

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, JUNE 11, 1903

NO. 24



*A man does not have to be his own employer in order to obey the dictates of his own conscience.*

*The right to work is as sacred as the right to rest, and it loses none of its sacredness on Sunday.*

*The "Day of Rest" and not the right to rest is the thing that Sunday laws were made to safeguard.*

*If his Sunday-law friends are correct, the workingman sells not only his labor, but his rights as a man and a citizen as well, for the wages he receives.*

*The man who for the sake of his position surrenders his liberty and violates his conscience is indeed a slave, but his is a slavery from which no legislation can emancipate him. He needs not outward but inward freedom. To coddle him with special legislation is the worst service that can be rendered him.*

*As long as the churches insist that Sabbath observance must be enforced by the law their pronouncements on the subject must be regarded and treated as attempts to prescribe law on the subject for the whole people instead of merely as regulations for the conduct of church members. What they condemn as "Sabbath-breaking" it must be understood they would have the law prohibit as criminal.*

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 11 West 20th St., New York City**  
**OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA • KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI**

Entered January 2, 1903, at New York, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

# A Study of Principles

In Alonzo T. Jones' book entitled

## "THE TWO REPUBLICS"

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

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

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

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

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

Complete catalog of publications mailed on request. Address

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

## LEGAL SUNDAY

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

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

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

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

## CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM

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

## THE GREAT NATIONS OF TO-DAY

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

**PAPER COVERS, 25 Cents.**

## THE MARSHALING OF THE NATIONS

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

Address,

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

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1903

No. 24

The editor of the Pensacola (Fla.) *Daily News* writes us that he is "one man who does not believe in enforcing the religious observance of any day." We are glad to receive this testimony, and also to report that many other representative citizens of Florida are of the same mind. Mr. C. P. Whitford, who since the Sunday-enforcement agitation at Jacksonville some weeks ago has contributed several articles on the subject to the leading daily of the city, has received about seventy-five communications from representative men in various parts of the State expressing approval of his position in the matter. Judge W. M. Ives of Lake City, county judge of Columbia County, wrote in one communication:

I simply desire to say amen to each sentence in your article, and to thank you for the interest you take in a matter which will soon bring about a religious trust. For many years I have contended against ministers and others endeavoring to form religious trusts, and to get the State to enact laws requiring me and others to worship God nor in spirit and in truth. I foresee that the time will soon come when laws on religion will be enacted. And when the State says I must keep a day holy it will soon say I must go to church—and then to what church. May God bless you in your efforts to free the minds of men from priestcraft.

A prominent citizen of Ocala wrote:

My sentiments are aptly expressed by Vattel in his "Law of Nations" as follows: "Worship consists in certain actions performed with an immediate view to the honor of God; there can be no worship proper for any man which

he does not believe suitable to that end. The obligation of sincerely endeavoring to know God, of serving him from the bottom of the heart, being imposed on man by his very nature, it is impossible that by his engagements with society he should have exonerated himself from that duty or deprived himself of the liberty which is absolutely necessary for the performance of it. It must, then, be concluded that liberty of conscience is a natural and inviolable right. It is a disgrace to human nature that a truth of this kind should stand in need of proof." Therefore I take it that any law which has a tendency to violate this right is a bad law from any standpoint morally, and legally, I take it, under our constitution.

A prominent citizen of Dade City wrote:

I am in hearty accord with you in your opposition to the intolerant opinions and efforts of some of our people in various localities, which lead to a subversion of the principles of the Constitution of our fathers. . . . This movement is no new departure. It is the same old spirit of persecution which deluged the olden countries with blood in the effort to make the civil subservient to the ecclesiastical power. It is the same old hydra-headed demon which every true lover of civil and religious liberty should uncompromisingly oppose. Accept my congratulations for the splendid work you are doing, and command me if I can aid you in any way.

A citizen of Jacksonville wrote:

I fully concur in all you say in regard to the Sunday laws. They are conceived in bigotry and brought forth in intolerance. I hope the time is past when the enforcement of such laws is possible.

It is certain that not only in Florida but in all the other States the enforce-

ment or enactment of Sunday laws in response to religious sentiment will find plenty of staunch opponents, for the thing is too palpable a violation of the principles of religious liberty to go unchallenged and unresisted in a time when these principles are held to be fundamental. But the difficulty is that the enforcement and enactment of Sunday laws in the future is not going to be, at least apparently, in response to religious sentiment. It is going to be increasingly difficult to see, or to get others to see, that there is any enforcement of religion in Sunday enforcement, for it is going to be placed upon the ground of social necessity or expediency and not upon that of religious obligation. Now the question is, will Sunday enforcement arouse the same opposition when done without any apparent connection with religion as it does when done plainly in response to religious sentiment? Will the labor union's or the merchants' association's demand for Sunday enforcement—that is, for the prohibition by law of labor and business on Sunday—be regarded as as much opposed to the rightful liberty of the citizen as the church's demand for the same thing? Upon this depends the question of whether there will be in these times vigorous enforcement of the Sunday institution, which is and will remain essentially religious.



For "a secular journal," as it has recently stated itself to be, *Leslie's Weekly*, "the oldest illustrated weekly in the United States," is certainly very much concerned for the maintenance of "the existing Sunday laws in New York State." As will be seen by one of the quotations below, it has even presumed to advise and stir up the churches themselves in this matter. The secret of this concern for the Sunday laws may be contained in the *Weekly's* declaration in its issue of April 2 that it is "a journal

that believes in the Bible and in the religion which the Bible teaches, and is glad, when opportunity offers, to help along any of the noble causes to which the churches of all names and sects are committed." But it is more probable that this concern is to be accounted for chiefly by the fact that the *Weekly* is affiliated with the political party which in New York State is committed to the policy of defending and upholding Sunday legislation. Though they are now somewhat old, it will be worth while to present some quotations from the *Weekly*. This is from an editorial in its issue of March 19:

We are confident that a large majority of the legislators, of all parties, will continue as in the past to oppose such a measure ["the old and familiar bill permitting saloons to remain open during certain hours on Sunday"], and that in so doing they will reflect the conservative and the best sentiment of the people of the entire State, including the most intelligent and responsible residents of the cities. As for our own views in the matter, we see no reason to recede from the position we have taken in the past, that, aside from all the purely religious aspects of the question—and we do not undervalue these—we believe it unsafe and utterly unwise policy to further weaken the present feeble *safeguards which the laws of the Empire State throw around the Day of Rest* in behalf of any interest, and least of all on behalf of an interest so selfish and so inimical to the true and higher welfare of the community as the liquor traffic. . . . To hold this view is not to be a Sabbatarian in the narrow and odious sense of that term, but only a fair-minded and reasonable American citizen, one who believes that the saloons in New York now have all, and more than all, the privileges and immunities which they ought to have, and that *the observance of one day in seven as a period of rest and religious worship*, free as possible from the distractions and temptations of other days, is good not only for the soul of man, but good for him in every department of his being, physical, mental and spiritual, and also that our so-called American Sunday is an institution of which we ought to be proud and one which we ought to jealously guard from attack either by its avowed enemies or confessed but mistaken friends.

The italics in the above, as in the quotations which follow, are supplied by us. And so, according to this secular champion of Sunday legislation, what is the consideration that should cause the Sunday law against liquor selling to be maintained intact? Is it the maintenance of the public peace and order? Is it the protection and safeguarding of the rights of citizens? No; the Sunday law against liquor selling should be maintained intact *because "our so-called American Sunday is an institution . . . which we ought to jealously guard from attack"*—because there should be no weakening of the "safeguards which the laws of the Empire State throw around the Day of Rest." The consideration is the safeguarding by law of an institution—"our so-called American Sunday." And thus, according to this secular champion of Sunday legislation, the Sunday liquor law exists and is upheld by it and others in the interests of (that is, for the maintenance and enforcement of) "the observance" of Sunday "as a period of rest AND RELIGIOUS WORSHIP." And this is what we get by way of argument for Sunday legislation from a secular journal when it lays aside (but, of course, does "not undervalue") "all the purely religious aspects of the question"! Verily, there is but one way to lay aside the religious aspects of the Sunday question, and that is to lay aside the question itself. The Sunday question is too thoroughly religious for any one who touches it to evade its religious aspects. "The Day of Rest," "our so-called American Sunday," is a *religious* institution, and the defenders of legislation safeguarding and upholding that institution cannot avoid revealing the fact in their arguments, no matter how hard they may try to leave out the religious aspects of the question. In its issue of March 26 the *Weekly* published the following, under the heading, "Churches Should Uphold Sunday Laws":

Friends of Sunday *observance* need to keep a watchful eye upon the legislature at Albany this session. One bill has already been introduced amending the penal code so as to permit the playing of amateur baseball on Sunday, and District Attorney Jerome will try to secure the passage of his bill providing for the opening of the saloons of New York on Sundays during certain hours. Neither of these measures ought to pass, nor do we believe they will if a sufficiently strong protest is made against them. *Here is where the churches of the Empire State can combine their forces* to some immediate and practical advantage by making their collective influence felt at Albany in behalf of a quiet and orderly Sunday. According to the statistics set forth by Dr. Walter Laidlaw, of the Federation of Churches in New York City, the year just past was unparalleled in the religious history of the metropolis, more having been expended for church extension than ever before in one year, the sum total being not less than twenty millions. If so, *what better opportunity could the churches* thus splendidly equipped with the sinews of war *have to show their renewed vitality and aggressive power for good than in a united stand against a further breaking down of the Sunday laws.* If it is not the duty of the churches to safeguard an interest like this, then we may well ask what reason they have for being?

And why should the churches especially uphold the Sunday laws? Why have the churches such an especial duty to "stand against a further breaking down of the Sunday laws"? Ah! Sunday observance is a church institution; Sunday legislation is legislation for the church. The churches are the organized forces of religion, and the Sunday laws are religious laws—laws for the "safeguarding"—the enforcement—of a religious observance. This is why this secular champion of Sunday legislation addresses itself to the churches on behalf of these laws, and makes bold to intimate that they have no reason for being if not "to safeguard an interest like this." And for this very reason such prompting of the churches is unnecessary. They do not need to be urged from "secular" sources "to keep a watchful eye" upon legislatures with regard to this matter, nor do they need to

be informed from the same sources that "here"—in the matter of opposing such measures as are mentioned—is where they can make "a united stand" and "combine their forces to some immediate and practical advantage [to the religious institution which they hold in common]." They instinctively know and do this, as is shown whenever and wherever any attempt is made to secure the modification or repeal of Sunday laws. "The churches of the Empire State" did not fail to make "their collective influence felt at Albany" against the bills mentioned. At every hearing on these bills representatives of religious bodies were present in force to oppose them, and the significant, though not strange, fact is that the opposition on these occasions was confined almost entirely to the religious forces; most of the opposing speakers were clergymen, and some who were not clergymen were representatives of religious or semi-religious organizations. All this goes to show, what we must constantly repeat, that Sunday legislation is religious legislation. Here is another quotation from the *Weekly*—from its issue of April 2:

No State in the Eastern part of the Union has such liberal Sunday laws as New York, and the present movement to liberalize them still further is a weak and cowardly concession to certain interests that have more privileges and immunities now under the State laws than are asked or expected by any other business interests in existence. Once a step of the kind proposed is taken and it is almost impossible to retrace it, however great the error made may be found to have been. Some modification in the Sunday laws will probably be found necessary now and then as the years go on, but when such changes are made it should be in deference to a demand from some higher source than amateur baseball clubs and drink shops.

The *Weekly* evidently believes with regard to the Sunday laws as it does with regard to the tariff schedules, that they should be modified only by their friends

and beneficiaries. It is true that the sort of liberalization of Sunday legislation that is usually asked for is not such as to inspire respect and enthusiasm, and especially is this true of the demand for their liberalization in favor of the liquor traffic. But the question of the propriety of Sunday legislation itself is not to be determined by the merits or demerits of particular demands for its modification. No matter how disreputable may be the source and purpose of certain demands for its modification, no justification is thereby afforded for Sunday legislation, not even for the particular prohibitions against which the demands are directed. If the movement for Sunday-law modification which has arisen in New York is "a weak and cowardly" one it is because of the fact that it is in the nature of a concession to certain interests instead of a movement against the Sunday laws themselves with an equal regard for all interests. It seeks to do away with Sunday enforcement with regard to *one* business only, and that one of the most disreputable in existence. The logic of the demand is that Sunday enforcement is all right against all other businesses, however honorable and legitimate they may be, but that it should not obtain with regard to the liquor traffic. The saloon-keeper should be excused from the requirement to observe Sunday, but the manufacturer, the merchant, the shopman, the artisan and others should not be excused. This is of course an unsound and unfair position. But the right position is not that *none* should be exempt from Sunday enforcement, but that *all* should be exempt. The fact is that it is not liberalization of Sunday legislation, for that brings class legislation, but repeal and abolition that should be demanded. In this way only will it be possible to eliminate from the matter "weak and cowardly concession to certain interests," for Sunday legislation it-

self is an unwarranted concession to religious interests, and so long as a vestige of it remains there will remain an unwarranted concession to religious interests. In its issue from which our first quotation is taken the *Weekly* called attention to the fact that a bill had been introduced in the New York legislature to make "Good Friday" a legal holiday. It said it could see no good reason why that bill should become a law, but that on the contrary "a multitude of arguments array themselves against such a proposition." "Good Friday," it declared, "has long been a day of religious observance by various sects and will continue to be thus set aside whether recognized by law or not," and that "to make the observance" of the day "compulsory in schools, banks, and other institutions is nothing short of a nuisance." Now why is that the *Weekly* does not hold this same attitude with regard to the religious Sunday? Why should one religious observance have different treatment from another? Is it not just as true of the "so-called American Sunday" as it is of "Good Friday" that it "has long been a day of religious observance by various sects and will continue to be thus set aside whether recognized by law or not"? Why then should the laws of the Empire State throw "safeguards" around the one any more than around the other? Why should there be legal "recognition" and enforcement in the one case and not in the other? The fact is that when the *Weekly* says that there is no good reason why "Good Friday" should be recognized and enforced by the law, but a multitude of arguments why it should not be, it virtually says that there is no good reason why the "so-called American Sunday," which it is so anxious to have thus safeguarded, should be recognized and enforced by the law, but a multitude of arguments why it should not be.

The following from the Providence (R. I.) *Visitor* (Roman Catholic) is very pertinent to what was said two weeks ago regarding the official recognition of "Good Friday" by civil officials:

In making Good Friday a school holiday for this city not only were the gentlemen of the school committee not exceeding their powers, but they laid down a precedent, which we hope will be speedily followed, in spirit, at least, if not in substance, by other and larger bodies throughout the country. . . . This indirect recognition of the Providence school committee of the most sacred day in all the year may well be hailed by Catholics as a step forward towards national decency and self-respect; even though they themselves of all men in this country would be the last to welcome so pathetic an anachronism as an American union of church and state.

Certainly Catholics may well hail "as a step forward towards national decency and self-respect" the "recognition" of "the Church's" "most sacred day" by school boards and "other and larger bodies" of public officials "throughout the country," for is it not true from the standpoint of the Catholic Church that "national decency and self-respect" means national subjection to "the Church" and legal "recognition" of her "sacred" observances and dogmas? Of course the school board "laid down a precedent" when it made "indirect recognition" of "the most sacred day in all the year." It is in this that the danger lies. No such precedent as this should be laid down, for such precedents prepare the way for "an American union of church and state." What have the "Protestant" advocates of Sunday "recognition" got to say to this Catholic demand for "Good Friday" "recognition"? What can they say?



Of course *The Independent* does "not share M. Gohier's views as to the imminent and serious danger that the Catholic Church is about to rule this country to its ruin." It observes that "a foreign

visitor does not always see everything right," and says the views in question are "about what might be expected from one who is convinced that the Catholic Church is attempting to overthrow the French Republic." This view of M. Gohier's views on the point in question is about what might be expected from a periodical which can calmly publish as a matter of course that the President of the United States has appointed a man to a very important civil office because he is "a Catholic" and "was educated in a Catholic college"; because it is assumed that the people who inhabit the territory with the affairs of which he is to deal "are Catholic"; and "especially" because "it was thought wise to put a Catholic into" an office in which the incumbent would have the chief voice in the decision of questions involving property and other interests of the Catholic Church! A periodical that can see nothing wrong in that can hardly be expected to know when there is "imminent and serious danger that the Catholic Church is about to rule this country to its ruin." But it is very probable that events will yet teach *The Independent* that M. Gohier saw tendencies and realities to which it was blind.

Of course the matter of Sunday observance, or rather of enforcement, is one of the features of "the religious situation in America" which caught the attention of M. Gohier when making his observations here last summer. He says that "the affliction of the Protestant world is its Sunday," and remarks thus as to the matter in the United States:

Laborers who indulge in certain pleasures during the week because they are confined in shops and factories cannot have them on Sunday merely because it is Sunday. Museums and libraries are closed; mail is not delivered. At Chillicothe, Ohio, the municipal board tried once to reduce the fines and other penalties which fell upon the managers of playhouses for violation of the laws against Sunday per-

formances. The pastors were in an uproar. They called mass-meetings to demand the dismissal of the mayor and his associates. It was evident that the church could not stand competition with the other shows, if the two were to take place at the same time.

M. Gohier touches a vital point here. The church desires Sunday enforcement in order to prevent competition on the day that she assumes to be exclusively her own. She desires the state to secure her in a monopoly of the day.

It was reported from Rome and Paris last week that "the papal nuncio at Paris has confidentially informed President Loubet that it will be impossible for the Pope to receive him if he visits Rome as the guest of the King of Italy," and that "M. Loubet has conveyed to his Holiness a private expression of regret because of this decision." There is every reason to believe that this refusal to receive the French President is not due so much to the visit to the Quirinal, but is intended by the Vatican as a snub for the French government because of the policy it has carried into effect with regard to the religious associations, and which now threatens to lead to the abolition of the Concordat and to the separation of church and state.

Anent the recent "Sabbath observance" pronouncement of the Presbyterian General Assembly, *The Public* (Chicago) makes this pertinent comment:

By "Sabbath" this body of religionists means Sunday. But what authority they have for regarding Sunday as a sacred day it would probably puzzle them to explain. From this dilemma they cannot escape by any such plea as that it makes no difference what day of the week is set apart for religious observance, provided one day be so distinguished; for they attribute sacredness to this particular day. For giving that attribute to Saturday the Jews and other seventh-day worshipers have Biblical authority, but what authority is there for disregarding the sacred character of Saturday and setting up Sunday as the sacred day?

## “The Catholic Peril”

THERE have appeared in leading periodicals in the last few months several articles by persons of prominence that contain matter very pertinent to what has been and is being said in THE SENTINEL regarding the Papacy—her character, aims, and growing power in this country. This matter has been of especial interest and importance to us because of the fact that it was written by persons whose viewpoint is very different from that of THE SENTINEL and its contributors. We have intended to, and will as there is opportunity, present this matter in THE SENTINEL.

Perhaps the most pertinent and striking of the extracts that we have to present is the one given herewith, which is taken from an article by Urbain Gohier that appeared in *The Independent* of May 14 under the heading, “The Religious Situation in America.” M. Gohier is “the famous French Dreyfusard” and his article “is to be a portion of a book on the American people” that he will shortly publish in France, the material for which was collected “during an extensive trip here last summer and autumn.” He saw some things exactly as they have been set forth in THE SENTINEL, but, as he states, as they are not seen by most American Protestants. The point regarding the Catholic Church and the coal strike we have seen broached and emphasized nowhere else except in the article in THE SENTINEL of April 30 under the heading, “The Supremacy of the Papacy.” There is one error of fact made in bringing out this point that detracts from its force and significance. The appointment to the board of arbitration of a Roman Catholic prelate was not made “on the request from the operators,” but on the request of the strike leader and “as a concession to the strikers.” We are tempted to put some

statements in this extract in italics, but will give it just as it was printed in *The Independent*.

After pointing out that there was a “division in the ranks of the Protestant clergy” over the matter of the coal strike, M. Gohier says that “among the Catholic clergy there was, however, no uncertain front”; that “with a unanimity of which the American public carelessly ignores the causes and the significance, the Catholic priests, one and all, took the part of the miners.” He then continues:

The Catholic question in the United States is one of extreme interest. Within a few years it will be *the Catholic peril*. When one expresses this opinion to an American Protestant he laughs loudly, shrugs his shoulders, and pooh-poohs with hearty contempt. He answers that the Catholics of his country are animated by a genuinely republican spirit, that they have no religious fanaticism, that they are a petty minority with neither the purpose nor the power to trouble American society. Very well. The following statements will be judged idle by the American public, but they will interest the French public, which has been instructed by experience:

The Roman Church, which in the United States numbered 44,500 communicants in 1790, to-day numbers 12,000,000 or more. The total population of the country is twenty times more numerous than at that epoch; the Catholic population three hundred times more numerous. To this we must now add 6,500,000 of Catholics in the Philippines, and 1,000,000 in Porto Rico. The territory of the Republic maintains one cardinal, 17 archbishops, 81 bishops, administering 82 dioceses and 5 apostolic curateships, almost 11,000 churches, more than 5,000 chapels with 12,500 officiating priests. There are 81 Catholic seminaries, 163 colleges for boys, 629 colleges for girls, 3,400 parochial schools, 250 orphanages and nearly 1,000 other various institutions. Finally, the United States alone sends more Peter's pence to Rome than all the Catholic countries together.

Two incidents within a short interval may have opened the eyes of American citizens, here and there, to the Catholic question: the situation in the Philippines and the Pennsylvania strike.

We have already noted that while the Protestant clergy were divided in their partisanship between the strikers and the operators, the Catholic clergy went solidly for the strikers. Its attitude and policy was directly contrary to that which it holds in Europe, except that it was the essential Catholic policy of playing for favor. In the United States the Catholic population is in the lowest stratum of society, comprising Irish, Polish and Italian immigration of the pauper class, besides a large influx of Canadians, who are as abjectly submissive to their priests as their forefathers of the seventeenth century. Under these conditions the politics of the Catholic Church is and will continue to be that of demagogues.

In the case of the recent strike it is to be remarked that John Mitchell, "the Bonaparte of the miners," is a Catholic, the son of an Irish Catholic, and his oldest son is being educated for the Catholic priesthood; that the Federation of Catholic Societies of the United States petitioned President Roosevelt to end the strike; and that on the request from the operators that a clergyman be included in the Arbitration Committee, the President chose a Catholic bishop.

The question of the status of the friars in the Philippines gave a striking illustration of the changed position of the United States. In 1776 the government in its infancy forbade the Pope the nomination of a single prelate, and refused to make any kind of recognition of the Holy See. To-day the outcome of the Philippine issue is that the Pope has the official nomination of 100 prelates within American territory, with the added triumph of having received American ambassadors, at the Vatican. The mission of Governor Taft, it is true, was represented by the government at Washington as without any official character, but this flimsy hooding of the facts cannot bear examination. Judge Taft was equipped with credentials and empowered to negotiate with the Vatican as formally and completely as any other ambassador.

The conduct of Catholic leaders in America at the beginning of the agitation against the friars was significant. Archbishop Ireland counseled prudence and forbearance as the

course for the Church, lest public apprehensions should be roused by a revelation of the power of the Catholic community now solid and formidable in the heart of the American nation. His counsels, however, were not adopted by the Federation of Catholic Societies then in convention at Chicago. Bishop McFaul, of Trenton, led in a bold arraignment of the American administration in the Philippines, declaring that it had been animated by Protestant fanaticism, and calling on the President to do his duty under the Constitution and secure personal rights and property—to the friars—in the Philippines. This means that Catholicism in the United States feels itself sufficiently powerful to lay aside diplomacy.

The power and success of the Catholic Church are apparent to discerning eyes in every part of America. The public press, for example, carefully tempers its news and its views in deference to its Catholic patronage. In most of the larger towns the Catholic youth are not only united in special societies and clubs, but even in military organizations. The Church even derives profit from the American weakness for marrying foreign titles by introducing young Catholic aristocrats into the society of millionaires, and she is often rewarded not only by gaining control of great dowries, but even by gaining fair converts, who embrace the ancient faith for the pleasure of being married by a bishop or cardinal amidst the theatrical and medieval pomp of Rome.

The Catholics, it is true, are a minority; but they are a minority that is homogeneous, organized and disciplined. They form a solid block in the midst of a heap of crumbling Protestant fragments. They are, it is true, the lowest element of the nation; but under universal suffrage the vote of a brute is worth that of a Newton. When there shall be an army of fifteen or twenty millions of Catholics, firmly united by a tyrannical faith, trained under the *régime* of the confessional, blindly committed to the will of their priests, and directed by the brains of a few high Jesuits, we shall see how much of a showing there will be for American liberty.

When Judge Taft was sent on his special mission to Rome we pointed out the impolicy, not to say the impropriety, of the precedent established by President

Roosevelt in *this formal recognition, for the first time, by the United States, of the temporal status of the Roman See.*—*Leslie's Weekly*, August, 1902.

## More on the Sunday-Law Question from Florida

IN giving attention three weeks to the agitation and discussion of the Sunday-law question at Jacksonville, Fla., we undertook to review some arguments in favor of, or rather in defense of, Sunday legislation that had been presented in a "lay sermon" on "Sabbath observance" by an editorial writer on the *Times-Union* of that city. This called forth by way of reply another and longer "lay sermon," headed "The Sabbath for the Poor," which appeared on the editorial page of the paper named in the issue of May 24. It was not our purpose in considering the arguments of the former article, nor is it our purpose in giving attention to this later article, to engage in controversy. Now as then our object is to promote by proper and legitimate discussion what we believe to be the right attitude on this matter of Sunday legislation. Regarding his former article and the position taken therein the writer says:

The article was written by a member of the *Times-Union* editorial staff, and took the middle ground between the positions of those who would have the law compel a rigid observance of the Sabbath and those who think the law should not require its observance at all. It was held that the law should prescribe one day in seven as a day of rest, but should not otherwise interfere with the liberty of individuals except where, in the exercise of that liberty, they would encroach on the rights of others. The position was taken not to please anybody, but because the writer thought it was correct. It was believed that the ministers of the various denominations and others who insist on a Sabbath as a day of religious devotion would consider the position too lax, and that those who opposed all legal recognition of the Sabbath would consider it too strict. It was one man's opinion of what was right, and did not profess or aim to be anything else. Those who favor a legal recognition of a religious Sabbath have found no fault in print with this position. This does not signify that they ap-

proved it. A prominent representative of those who oppose all legal recognition of the Sabbath has replied at length.

The statement here made of the position taken in the former article is a perfectly fair one, only it must be understood that the claim that "the law should prescribe one day in seven as a day of rest" is in this case a claim that the law should compel Sunday observance so far as labor and business is concerned. To the extent of compelling them to refrain from labor and business on Sunday it is claimed that the law should "interfere with the liberty of individuals." We have no doubt but that the writer took this position because he thought it was correct, and not in order to please anybody. We took exception to it because we do not think it is correct, and we did not do this to please anybody, either. The fact that so far as the writer was concerned the position taken was but "one man's opinion of what was right" does not matter so far as the discussion of it is concerned. What we had to say regarding the matter was but one man's opinion, too, of what was right. But these two opinions are quite vital to the Sunday-law question, for they are representative of the opinions of many others on this matter. The position taken by the *Times-Union* writer is the popular position on this question, and therefore it is one that may well be considered in discussing the matter.

Following the quotation given attention was called to the issue of THE SENTINEL of May 21, and to the "answer to the *Times-Union*" presented in it. From this two quotations were made. The first of these was the paragraph in which we pointed out the fact that the writer, in common with many others who write and speak on the Sunday question,

failed to make any distinction between Sabbath observance and Sabbath enforcement. We stated that this emphasized the fact that public opinion needs to become intelligent on this question, and that it was time people were learning that there can be such a thing as a Sabbath institution and its observance without a "legal Sabbath" and its enforcement. The writer commented thus:

This breezy assumption by THE SENTINEL that such public opinion as is not its opinion is not intelligent is a characteristic of those who oppose any legal recognition of the Sabbath. If they could and would meet the issue fairly, instead of declaiming about liberty and throwing bouquets at themselves, they might influence public opinion. As it is, they are generally considered as a not very dangerous variety of cranks.

No doubt "those who oppose any legal recognition of the Sabbath" will be glad to know that they are not considered very dangerous, even though they must be regarded as "cranks." We do not mean to assume that all opinion on this question that does not accord with our own is not intelligent, but at the same time we cannot do otherwise than think that that opinion which holds the Sabbath to be an institution of the civil law in this country and its observance to be a mere matter of statutory regulation has either not been formed with a knowledge of what the Sabbath and its observance is, and of what the fundamental principle in this country of the relation of the civil law to religion and religious observances and institutions is, or else it is held in spite of that knowledge. We have no other desire than to meet the issue presented by the Sunday-law question fairly, and we believe that we are doing so. We shall be glad to have any unfairness that we are guilty of in dealing with the matter pointed out. And is it unfair "to oppose any legal recognition of the Sabbath"? If so, would it not be unfair to oppose the legal recognition of any other

religious observance or institution, even if it meant an established church?

The writer ignores as "mere quibbles" all that we had to say as to the Sunday law being a law for enforcing a religious observance, which the very origin and character of the agitation at Jacksonville meant to show. One of the points was his own admission or avowal that the law had to do with the "creeds" of people. He thinks the only point worth considering is that "as to the necessity of the legal requirement of a day of rest." On this point he quotes an extract from our article, and then proceeds:

If every man were his own employer there would be no necessity of a legal enforcement of one day in seven as a day of rest; but, unfortunately, the majority of men are not their own employers. They are paid to work for others. They must work or starve. Then, where is the sense in talking about their liberty to work or not to work, when they have no such liberty? The liberty in the case is in the hands of the employer. What good would it do the man dependent on his salary for the support of his family to say, "I will rest today because I need to rest, or because my conscience requires it?" His employer might say: "You will work to-day because your position requires it." The employee would have no liberty in the matter at all. He would have to work whether he needed rest or not, whether his conscience permitted it or not.

But it is stated that men have eight, ten, twelve, fourteen or sixteen hours of freedom from labor in every twenty-four. It is assumed that these periods of exemption are due to an acknowledgment by employers of labor of human necessity. Then why are the hours of exemption in some cases twice as long as in others, and that not on account of the needs of the individual, but fixed absolutely by each employer for all his employees of the same class? Does this not show that it is the convenience of the employers and not of the employees that permits hours of exemption? A merchant requires his clerks to work as long as he needs them. When he does not need them they may rest. He does not need them before his customers are astir in the morning, or after they go to their homes at night. They may rest—not when they need

it but when men are not trading. Street-cars run sixteen hours in the day—sometimes longer. Labor unions sometimes force the employment of two shifts of men. In some cases, however, employees are required to work sixteen hours. Here, again, it does not depend on the needs of the employees, but of the business in which they are engaged. A bank is open only four hours a day, and its employees have shorter hours than those engaged in any other business. Are these hours fixed as they are because a bank clerk needs eighteen hours of rest, and a street-car conductor only eight? The idea that the hours of labor are fixed by the necessities of the employees is rubbish. They are fixed by the needs of the business, or by the labor unions, when the unions are strong enough. Men who do not like the hours of a business may let it alone and find something else to do—if they can.

If all Sabbath laws were repealed it is probable that at first few employers would require their help to work on Sundays; but some would, and would make by it. They would get some of the trade that others would have gotten if their places of business had been open. Then others would carry on their business seven days in the week, and then others and others until nearly all men dependent on their salaries would toil every day in the year without a day of rest. The man who tried to be humane would go to the wall.

We need not enter here into a discussion of why the length of a day's work varies in different occupations. Our point was that it was not true that "the fierceness of competition would compel men to work all the time" if the law did not compel them to rest, and in proof of this we called attention to the fact that men universally lay aside labor and take rest daily without any legislation setting apart the time and requiring them to observe it. We said that if it was true as declared that one day of rest in seven was a "human necessity" no legislation was required to enforce such rest, since a human necessity, as shown in the matter of the human necessity of nightly rest, is stronger than any competition, no matter how fierce it may be, and that people do not need to be compelled to do what the necessities

of their nature require them to do. We say now that if it is true that the repeal of "all Sabbath laws" would be followed by toil and business seven days in the week and every day in the year, then it is not true that a weekly rest day is a human necessity, but it is something that people can get along without. If this doleful prediction is true then this much talked of and worried over "day of weekly rest" is an artificial institution and has no basis in human need. Would it not be well to find out if this is the case by taking from it the support of the law?

We will say, however, with regard to the length of a day's work in the various occupations that it is not true that it is "fixed absolutely by each employer" or by all employers, or that it depends entirely upon the nature and needs of the business, or that it is determined without regard for the needs and convenience of the workers. It is ridiculous to assert that "it is the convenience of the employers and not of the employees that permits hours of exemption." What convenience of the employer is it that requires the midday lunch period for the employees? What convenience of the employer would be interfered with if his employees worked all night? Could he not sleep while they worked? If it is the demands of the business that control the matter, why is it that a manufacturing or other productive business is not kept going constantly as long as there is a demand for the product? Would those who participated in the profits of the business object to that? The publication of a metropolitan daily is a business to which we are told there is no cessation night or day. Are the employees in such an establishment required to work all the time, or are they required to work to the utmost limit of physical endurance? Do not they have as short hours of labor as employees in establishments that are

closed three-fifths of the time? If this is so, what becomes of the notion that the needs of the business fixes the hours of labor regardless of the needs of the workers? There are a number of things that enter into the matter of the determination of the hours of work, but in the nature of things one of the most important is the needs and convenience of the workers. What else than this is it that labor unions have upon which to base their demands for shorter hours?

We have no objection to the people who are seeking to bring about a more ideal condition of society representing the workingman as in some respects a slave, but we decidedly dissent from the use of any such argument in defense of an antiquated and unjust statute. Are we to determine a matter of law, a matter affecting the rights and liberties of citizens, upon the assumption that the workingman is the slave of his employer in this country? Is it true that there is no "sense in talking about the liberty to work or not to work" in this country, and that the workingman "has no such liberty"? Certainly workingmen have to work or starve. What honest man does not have to work or starve? Do not all men have to work or become the slaves of idleness and vice? The theory of the law in this country is that every citizen is free, and, whatever may be the idea of radical schools of social thought, according to that theory the workingman is as much a free man as is his employer. And since it is a matter of law that is under consideration, this is the theory that we have a right to expect will be adhered to in the discussion. This argument that the workingman, conscience and all, is subject to and at the mercy of his employer amounts to nothing in this connection because it is not true.

There is another point that should be considered in this connection. There are a good many thousands of conscientious people in this country who observe the seventh day of the week. They are most all people who are obliged to earn their living by their daily work, and that by work for people who carry on their business on the day held sacred by them. Now how is that these people live and many of them support families if it is true that a workingman would have to starve in this country if he tried to observe a weekly rest day without having the law to back him up in the matter? These seventh-day observers rest on a day that is universally devoted to business, and yet they find employment and live. What a miserable plea is it then that those who desire to rest on the day that is held to as a rest day by the great mass of the people would be prevented from doing so if they did not have the special protection of the law! It is a libel upon the country to say that a man would have to starve in it if he insisted upon observing a weekly rest day. Anybody should know that this is not so. The seventh-day observers are living refutations of this pitiable argument. Its use is indicative of the desperate extremity to which Sunday legislation is reduced for defense. And this reminds us, as we said in the former article, that the law under discussion is not a law for securing to the workingman a day of rest. It is a law for another purpose, and the contention that it is necessary in order to secure a rest day for the workingman is merely an irrelevant argument invented for its defense. It was the day, the religious institution, and not the working class in the interests of which the Florida Sunday law was enacted and in the interests of which its enforcement was recently demanded at Jacksonville.

# 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 abstractions 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 months.....	.50
" " three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year.....	1.50

### CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year.....	per copy. .70
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.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**

11 West 20th Street, New York City

In view of the fact that the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor is to hold its International Convention in Denver, Colo., July 9th to 13th, we are planning to make our July 9th issue one which will be especially appropriate to distribute among Christian Endeavorers everywhere.

Although a little too early to announce definitely just what will appear in this number, there will be articles setting forth the principles of

True Christian Endeavor, and  
True Christian Citizenship;

and which will in a kindly, helpful way point out where and how our endeavor should be put forth for Christ. Such a number will, therefore, be especially valuable to place in the hands of EVERY ENDEAVORER.

Extra copies of this issue will be sold at the following prices:

10 copies .....	15 cents
25 " .....	35 "
50 " .....	70 "
100 " .....	\$1.25
1,000 " .....	\$10.00

Single copies will be addressed, wrapped and mailed from lists furnished at the rate of 8 cents for five.

If you cannot personally place a copy of this issue of THE SENTINEL into the hands of all Endeavorers in your community, get your friends to help so that this can be accomplished.

Orders for this number should be received early, as we are planning to have it ready to mail several days previous to the date of issue.



Now is the time for those whose subscriptions expire with the month of June to renew. Please notice your wrapper and see if your subscription expires this month, and if so please favor us with your renewal now. We would also appreciate having you send us several new subscriptions at the same time.

A TWENTY-FIVE CENT EDITION  
OF  
POWER FOR WITNESSING

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

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

AN ILLUSTRATED DESCRIPTION WILL BE SENT ON APPLICATION.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 West 20th St.,  
New York City.

Oakland,  
Cal.

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