLLMAN.

We believe in the religion taught and lived by Jesus Christ.

We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting civil government and submitting to its authority.

We believe that human rights are sacred, and that they indissolubly inhere in the moral nature of the individual.

We deny the right of any human authority to invade and violate these inalienable rights in any individual.

Therefore we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on matters of religion and conscience.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, free from all dictation, interference, or control on the part of civil government or any other external authority; or not to worship at all if he so chooses.

We also believe it to be our duty, and no less the duty of all others, to oppose religious legislation and all movements tending toward the same, to the end that all the people may freely enjoy the inestimable blessing of liberty, which is theirs by virtue of the unbounded wisdom and beneficence of the Author of their being.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Single copy, per year \$1.00
 " " six months50
 " " three months25
 To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year..... 1.50

CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year..... .70 per copy.
 Club rate for three and six months in proportion.
 Special terms to agents. Sample copies gratis. Correspondence solicited.

Any one receiving THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered the magazine need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

TO OUR PATRONS

Please be careful to write all names of persons and places plainly.

Remit by P. O. Money Order, Express Money Order or by Bank Draft on New York.

Make all Orders and Drafts payable to Pacific Press Publishing Company.

We will receive Postage Stamps in small quantities, and any kind of good money. Paper money or silver should be sent in a Registered Letter.

The address on the wrapper will always indicate the time to which your subscription is paid. In case of non-receipt of the magazine, or other irregularity, please notify us immediately.

When requesting change of address, be sure to give both old and new address.

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

OUR Kansas City Branch House has a few books which are slightly damaged by water, or the cloth covers shelf-worn, or some other small defect. The bindings are all right and the paper stock neat and clean; only the outside cloth or leather covers is all that is spotted or damaged. These books will be sent postpaid, while the stock lasts, at the following low prices, which in many cases is half-price, with postage free.

Best Stories from the Best Book, Cloth \$.50
 " " " " " " Board35
 Beware, a story for girls, Cloth50
 Bible and Its Story, The, Cloth 1.00
 Bible Readings for the Home Circle,
 Cloth 1.25
 Bible Readings for the Home Circle,
 Half-morocco 1.50
 Bible Readings for the Home Circle,
 Cloth, German 1.30
 Christ Our Saviour, Fancy cloth, gilt top... .75
 " " " Board40
 " " " Board, Spanish40
 Daniel and Revelation, Library 1.75
 " " " Half-morocco 1.75
 " " " Cloth, gilt 1.50
 Eden to Eden, Cloth, plain, English or
 German65
 Eden to Eden, Cloth, gilt, English or
 German90
 Gospel Primer, Cloth35
 Great Controversy, The, Half-morocco ... 2.00
 Health: How to find it, Cloth65
 His Glorious Appearing, Cloth35
 Home Hand Book, Cloth, plain 3.50
 Ladies' Guide, Cloth 2.00
 Man the Masterpiece, Cloth 2.00
 Patriarchs and Prophets, Cloth, plain 1.00
 Prophecies of Jesus, Cloth, gilt edges 1.25
 Science in the Kitchen, Cloth 1.20
 Two Republics, The, Half-morocco 2.00

First come, first served. These prices are very low, and cash must accompany all orders.

Address,

The Pacific Press Publishing Company,
 18 W. Fifth St., Kansas City, Mo.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1903

No. 15

A majority has no more right to do injustice than has a minority.

By "justice" the Papacy means special favor for herself regardless of the rights of others.

More important than what the majority thinks and does is what the majority *should* think and do.

Sunday legislation is the only "civil" legislation that the churches and religious societies make any great stir about.

Legislation concerning "*the observance*" of Sunday or any other day is altogether out of place on civil statute books.

Government is an instrument for restraining those who would wrong others; not an instrument for wronging some at the behest of others.

A Sunday or "Lord's day" law determines for the people the manner and season in which they shall worship the Lord by Sabbath observance.

It is not a right but a day, a religious observance, that the advocates of Sunday legislation desire to have the law "maintain," "guard," and "protect."

To deprive Sunday legislation of its religious character would be to deprive the friends of such legislation of all motive

and inspiration for proclaiming it to be wholly civil.

If it is right and just to relieve seventh-day observers from the requirement to observe Sunday, then it is wrong and unjust not to relieve all other persons who do not hold to Sunday as the Lord's day.

It is better to be with "only one-third of one per cent. of the people" and be standing for right and principle, than to be with the ninety-nine and two-thirds per cent. and be upholding and defending abuse, injustice, and wrong.

The advocates of Sunday legislation would prevent the "degradation of Sunday into a day of idleness" by "prohibiting with adequate penalties *all unnecessary labor and business*" on that day! These people certainly have queer ways of doing things.

When the United States decided to govern its dependencies outside the Constitution it gave the Papacy a mighty vantage ground, which she has not been slow to perceive and take advantage of. Read the article on "The Supremacy of the Papacy" this week.

Representatives of the Papacy in the United States hold that the principle of separation of church and state does not apply "among a people unanimously of

one form of religious belief." This does not look as if modern progress was affecting them very much. This is what the Papacy has always held.



The "recognition" that is being demanded by representatives of the Papacy for "Catholics in the Philippines" is the same sort of "recognition" that many people in this country are constantly demanding for Sunday, and in that for Sunday observers. It is a sort of recognition that the civil authorities have no right to grant.



"The majority must rule," declares a Sunday-enforcement advocate. If this argument is a sufficient justification for Sunday enforcement (and it seems to be so regarded), then all the atrocious persecutions of the Dark Ages have sufficient justification. Although some people do not seem to realize it, we live in a time when it is not enough for the majority merely to rule; it must rule *right*.



The Papacy holds that the principle of separation of church and state should not be put in practise in the Philippines because that is "a country almost exclusively Catholic." Whatever she and her spokesmen may say now, when the United States becomes "a country almost exclusively Catholic" she will just as boldly and unblushingly avow that the time has come for the principle of church-and-state separation to go out of practise *in the United States*.



The champions of Sunday legislation are such great sticklers for the rule of the majority because they are confident that, whether as the "Lord's day" or merely as the "civil rest day," the majority favors legislative protection and enforcement of the day that is *their holy day*. If the majority should select some other day than Sunday as the day to be "recog-

nized," "provided," and "protected" by the law as the "rest day," these gentlemen would suddenly change their tune about the rule of the majority in this matter.



The moment it is admitted that a legislature or any other civil authority has the right to exempt people (no matter whether they be seventh-day observers or any other class of people) from observing Sunday, that moment it is admitted that that authority has the right to *compel* the people exempted and everybody else to observe Sunday. That is why seventh-day observers and all other people who take their stand upon the principle of religious freedom can give no endorsement to such exemptions. In principle they are every bit as bad as the law of which they are a part.



We are told now and again that the Papacy in this country endorses the principle of separation of church and state. The fact is that the instant she sees an opportunity for having that principle set aside she is ready to demand that it be done. Some of her representatives in this country have with one breath denounced the withholding of the Constitution from the dependencies and with the other have demanded the setting aside of the principle of separation of church and state, on the ground that "the clause of the Constitution which requires the absolute separation of church and state was intended by the framers of the document to meet conditions in the United States" only!



The Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Standard and Times* says that at the "jubilee" celebration on February 20, "His Holiness concluded his speech by saying that he gave all present as a *special injunction to be received and to be spread, that only in the Church was salvation*, and that God had set a most

powerful and a perpetual means of salvation in the Roman Catholic Pontificate." It is evident that the Pope is not aware of those "reforms" in the Papacy of which some "Protestants" are so assured. While they are praising him to the skies for his wonderful liberality, he is quietly holding to, strengthening and promulgating the fundamental pretensions of the papal system.

Within a month of the time of its declaration that "reforms in the Roman Church do not appear in decretals or on parchment, *but they come all the same*," *The Independent* has printed an article by "a Roman Catholic of scholarship and distinction and in unimpeachable standing in his church," in which it is declared unequivocally that "*there can be no hope of reform in the Catholic Church while the present pretensions of the Papacy and the Hierarchy hold sway*"; and again that "reform is not to be looked for from the Curia Romana or, indeed, from the Episcopate or even from the clergy." This "Roman Catholic of scholarship and distinction" evidently knows the Papacy better than *The Independent* does.

While American "Protestant" journals are telling us that the Papacy is on the verge of yielding entirely her claim to temporal sovereignty, papal organs are boasting that "the United States has given official recognition to the Pope's temporal power." The first offer nothing in proof of their assertions, but the latter point to last summer's negotiations at the Vatican and especially to the negotiations now in progress at Manilla between Governor Taft and the "duly accredited representative of the Holy See," whose "official character" "the Philippine government expressly recognizes." The papal organs are right in their assertion. It is strange that the "Protestant" journals do not take note of the very signif-

icant facts before them, instead of deluding themselves with the notion that the Papacy is rapidly ceasing to be the Papacy.

In their clamors against the putting into practise of the principle of separation of church and state in the Philippines the papal representatives in the United States have been very solicitous (professedly) "that the policy of our government in this vital matter will be dictated solely by a high sense of justice, without any yielding to the clamors of religious prejudice." If this was really what they desired they have certainly done everything they could to defeat their object. The only clamors of religious prejudice in this matter that anybody knows anything about have been their own. A policy dictated by a high sense of justice was exactly what these papists did not want "in this vital matter"; they wanted a policy of special favoritism to the Papacy, and with clamor and threats set about to secure it. And it seems that they have obtained to a considerable degree just what they were after. And in this there has decidedly been a "yielding to the clamors of religious prejudice." But of course to them this is the sort of policy that is "dictated solely by a high sense of justice."

Does any one suppose that it is giving the imagination too free play to see in the appointment that has been made of a Roman Catholic to be a "member of the Philippine Commission and Secretary of Public Instruction in the government of the Philippine Islands," evidence that the Papacy is bending and bringing things her way in the Philippines entanglement? We thought this might be the case at first, notwithstanding the resignation of the former secretary and this appointment followed close upon the clamorous campaign in behalf of the "rights" of "the

Church" in the Philippines (which campaign in large part was directed against the conduct of educational affairs in the islands because of the application of the principle of separation of church and state in those affairs) that was waged by papal organs and representatives in the United States last year. With the thought that perhaps our "prejudice" was getting the better of us, we dismissed the idea that this campaign was proving effective with those in authority. But we need not have done so, as later developments have shown. Something in substantiation of this will be presented next week.

California is about the only State which does not attempt to compel the observance of the first day of the week, and the honor is all the greater from the fact that this is not because it has never gotten around to enact a Sunday law, but because it repealed twenty years ago the law that it once had. But it is evident that California is not to be allowed to have this honorable distinction long. During the present winter petitions for the enactment of a Sunday law have come to the legislature, one of them declaring that the petitioners—

in view of the innumerable immoral and social evils, resulting from the present degradation of Sunday into a day of idleness and dissipation, do earnestly and respectfully petition your honorable body to enact a Sunday law, that will give to all classes of men a weekly day of rest, by prohibiting with adequate penalties all unnecessary labor and business, seventh-day worshippers excepted, and all barbarous, unseemly or noisy amusements to be prohibited.

How the "degradation of Sunday into a day of idleness" is to be stopped or remedied by a law prohibiting labor and business on that day was not explained. In a communication to her co-workers a leading official of the W. C. T. U. has stated that no further attempts will be made for the passage of a Sunday law at the present session of the

legislature, but that "some broad, general, definite legislation" will "be ready for presentation to the legislature two years hence," and that in the meantime it is proposed to make "a thorough State canvass" in the interests of the measure.

In connection with the matter of permitting the opening of saloons on Sunday in New York the *Christian Advocate* presents a quotation from a speech delivered by Bishop Potter several years ago, we believe in 1896, "at the great mass-meeting in Carnegie Hall, to protest against open saloons on Sunday, when he presided and Father Doyle, the Hon. Frederic R. Coudert and others spoke." Here are some of the things that the Bishop said, with emphasis by us:

The Sabbath is the day of rest. *Our legislation concerns THE OBSERVANCE of this day of rest, which is so essential to the physical well-being of man and the safety of society. Then why not speak of the guardianship of this day and the relation of saloons to that guardianship, and the maintenance of RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE? The saloons should be closed on the Lord's day in this great Christian State, so that on that day there may be an opportunity for ITS OBSERVANCE.*

Then the Bishop expressed "profound gratitude to that courageous and efficient officer [no doubt referring to the then Police Commissioner Roosevelt] who has insisted upon the enforcement of law," and "who has put down *the insolent clamor that said we wanted no CHRISTIAN SUNDAY,*" so "that on the Sabbath the door of the saloon was shut and the door of the House of the Lord was open." Bishop Potter has since changed his attitude regarding the Sunday opening of saloons, but the secret of the activity of those who uphold Sunday legislation, so plainly revealed and avowed by him in these words which the *Christian Advocate* quotes to-day with so much approval, remains exactly the same.

The Independent sees in the recent appointment of "Monsignor" O'Connell to the rectorship of the (Roman) Catholic University at Washington evidence that "the whirligig of time is now avenging the men who were condemned for 'Americanizing' the Catholic Church." In this connection it lets slip a statement regarding a matter of far greater concern to all true Americans that should be noted and emphasized. We refer to the portion of the following sentence that we have italicized:

Archbishop Ireland and Monsignor O'Connell were for a while in discredit [at Rome], but lately the "Americanists" have come into influence again, and *in the mission of Governor Taft to Rome they scored a distinct political success.*

What does *The Independent* wish to have understood from this last statement? Just what is this "distinct political success" that the "Americanists" of the Roman Catholic Church have scored "in the mission of Governor Taft to Rome"? Why was it striven for? how was it attained? what does it secure for those who scored it? What part did politicians and statesmen play in bringing about this "distinct political success" of a section of the Roman Catholic Church in this country? Was it a part that accords with that fundamental principle of the nation respecting the relation of church and state? or was it a part played in obedience to the desires and persuasions of ecclesiastics who were enabled to exert a powerful influence (with those who would yield to such influence) because of the character and greatness of the religious constituency behind them? How is it that what *The Independent* so confidently affirmed last spring was solely for the purpose of accomplishing a mere "business" transaction between the Government and "the authority which controls the friars and their possessions," and which at that time it would have every-

body believe was a step taken by the Government wholly upon its own volition and in its own interests, was the securing, or the means of the securing, of "a distinct political success" by and for what is no doubt coming to be the most influential and powerful section of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States? It would be very interesting to have *The Independent* go into details concerning what it affirms, or perhaps it would be more true to say, what it inadvertently acknowledges; but it is not likely to do this. It has admitted and affirmed what is indeed a fact in reality, and a fact of great significance and importance, but, we fear, it is not a fact that *The Independent* cares to have pointed out and emphasized in the way it ought to be pointed out and emphasized. When it is a matter of the influence and standing of the "Americanists" of the Roman Catholic Church in this country with the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome, it is ready to affirm that "in the mission of Governor Taft to Rome they scored a distinct political success"; but when it is a matter of the influence and manipulation of these same Roman Catholic "Americanists" with the governmental authorities at Washington, it is not at all likely that *The Independent* will be able to see that in this governmental "mission" to Rome these Roman Catholic ecclesiastics scored a *distinct political success*. But they certainly did; and the thing demonstrates that they are doing something else besides "'Americanizing' the Catholic Church"; they are also Catholicizing the American nation. And it is this latter work no doubt that is causing the removal of the condemnation that rested upon them for the former. The American people should arouse themselves to what "the whirligig of time" is now doing for their nation, for it is doing some things that they cannot afford to treat with indifference.

The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

XIV

A Point of "Capital" Importance with the Papacy

WE have seen that one great thing that has been gained by the Papacy from the United States through her Philippines connections is the express recognition by the United States government, through the government of the Philippines, of the official character of the papal delegate "as the duly accredited representative of the Holy See." And there is another item in the Philippines entanglement with the Papacy that has given to her even a stronger hold than this upon the United States government.

During all the time of the Spanish dominion in the Philippine Islands, the Papacy had complete control of education there. In the nature of things, with her this control of education meant simply that the Catholic Church taught to the people her own dogmas for which the Spanish government paid her by taxation of the people. It was the same old papal system of the state being the support and stay of the church in all the work of the church.

Since the United States government has supplanted Spain in the Philippines, the Papacy has all the time insisted that this government shall also occupy the place that Spain occupied in supporting the Catholic Church by taxation and the governmental power, while she holds absolute control of education; that the United States government shall continue the same papal system of union of church and state as was there before. The Philippine government of the United States began by taking the control of education, and has insisted that the schools shall be governmental schools instead of church schools, and that in education there shall

be a separation of church and state, according to the constitutional principles of the home government of the United States. This has brought the strong, wire-working opposition of the Papacy in the Philippines, in Rome, and in the United States. It was one of the questions involved in the negotiations last July in Rome between the Papacy and that two-thirds papal commission that was sent from Washington to represent the United States government.

This school question was with the others transferred to Manila to be "settled" there between Governor Taft and the papal delegate. And the place held by this question in the estimation of the Papacy is shown by the words of the Pope's "Secretary of State" in a note to Governor Taft during the negotiations in Rome last July, which were that "the Holy Father consents that the school question in the Philippines be not insisted upon for the moment, but His Holiness hopes his representative in the archipelago may have an understanding with you, Mr. the Governor General, on this point of *an importance* SO CAPITAL in a country almost exclusively Catholic."

Thus in Rome. And how the thing was then, and is, being worked in the United States is revealed in the following facts. At the very time when his negotiations were being conducted in Rome, and the Pope was pronouncing the school question a point so capital in importance, a campaign was being conducted by the Papacy in the United States on the same so capitally important question. The following documents issued by Archbishop Elder plainly tell this part of the story:

Cincinnati, July 10, 1902.

Rev. Dear Father:

Should you be willing to do so, kindly sign your name to the enclosed memorial and return it as soon as possible to the Chancery, stating at the same time the number of Catholics under your care. The document has already been signed by the Right Rev. Bishop of Hartford, and the 262 priests of his diocese, and probably by many others.

WM. HENRY ELDER,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

To His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States:

The undersigned, the clergy of the diocese of Cincinnati, in their own name, and in the name of 200,000 Catholics of the diocese, would respectfully beg to lay before your excellency the following memorial bearing upon the Philippine schools.

Your excellency is aware that the Filipino people, in so far as they are Christians at all, are members of our communion. For three hundred years they have committed the education of their children to the care of religious teachers. To the training thus imparted the natives owe their present status as a civilized and Christian people. We respectfully submit that, in our judgment, the abrupt and complete breaking away from this system of education and the adopting of another entirely devoid of religious coloring, coupled with the violent disruption of venerable traditions which must necessarily ensue, would be a grave hindrance to their progress in civilization and impede unnecessarily our peaceful and successful government of the archipelago.

We respectfully submit that the clause of the Constitution which requires the absolute separation of church and state, was intended by the framers of the document to meet conditions in the United States of America, and not those which obtain in the Orient and among a people unanimously of one form of religious belief.

Your excellency, we are profoundly convinced that the Filipino people, deeply Catholic at heart, will deem it an unjust invasion of their rights to be taxed for the maintenance of a system of education which cannot command the free and full approval of their conscience. As American citizens, jealous of the good name of our country, we hope and pray that the policy of our government in this vital matter will be dictated solely by a high sense of justice, without any yielding to the clamors of religious prejudice, which is blind alike to

the real interest of the republic and the eternal welfare of the people whom Providence has committed to our protection.

Your excellency, we regret that stubborn and uncontradicted report charges certain individuals employed by our government in the education of the children of the archipelago with offensive hostility to the religion of the natives, and we are convinced that you will visit this abuse with the speedy and uncompromising reprobation which you have already manifested in ridding our army of the shadow of inhumanity brought upon it by the excesses of certain individuals.

May it please your excellency, we count it a singular favor of Providence that our beloved country should, at this transition period, when confronted with tremendous issues, have fallen under the leadership of a statesman of such uncompromising fairness and high devotion to the dictates of justice. It is with the perfect assurance of your exalted statesmanship and absolute determination to seek the real good of the country in all measures of state that we presume to lay before you this memorial.

Cincinnati, July 10, 1902.

There is much in this document that there is not space now to discuss; but there in one point in it that is of transcendent importance and should be discussed everywhere and forever. Note that second paragraph of the memorial to the President of the United States: "We respectfully submit that *the clause of the Constitution* which requires the *absolute separation of church and state*, was intended by the framers of the document to meet conditions in the United States of America, and *not those which obtain in the Orient* and among a people unanimously of one form of religious belief."

The true story, then, so far is this: Under Spain's dominion in the Philippines there was absolute union of church and state. The United States government in the Philippines demands absolute separation of church and state. The Papacy insists that the absolute union of church and state shall continue, and against the demand of the government sets up the plea

that the clause of the United States Constitution that requires the absolute separation of church and state, *does not apply in the Orient*. And, since the Constitution does not apply there, it is perfectly proper that the previous order of things shall continue; that the church shall control education and the state shall support the church in this; that there shall be there the union of church and state.

And the chief mischief in this argument is that legally it is unquestionable sound. For has not the Supreme Court of the United States itself decided that *the Constitution does not apply in the Philippines*, nor in any of the insular possessions of the United States? that it was framed to meet conditions only within the limits of the United States? Therefore as the legal basis of her claim that the Constitution does not apply in the Orient, the Papacy has the official decision of the supreme authority on the subject. And plainly, since the Constitution does not apply there, it cannot legally be urged that the separation of church and state required by the Constitution shall be demanded there; especially in the face of the unbroken precedent and vested right of three hundred years. So the Papacy entrenches herself, and how can she legally be dislodged?

And against her being dislodged from her position of union of church and state, and her control of education, in the Philippines, she carries her defense into the United States itself, and up to the capital and head of the nation, as represented in this argument presented by Archbishop Elder to the President of the United States. And this argument of Archbishop Elder is backed up by the Catholic

paper — *Church Progress*, of St. Louis — in which it was published by the following suggestive, not to say threatening, paragraph:

While our government has been far from doing the right thing by way of *recognizing American Catholics in the Philippines*, we believe justice will eventually prevail. For this, the demand of fifteen millions of American Catholics is somewhat of a guarantee. It is one which no administration DARE IGNORE.

And that she does not intend to allow herself to be dislodged practically, any more than legally, is plain from the fact that hardly had returned to the United States that Catholic attorney who formed half of the papal portion of that two-thirds papal commission from the government of the United States to the Vatican, before he was appointed by the President a "*member of the Philippine Commission and Secretary of Public Instruction in the government of the Philippine islands*," which appointment was duly confirmed by the Senate. Directly and plainly that puts the Papacy in actual control of public instruction in the Philippines. And this in direct and plain furtherance of her purpose to maintain there the complete papal system of absolute union of church and state, because the Constitution which requires the absolute separation of church and state does not apply in the Orient!

In view of these facts which are indisputably laden with meaning, can any one deny that the Papacy is already making good her promise that "what the Church has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States"? Other nations in the past she made to be mere stepping-stones in her dark purposes and her vast ambitions; and what else is she now doing with the United States?

It is not alone in the Philippines that the Papacy is seeking to have the principle of separation of church and state violated by state support of religious teaching — yes, by state support of

Roman Catholic religious teaching. She is patiently, persistently and determinedly prosecuting a campaign for the same thing in the United States proper. Of course if she can secure this in the Phil-

ippines she will have made an immense stride toward success in her campaign for the same thing in the United States. No wonder this point in the Philippine matter is to her one "of an importance *so capital*." All this makes the question

of religion in the public schools, or of public support of religious teaching, a very live and important one. The matter in *THE SENTINEL* of three weeks hence will relate especially to this subject, and something good will be presented.

A Question of Principle and not of Sectarianism, nor of Numbers

*By A. E. Place**

I FAVOR this bill because I think our lawmakers should be relieved from the stigma of maintaining religious legislation, and that honest American citizens should be free from legislative restriction in a matter of religion. It has been clearly shown that the calls for Sunday laws come from the church, and that the legislation is religious legislation. It is evident that if it were not for the religious character of the day there would be no more legislation respecting Sunday than there is respecting the Fourth of July or Washington's birthday.

One speaker here to-day has claimed that those who favor this bill are here in the interests of legislation for the seventh day. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Every true Seventh-day Adventist would oppose a Sabbath or Saturday law as sincerely and vigorously as a Sunday law, for the matter to them is a broad question of principle and not of sectarianism. Our contention with respect to Sunday legislation is not dependent upon our belief and practise in the matter of Sabbath observance. Were this not so we would not hold to the position concerning the exemption clause expressed here to-day. It is because we are contending

impartially for the broad principle of religious freedom and separation of church and state that we cannot endorse an exemption clause even in our own behalf. We believe that the moment we admit that the state has the right to exempt people from performing religious duties and observing religious rites we admit that it has the right *to require* the performance of religious duties and the observance of religious rites, and, of course, whenever it chooses, to rescind any exemption it may have granted. This is to admit that the control of religious matters should be in the hands of the majority—that the individual should be subject to the majority in matters of faith and worship. But every one should know full well that this is utterly antagonistic to the principle of religious liberty. All the persecutions of the past were carried on by majorities against sincere, God-fearing minorities.

That well-known historian, Dr. Philip Schaff, in his "History of Church and State in the United States," has well said: "Secular power has proved a satanic gift to the church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the state." No matter how honest may be the churchmen who call for religious laws, or how sincere may be the lawmakers who enact the will of the church into law, the whole history of the past, together with the teachings of the good

* Mr. Place, who is a Seventh-day Adventist minister, was to have spoken at the hearing reported last week, but the time expired before he had an opportunity to do so. He has favored us with this report of what would have been his remarks, which we take especial pleasure in presenting here. Though not delivered at the hearing, these intended remarks are certainly worthy of a wide reading.—EDITOR.

old Book, all show that religious legislation and true Christianity are antagonistic to each other.

Jesus Christ was the author and founder of true Christianity. He ever has been and still is its only foundation; his life among men is a true object lesson of its demands. Churchmen and legislators may look long and well, but not one particle of evidence will they find that the author and exemplar of Christianity ever asked for a single law or any recognition from government enforcing or even favoring one of its tenets. When he came the Roman government, in the pride and pomp of its power, was maintaining the religion of the majority by law. He sent no petitions to those in authority asking that Christianity be favored. He went on quietly with his work. His teachings and the tenor of all his life, from that day when the Holy Ghost rested upon his sacred head at Jordan to the time when that same head, bleeding from the crown of thorns, once more turned upward and cried, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," was: "My kingdom is not of this world"; "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." To all his followers he said: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

As long as the Golden Rule is heeded there will be no force employed in religious matters. Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that very few of the would-be reformers of our State and nation by means of Sunday laws, or laws regulating and enforcing any other religious observances, would want the legislature to pass a law coercing them on any point of religious faith and practise. Neither would they want to be compelled to do

any religious duty, no matter how much they might believe the tenet to be right.

To compel a man who is not religious to act religious, instead of making him religious, makes him a hypocrite, and Christ said, "Woe unto you, . . . hypocrites." If Christ pronounced a woe upon the hypocrites will he not pronounce a woe upon the members of his professed church who induce the state to make and enforce laws which make hypocrites? I repeat, the whole plan of legislating in matters religious is opposed to the spirit and genius of Christianity.

One speaker asserted here to-day that Seventh-day Adventists are only about one-third of one per cent. of the people, and that as the great mass of the people believe in Sunday their will should obtain, as this is a country ruled by majorities. Had I not heard similar expressions before I should be astonished to hear it from one who calls himself an American and a Christian. Must a people wait till they constitute a majority before they have the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, and when they get to be the majority are they to legislate for the minority in religious matters? He who is called the father of this "land of the free," said: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

But is it a fact that the majority of the people favor this religious Sunday legislation? Statistics show that not more than one-third of the people of this country attend religious services. This means that not more than one-third of the people have enough regard for the "Lord's day" to go to church on that day. Shall this one-third of the people dictate to the other two-thirds how they shall use the day, and deny them the

exercise of their natural and God-given right to use the day as they please so long as they respect the rights of others?

Sunday keeping or Sunday breaking is not a question to be decided by majorities, and minorities should never ask or willingly accept exemptions or toleration in the exercise of religion. Lord Stanhope, of England, declared in 1827: "The time was when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon; it is now demanded as a right; but the time will come when it will be spurned as an insult." That time has come. I spurn the thought of asking the legislature to favor me or the people I represent in any religious matter, or to tolerate me or them in violating restrictions in a matter of religion that are imposed upon others. We ask for no favor, and for no special recognition of our rights. We ask for nothing more and nothing less than the recognition of the right of every American citizen, of whatever persuasion, to be free from the dictation and interference of government in every matter of religion.

As for ourselves, we feel that He whom

we serve will vindicate us in every time of trial if we are true to Him, no matter what unjust discriminations the law may make or what may be the attitude of those in authority toward us. We serve Him who went into the fiery furnace and the lions' den with His servants, who were less than one-third of one per cent. of the people at that time, and brought to naught the persecuting decrees of the Babylonian and Medo-Persian monarchs; He who unlocked the prison doors for Peter and unloosed the stocks which held Paul and Silas in the dungeon; He who has gone to the dungeon and the stake with millions of persons to establish and confirm the truth that with things religious, with things which have to do with man's relation to God, civil government can of right have *nothing* to do.

I favor the bill before you because I believe our legislators should have to do only with things secular, and that there should be no law upon our statute books which invades the realm of conscience and desecrates the sanctuary of the soul.

We are glad to note that *The Law Register*, of Chicago, condemns the Sunday-closing measure which the clerks of Illinois, and especially of Chicago, are trying hard to get enacted into law at the present session of the legislature. *The Register* gave prominence to the matter in its issue of March 4, and in its comment called attention to a very important fact with regard to Sunday legislation that should not be overlooked by those who would intelligently discuss and oppose such legislation to-day:

Students of Sunday laws note a radical change in the character and purposes of those who propose such laws to-day as compared with the authors of the so-called "Blue Laws." The ancient statutes of Connecticut and Massachusetts which safeguarded Sunday from all secular labor and every form of

amusement, expressed the religious sentiment of the people of those States or colonies. The early settlers in New England were Bible Christians in the literal sense, taking the Ten Commandments and the moral precepts of the Old and New Testaments as the rule and guide of legislation. Whatever criticism may be meted out to them, they cannot be charged with inconsistency, insincerity or lack of profound respect for what was regarded as the "Lord's Day." In recent years, however, Sunday legislation has not looked to a religious, but to a social sanction. The question is not, "Does God command such an enactment," but does the body politic, which in many instances means the political body, or an influential factor of the same, demand it. The proposed law above is of this nature. In an effort to close delicatessen-shops, which in large cities are beginning to compete somewhat with groceries, those interested in the latter are moving the legislature to close up these places Sunday. Against such legislation, all fair

mind men should protest. The State should not be used as a club by those in one branch of business to injure those in another equally lawful. If it is innocent to sell milk and bread six days in the week, it is no less so on the seventh. Especially in Chicago, with its wide-open saloons and low places of amusement in full blast on Sunday, the enactment and enforcement of the proposed law would bring contempt upon law itself.

Mr. J. W. Boynton, a Seventh-day Adventist living in Ponoka, Alberta, Canada, sends us this account of a Sunday enforcement experience that has been passed through by one of his fellow-religionists:

Last November Mr. J. L. Hamren, who lives near Wetaskiwin, Alberta, was arrested for violation of the Lord's day ordinance. At the trial in the justice's court he was fined \$2 and costs, making \$3.45 in all. The justice advised him to appeal to the higher court, which he did. In the interval between the trials, by means of literature and personal letters, we called the attention of all the lawyers, editors, justices, and other prominent men we could reach, to the trial and the principles involved in Sunday legislation. We received many letters from these men, and many of them expressed their hearty approval of our position, and said we should be protected in worshiping as we chose. On February 19 the case was called in Judge Scott's court at Wetaskiwin. The judge sustained the appeal and quashed the conviction of Mr. Hamren. This is the first case of this kind in the Territory, so far as I know, and of course will form a precedent for future cases.

It is gratifying to note that such a precedent has been established in this first case of Sunday enforcement against a seventh-day observer in Alberta. If it is not overborne by the insistent clamors of the religion champions of Sunday enforcement, an appeal to the intelligence

and conscience of a community is usually sufficient to secure justice in such cases, even in spite of the existence of the unjust law.

It is announced that "Cardinal Gibbons has accepted an invitation to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the St. Louis Exposition, and will offer the opening prayer on that occasion, as he did at the World's Fair at Chicago." Nobody has any right to find fault with the selection of Cardinal Gibbons for this function, and nobody is likely to, but at the same time it would be a blind person indeed who could not see in this an evidence of the prestige of the Papacy in the United States to-day.

"All the diplomacy of the Vatican is being brought into play to secure an interview between the King of England and Pope Leo," stated a dispatch from Rome under date of April 1. The news had reached Rome that King Edward was to visit the city "at the end of this month," and it had "produced a great impression at the Vatican." Evidently the United States is not the sole object of the Pope's solicitude and affection.

"Picturing the Church as different in various lands and ages," is characterized by the *Catholic Standard and Times* as "the usual sophistry" of Protestants. Protestants should take note, and cease imagining that "the Church" has become entirely different in this country or in this age from what she is in other countries or has been in other ages.

It is false to logic and to history to think that the work of a minority, in which men are set to defend and propagate fundamental and practical truth, is undesirable or unimportant. History shows that such minorities, being true to

their mission, secure a development of character and types of experience far higher and more valuable than do those who go lazily or are carried without effort by the crowds which throng easier paths.—*Sabbath Recorder*.

“Rome is aiming to reestablish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. She is silently growing into power. All that she desires is vantage ground, and this is already being given her.”

READ THESE QUOTATIONS

If the American Republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, IT MUST BE BY THE REJECTION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF THE REFORMATION, AND THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.—*The Catholic World*, September, 1871.

In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. . . . According to him THE CHURCH OUGHT TO BE THE CHOSEN CRUCIBLE for the molding and absorption of races into one united family. . . . WHAT THE CHURCH HAS DONE IN THE PAST FOR OTHERS, SHE WILL DO FOR THE UNITED STATES.—*Letter from the Vatican to the New York Sun*, July 11, 1892.

All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. THEY MUST PENETRATE WHEREVER POSSIBLE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL AFFAIRS; MUST CONSTANTLY USE THEIR UTMOST VIGILANCE AND ENERGY TO PREVENT THE USAGES OF LIBERTY FROM GOING BEYOND THE LIMITS FIXED BY GOD'S LAW. ALL CATHOLICS SHOULD DO ALL IN THEIR POWER TO CAUSE THE CONSTITUTIONS OF STATES, AND LEGISLATION, TO BE MODELED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE TRUE CHURCH.—*Leo XIII. in his Encyclical of 1885.*

Our country has had its experience of his [Pope Leo's] influence; for it was his gentle forbearance, that never uttered, nor permitted to be uttered, a word that would wound or offend, which has SO SKILFULLY GUARDED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS with a proud and victorious people that the wild clamors of religious fanaticism HAVE BEEN QUELLED and the unworthy aims of designing politicians HAVE BEEN THWARTED, while he, the great Father of Christendom, with absolute trust in the fearlessness and keen sense of justice of our great Chief Executive, as well as the honor of our people, SERENELY LEGISLATES FOR THE RELIGIOUS GOVERNMENT OF THE NEW POSSESSIONS, and gives an assurance that the Catholics of the Philippines will be the most devoted supporters of the American Republic.—“*Father*” *Thos. J. Campbell, (orator of the day), at the “jubilee” celebration in honor of the Pope in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on March 3, 1903.*

And then read, and get others to read, from beginning to end the
new series of articles

by

ALONZO T. JONES

on

The Supremacy of the Papacy

now being printed in THE SENTINEL, and which began with
the issue of March 19.

“Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism, and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.”