

Sunday Laws and Good Government

# Liberty

*A Magazine of Religious Freedom*

Devoted to the American Idea of Religious Liberty Exemplified in the Complete Separation of Church and State



DOMINION PARLIAMENT BUILDING, OTTAWA, CANADA

Among the most inestimable of our blessings is that of liberty to worship our Creator in the way we think most agreeable to His will—a liberty deemed in other countries incompatible with good government, and yet proved by our experience to be its best support.—*Jefferson.*

PRICE, FIVE CENTS



SIGNING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE



# LIBERTY

*Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof. Lev. 25:10.*

VOL. I

JULY, 1906

No. 2

## Survey of the Field

IN the progress of the world-wide controversy between liberty and despotism, two general movements are to be noted. In those lands whose governments have been established upon liberal principles there is a drifting away from the spirit of the earlier times, a tendency to forget the struggles by which the blessings of liberty were won, a relaxing of that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty; as a result of which despotic principles are seeking to gain the ascendancy. History is repeating itself in the cycle which runs from strength and prosperity to wealth, from wealth to luxury, from luxury to corruption, and from corruption to degeneracy and the loss of the power of self-government. Events which marked the last days of the Roman republic are so closely paralleled by events of recent occurrence in American history, that only a change of names and dates is needed to make the similarity complete. In those lands whose peoples have not had liberal government, on the other hand—in papal lands and Russia—there is a reaction from the oppression of priestcraft, which gives hope of bringing final emancipation and the blessings of full civil and religious freedom. But in the Protestant nations which lead and largely dominate the world to-day, there is a general retrograde movement, the influence of which must operate strongly to turn the tide against real liberty in all lands. It will be of interest to consider the situation in some countries separately.

**England.**—The contest for religious freedom in England centers around the question of public education. The victory of the "Liberal" party at the last parliamentary election meant the end of the educational system under which non-conformists were obliged to support schools in which their children were taught the tenets of the established church and of the papacy. With the assembling of the new Parliament a new educational bill was brought forward by the president of the board of public education, Mr. Birrell, which gives justice to the non-conformists, but has aroused a storm of indignant protest from other parties throughout the country. The bill provides that after Jan. 1, 1908, state aid to all church-schools will be stopped, and to secure such aid these schools must abandon their denominational character, and be turned over to the educational authorities provided for in the bill, and these authorities shall have power to appoint teachers for the schools without regard to their religious belief. It is provided, however, that where the state occupies buildings erected by religious denominations, the state is to pay rent for them as though they belonged to individuals. "Fundamental Christianity" will be recognized in the schools, but denominational tenets are only to be taught outside of school hours by outside teachers to be selected and paid by the denominations interested, and no pupil will be required by the school authorities to attend any such religious instruction. An exception is made



in the case of communities where four fifths of the parents unite in asking for denominational instruction. In such cases this instruction may be given by the regular teachers of the schools. The Church of England and the Catholic Church oppose the bill on the ground that they have spent vast sums in the building and maintenance of their schools, and that to turn them over to the state, as a condition precedent to state aid, would be nothing short of spoliation. They insist that religion should be taught in the schools, and that the establishment of secular schools would be a step in the direction of infidelity. Even the Jews, who have profited financially under the existing system, have joined with Catholics and An-

glicans in protest against the pending change. It is stated that "the Roman Catholic archbishop of Westminster was one of the first to lead the attack on the bill;" that "his denunciation of it was scathing, but it was exceeded in vehemence by that of the primate of the Church of England, the archbishop of Canterbury." There is really, of course, no confiscation of church-school property contemplated. Anglicans, Catholics, and all others are perfectly free to retain their schools and teach in them what religion they please, only in that case the state does not propose to bear the expense of the teaching. The state pro-

poses that the party which bears the expense of an enterprise shall have the privilege of directing its management. This is a fair proposition, the justice of which is recognized the world over. It is the right of every church to have its religion taught at its own expense.

**Spain.**—The status of religious liberty in Spain is shown by incidents attending the opening of an English Protestant chapel in Barcelona. Spain now permits the erection of Protestant places of worship in her cities under various illiberal conditions, and on the strength of this claims to have accorded liberty of conscience. But when some English Protestants in Barcelona recently erected a small chapel for Sunday



AMPHITHEATER IN BARCELONA, WHERE SUNDAY BULL-FIGHTS ARE HELD

services, they were commanded to remove the cross from its gable on pain of seeing the building closed. Other demands were made, but were waived after appeal had been made by the English consul resident to King Edward VII. But a few days before the dedication a Catholic paper, published in Barcelona under the imprimatur of the Catholic bishop, put forth a prayer that "fire may descend from heaven and destroy this cursed building and bury it in hell, from which it proceeded." Not long ago a movement for more rigid Sunday observance took shape in Spain, and laws were enacted to this end, under which an

glicans in protest against the pending change. It is stated that "the Roman Catholic archbishop of Westminster was one of the first to lead the attack on the bill;" that "his denunciation of it was scathing, but it was exceeded in vehemence by that of the primate of the Church of England, the archbishop of Canterbury." There is really, of course, no confiscation of church-school property contemplated. Anglicans, Catholics, and all others are perfectly free to retain their schools and teach in them what religion they please, only in that case the state does not propose to bear the expense of the teaching. The state pro-



effort was made to stop all Sunday work and sports, including bull-fights. For a time the Sunday exhibitions of this sort were suspended, but adverse public sentiment proved too strong, and the bull-fights are now legally compatible with a proper observance of the "Sabbath."

**France.**— France is emerging from the shadow of the union of church and state which was established by the Concordat in 1801. Under this union religious teaching was in the hands of the priests and nuns, whose aim there, as everywhere, was first and foremost to produce Roman Catholics. The religious teaching and training for which the state was paying was found to be at cross-purposes with the interests of the republic. The principles of Rome are not those of a republic, but of a monarchy. So serious did the menace of this system finally become that the government, under the leadership of M. Combes, determined to secularize the system of public instruction, and from this point it was a short and logical step to the disestablishment of the church and the abolition of the Concordat. The execution of the steps incidental to the establishment of the new régime met with violent resistance in those places where the papacy was strongest, but there was no resistance on the part of the Protestant churches concerned. The mask of conservator of the public peace was torn from the Catholic Church, and it was seen that she loved peace only when peace meant harmony with herself. The opposition to the taking of church inventories led finally to the overthrow of the Combes ministry, but the papal victory proved an empty one, for the new ministry proceeded with the work of severing the tie with Rome, and the general elections coming soon afterward showed that public sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the policy the government was pursuing. Seeing this, the papacy abandoned the struggle, and the political separation from that power is now complete. Full religious liberty is now granted in France, the state requiring only that liberty of worship shall not be made to sanction any disturbance of the peace.

**South America.**— A Catholic paper, *The Missionary*, presents the following picture of Catholic prosperity in Brazil which has followed the separation of church and state in that country in 1889: "Things are changed there since 1889, when the state gave freedom to the church. Up to that date the church had been enslaved to the government, with the usual consequences of evil. Then came the proclamation of the republic, which, by a simple decree, cut loose the church from all state support, and also from all state control. The Catholics met the perils of poverty with courage. Parochial associations were founded, money for every good cause continued to flow in, and now the church is stronger, religiously and financially, than at any time in the past. She has excellent schools, and colleges for higher education; the clergy are better trained and instructed; the religious orders from Europe have given new life to the faith; a good Catholic newspaper press is growing; and the public spirit is active and zealous among the faithful. Only recently the Parliament tried to introduce divorce into Brazilian legislation, but the Catholics and their deputies raised such an outcry that the bill was rejected. The church in Brazil has begun a fresh career, and presents one more proof of the advantage of keeping religion free from the golden chains of servitude to the interests and schemes of tricky politicians. The faith finds its best support on the sacraments; they will keep it alive."

In other South American republics, particularly in Argentina, there is a growing public sentiment against that clerical interference in state affairs which the Catholic prelates have been wont until recently to assume as their vested right. It is stated that "the Liberals of Argentina have been making angry demonstrations against the clergy, and against the government for its leniency toward the clerics." This went so far that "violent speeches were made which incited the populace to deeds of lawlessness and disorder. An attack on a convent was made, and several church windows were broken." In nearly all the coun-



tries of Latin America the papal hold upon state affairs is loosening, and more toleration is being accorded the representatives of Protestantism.

**Russia.**—An imperial decree issued April 17, 1905, granted freedom of worship to all subjects of the czar. While the internal affairs of the empire have been almost in a state of anarchy, following the breaking up of the long-standing bureaucratic system of government, much good has already resulted from the czar's decree. Religious publications which were before

certain demands in the interests of freedom which the czar refused to grant. The czar threatened to dissolve the Douma, and the Douma replied that should this be attempted it would pay no attention to the czar's order. A conflict between the people and the throne seemed for a time inevitable, and the danger is not yet past. It seems safe to conclude, however, that the ground which liberty has won in Russia will at least not be wholly lost, and never again will freedom of worship be under the rigid ban which has hindered it in the past. The



THE TAURIDE PALACE, ST. PETERSBURG, WHERE THE DOUMA IS IN SESSION

put under the ban of the censor, can now be circulated freely. Religious assemblies can convene without fear of molestation from the police. No restriction is imposed in the matter of Sabbath observance, and in this respect there is more freedom in the czar's dominions than there is in America. Whether the forces of liberty will hold their ground and make further conquests toward the establishment of governmental freedom, or be compelled to yield to the reactionary forces arrayed against them, is a question which engages the attention of the world. The Douma, acting in the interests of popular government, made

recent terrible massacres of Jews in Russia seem to be due to some other cause than that of religious animosity.

**Canada.**—For years past the "Lord's Day Alliance" of Canada has persistently sought to secure legislation compelling a more rigid observance of Sunday in that country. The Alliance began work to this end with the provincial legislatures, but after the matter of Sunday legislation had been several times brought before the courts, it was settled by decision of the privy council in London, England, that as regards the provinces such legislation was



*ultra vires*, that is, that a provincial legislature had no authority to enact legislation of that character. Thereupon the "Lord's Day Alliance" proceeded to lay siege to the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa. At the beginning of the session of Parliament which is now drawing to a close, a Sunday observance bill was introduced at the instance of the Alliance, which forbids the sale or purchase of "goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate," and the transaction of any business on Sunday. A public hearing on the bill was given April 19, at which it was seen that the business interests of the Dominion were very largely opposed to the measure, and this resulted in an amendment which greatly modified its rigidity. Mayor Folinsbee, of Strathroy, spoke at the hearing in behalf of those who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, and his argument was favorably received by the committee in charge of the bill. It resulted in the adoption of the following amendment: "Notwithstanding anything herein contained, whoever conscientiously and habitually observes the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from work and labor on that day, shall not be subject to prosecution for performing work or labor on the first day of the week, provided that such work or labor does not disturb other persons in the observance of the first day of the week as holy time, and that the place where the same is performed be not open for traffic on that day." The animus of the religious people behind the bill was exposed by the following telegram sent to Premier Laurier when it was known that this exemption clause had been adopted:—

"Toronto Methodist Conference, assembled here, unanimously opposed to clause 11 [exemption clause] in Lord's Day Act. R. H. Burns, Pres.; Isaac Couch, Sec."

This action of the Toronto Methodist Conference appears to have borne fruit, for the House of Commons, after an extended discussion of the Sunday bill, passed it (except one section), rejecting the exemption clause by a considerable majority. And this was done in spite of the fact that strong arguments were made by members of the

Cabinet in its favor, who spoke highly of seventh-day observers as being a loyal, conscientious, law-abiding people. Among those favoring the exemption were Premier Laurier and the leader of the Conservative or Opposition party. While the bill was under consideration, representatives of the Lord's Day Alliance were busy in the Capitol lobby room, and the effect of their lobbying was seen in a speech by one member, in which he said, "There should be one day of rest in Canada, and only one, and those who will not conform to this should go elsewhere." At this many of the members exclaimed, "Hear, hear!" The attitude of the Senate toward the bill remains to be seen.

**The United States.**—The past year has been marked by unusual activity on the part of those seeking Sunday legislation, and more demands of this sort have been made on Congress and the State legislatures than ever before in a like period of time. Thus far, however, they have failed to produce any marked results. Congress has adjourned without passing the Sunday closing bill for grocers and butchers recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and an effort to attach a Sunday law to the railway rate bill failed, as described elsewhere in this issue of LIBERTY. The effort to secure Sunday closing of the Jamestown fair-grounds by act of Congress also failed, but the managers have decided to close the gates.

A session of the National Reform Association, which is seeking to change this government from a republic to a theocracy, is to be held at Winona Lake, Ind., August 11-18. The *Interior*, of Chicago, states that "the meeting of the National Reform Association has become an annual feature of the summer program at Winona Lake, but this year it will be made more important and significant than at any time hitherto." Among the special subjects considered will be "Sabbath desecration," and religious instruction in public schools.

Further information regarding Sunday legislation and enforcement in the United States is given in the department of News and Notes.



## Editorial

### War and Peace

A MAGNIFICENT "Palace of Peace" is to be erected at The Hague, Holland, in which to hold the sessions of the conferences which meet to further the cause of peace throughout the world, and to miti-

union is contrary to the gospel of the God of peace, and inevitably begets conditions which are destructive of peace. The history of church and state union throughout the centuries is written in blood. The countries which have had most complete church and state union, have had most war. Russia, whose ruler led in the peace movement represented at The Hague, is to-day convulsed with internal strife because of the popular rebellion against the despotism



THE PROPOSED PALACE OF PEACE AT THE HAGUE

Made from photograph of the drawing which took the prize of \$5,000 offered for the best design

gate the evil of war. This temple represents one prominent influence in the world which makes for peace. There are other and opposite influences which make for war, and prominent among these latter influences has ever been the union of church and state, with its denial of religious freedom. The principle of church and state

of the church and state autocracy. Nothing would do more to promote peace in the world than to eliminate this evil principle from its systems of government, and give to the people of all lands the freedom for which they sigh. Liberty and peace, oppression and war, go hand in hand. "Let us have peace."



## Sunday Laws and Good Government

ARE Sunday laws necessary to good government? This is an important question. Advocates of Sunday legislation would have the people believe that such laws are of more importance than any others, that without them civilization could not go on, and that the opposer of them is therefore an enemy of good government, an anarchist. This is a claim that will bear investigation.

To almost every question relating to the essentials of good government, history affords a plain and reliable answer. To history we may go with this question of the utility of Sunday observance by law. What have Sunday laws done to promote good government? What have such laws done for the nations that have made and enforced them? What fruit has the tree of Sunday legislation borne in the past? For Sunday laws are not peculiar to our day. To find the beginning of such legislation we must go back more than a thousand years into the past.

The first Sunday law known to history was enacted by the Roman emperor, Constantine, in the year 321 A. D. Constantine was at that time not even professedly a Christian, and Sunday was to him only "the venerable day of the sun." This first Sunday law was as follows:—

Constantine, Emperor Augustus, to Helpidius: On the venerable day of the sun, let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations, the bounty of heaven should be lost.

This edict promulgated by a pagan ruler in the interests of pagan religion, was the parent of all subsequent Sunday statutes.

The first step in Sunday legislation had been taken, and others were to follow. The matter did not stop with Constantine's edict. This was a mild measure, applying only to people in the cities. In course of

time, much more stringent legislation was deemed necessary, and was enacted.

The next step was taken about half a century later, at the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, which enacted the following:—

Canon 29. Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honor, and as being Christians, shall if possible do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.

This was but a church edict, operating with compulsory force only upon those



CONSTANTINE

who feared the church anathema. But the civil power was not long in backing up the church decree. The historian Neander says: "By a law of the year 386, these older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege."

It soon became necessary, in the opinion of the church, to take a further step, since



the people congregated more to the public shows on Sundays than to the churches. Accordingly, in A. D. 401, at the Council of Carthage; it was decreed: "Canon 5. On Sundays and feast days no plays may be performed." And that this canon might be made effective, the bishops petitioned the Emperor Honorius, "That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days, to some other days of the week." For some reason this petition could not be immediately granted, but the desired law was obtained a few years later, A. D. 425.

Meanwhile, what had been the moral result of this Sunday legislation? How much had it accomplished toward the regeneration of society? The facts had not afforded to the church leaders a very satisfactory answer to this question. Sunday work had been forbidden, but the people did not congregate to the churches. They evinced a much greater inclination to go to the shows and theaters. Then a law had been obtained closing the latter on Sundays, but still the people would not go to church. They were "good" only in a negative way, going only so far in the practise of piety as the law compelled them. They were not devoted. Something further was needed to awaken their devotion. To solve the problem a theory was put forward by Augustine, the nature and results of which have invested it with undying notoriety. He said:—

It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain the highest grade of religious development.

This theory was adopted and put into practise. Of the outcome of it the church historian Neander says:—

It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.

There is a direct relationship between Sunday legislation and the establishment of the Inquisition. The germ of the system which blossomed into the Inquisition was contained in a theory which developed out of the effort to make people religious by law. The same theory, with the same germ, is hidden in religious legislation to-day, as it was during the development of the papacy.

There had been up to this date, following Constantine's edict, eight separate legislative acts commanding the observance of Sunday, progressing in the scale of severity, until, "in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden." What had this legislation accomplished for good government? What had it done to preserve the state? History gives the answer by recording the fact that the empire was at this time far in its decline, swaying toward its fall. The fall of the Roman empire, no intelligent person will deny, was due to its corruption. Side by side with increasing strictness in legislation and increasing outward deference for Sunday, there had progressed a decay of virtue which left the empire emasculated and ready to fall before the onset of the barbarians. As a bulwark of good government, Sunday legislation had proved a failure. It had been a source of apparent piety and real hypocrisy; nothing more.

About half a century later came one further act of Sunday legislation, promulgated by "the august emperors, Leo and Anthemius," making certain provisions to show "honor and veneration" for the "Lord's day;" to the end also that "a vicarious repentance may pervade" men's minds on that day, and decreeing that any one attending games on Sunday, or otherwise violating the provisions of the edict, should "suffer the loss of his office and the confiscation of his estate."

Then came the barbarians of the north, men unacquainted with religious laws and the vices of civilization, finding the degenerate empire an easy prey to their virile though uncultured strength. Rome fell, and the barbarian victors are said to have



blushed at the vices which they uncovered in her ruins.

Thus speaks history in answer to the question whether good government depends on the enforced observance of Sunday. Had the day been any other than Sunday, the same testimony would have been given, for the enforced observance of any religious day is inherently wrong and ruinous to both church and state.

After the fall of the empire, and as the civilized world came under the domination of the papacy, Sunday legislation was continued until the day was elevated to the highest degree of sacredness which human decrees could confer upon it; yet the world sank steadily into the night of the Dark Ages, which knew no morning until the Reformation came, asserting the individual right of religious freedom,—the right of the individual to think and act for himself in religious observances, free from the coercion of the civil law.

### A Modern "Christian City"

WHILE it must be admitted that no nation of the past has derived any perceptible benefit from Sunday legislation, and the argument that such legislation is essential to good government fails to find any support in history, it may be thought by some that times have so changed that legislation which failed in the days of the Roman empire may under modern conditions prove a success, and that the evidence of modern times supports the claim that Sunday laws are a necessity. We invite the attention of all such to some recent history in the State of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has long enjoyed the "benefits" of a fairly rigid Sunday law, enacted in 1794, and has had within her borders also an active "Sabbath association" whose aim was to see that this law was enforced.

In the year 1903 this association became very active and began a crusade in the city of Philadelphia against a large number of individuals who refused to regard Sunday as a sacred day. Not even candy, fruit, or drugs were allowed to be sold, and good government in Philadelphia received all the impetus that strict enforcement of a strict Sunday law could give it. It was stated in the *Public Ledger* that "two thousand persons have been subjected to fines and 'costs,' and the reports of recent hearings show that very many of them are poor women and old men, blind men and cripples, who eke out a scanty subsistence by an innocent trade that harms



MAYOR WEAVER

no one and in no way disturbs the public peace and order." The enforcement of the law was evidently about as rigid as the most ardent advocate of such a means of good government could desire.

In November of that year a delegation composed of "fifty-nine ministers and lay men, headed by Rev. L. Y. Graham," waited on Mayor Weaver and offered him their congratulations. Down past dens of vice, through the streets of a metropolis that had acquired national and almost international notoriety as an example of municipal corruption, came this clerical delegation, and having reached the mayor's office, entered and congratulated him on being mayor of "the most Christian city in the land"! They commended him for his zeal in behalf of Sunday enforcement, and that the good work might go on, presented to him a list of several hundred names of persons who were deemed fit subjects for further prosecutions. The mayor is quoted as replying that he took pleasure "in learning that Philadelphia was the most Christian city in the country," and that he was going to keep the city a Christian one.

The members of this religious delegation



must certainly have known something about the evil reputation of their city at the time, but apparently in their minds Sunday observance and Sunday desecration had come to represent almost the whole distinction between righteousness and its opposite. They had acquired a view of Christianity in which Sunday enforcement covered and atoned for a multitude of sins; so that, no matter what or how many forms of iniquity it might contain, a city was Christian if it was only zealous in the enforcement of "the Sabbath." That is the kind of "Christianity" which was approved by these eminent advocates of good government by Sunday legislation. The question is, Is it the kind that is wanted in this country?

This incident lets in a flood of light regarding the nature and worth of the ideal of government toward which these men are striving, and which they wish to set up in this country in the place of the existing republic. Supposing they should obtain all that they desire,—supposing there should be set up here a government which would enforce strict Sunday observance upon all the people, and would altogether so meet the minds of the advocates of such legislation that they would say of it, as did some of them of Philadelphia, that it was "the most Christian" government in the world,—what assurance would there be that it would not at the same time be as corrupt as was Philadelphia at the time of this incident? And would that be the kind of "Christian" government which the people desire, or the nation needs?

There must be something radically wrong with that which will so blind intelligent people to obvious facts and conditions that they will seriously believe and assert that a city notoriously corrupt is "the most Christian city" in the land. The thing which produced this strange aberration of vision in this religious delegation which waited on Mayor Weaver—the only thing which could account for it—was their zeal for an enforced observance of Sunday. That was the thing which distinguished them from other people, who saw conditions in their true light. And this incident, striking as it is, does not by any means

stand alone in proving the truth that a zeal to compel people to do the will of God, or his supposed will, in Sabbath observance or any religious matter, is an influence which darkens the minds and perverts the perceptions of those who come under its sway. History is full of illustrations on this point. We do not want that influence to be exerted in shaping legislation and molding the institutions of government in this country.

As a conserver of good government, or even as a thing compatible with good government, Sunday legislation has been weighed in the balances, and found wanting.

### A Rejoinder

IN an article with the title "A New Opponent in the Field," *The Christian Statesman* in the issue for May pays its respects to LIBERTY. It accounts for the zeal of this new magazine "by the fact that it is the mouthpiece of the Seventh-day Adventists, and is published by the Review and Herald Association." We are gratified to know that we have been able to establish so good a reputation for zeal, and hope that we may be able to maintain it. In order to give a clear understanding of the *Statesman's* estimate of our position and work, we will quote a few statements from this article:—

True to the character of its predecessors and of the auspices under which it [LIBERTY] is founded, it shows its utter misconception of the National Reform movement. . . . The Federation of Churches shares with the National Reform Association the apprehension and dislike expressed in these pages. . . .

LIBERTY is as unable to understand and appreciate the American republic itself and the ideas of its founders and upholders as it is to understand the spirit and the principles of the Federation of Churches or the National Reform Association.

We have no desire for personal controversy with the individuals who compose the National Reform Association and champion its cause, and we do not intend either to misrepresent their movement or to impugn their motives. Speaking in a general way,



we can say that we are in hearty sympathy with many of their expressed purposes in the line of moral reforms, but we are uncompromisingly opposed to the means which they seek to employ to accomplish some of these reforms. We reject utterly the National Reform theory that the state is in itself a moral person distinct from the people, having an individuality and a responsibility to God, of its own. We insist upon the principle laid down by the divine Author of Christianity when he said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." And furthermore we maintain that the state has nothing whatever to do as to how the individual shall render unto God the things that are God's, or whether he shall render them to God at all.

That we may correctly represent the position of the National Reform Association upon the question of the proper spheres of the church and the state, we quote the following from a speech by D. McAllister, D. D., in the Washington, D. C., National Reform convention held April 1-3, 1890:—

Now what does the National Reform Association say? It says, "Let the church do its duty in its own line. Let the line of demarcation be drawn here; let the functions of the state go with the state—with civil government, God's own ordinance. Let the church hold the moral principles of God's law,—the law of Jesus Christ, the only perfect law,—and let the state apply those moral principles that pertain to its own sphere of justice and right, in her schools and everywhere else, and do her own work, as she shall answer to God himself, as she is the creature of his ordaining."

If language means anything, this statement means that, according to the teaching of the National Reform Association, it is the duty of the state to apply the moral principles of God's law as interpreted by the church. From this view we dissent entirely. Each citizen of the state is under obligation to obey God's law, and every legislator and every executive officer of the state is in duty bound to adhere to the principles divinely ordained for civil government, and in doing this he will keep the church and the state entirely separate, and

will know that it is not the function of the state to deal with matters of religion or religious worship in any way further than to protect every citizen in his right to worship or not to worship, so long as he does not confound incivility with religion, and does not interfere with the right of others to worship or not to worship. Civil government was not established for the purpose of promoting any religion, whether that religion be true or false. Within its proper sphere civil government is supreme, but that sphere is limited to the relations of man to man, and does not include the relations of man to God. In a theocracy it would be different, but we are living under a republic, and not under a theocracy, and we are not in sympathy with any attempt to conduct our government on theocratic principles.

As throwing further light upon the real meaning of the National Reform movement, we quote a paragraph from the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 2, 1884:—

Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality.

Here is the same false conception of the nature, the sphere, and the purpose of civil government. This is a Christian nation only in the sense that the Christian religion has more professed adherents than any other form of religion. If the government is administered on Christian principles, there will be no attempt to interfere with the right of every person to profess and to practise, or not to profess and not to practise, any religion which he may choose, so long as he does not use religion as a cloak for incivility. No true Christian will be uncivil, in the proper sense of that word.

To enforce upon men "the laws of Christian morality" is to make them act, at least outwardly, in harmony with the moral law. But this will make hypocrites of those who are not truly converted, and will be of no benefit whatever to those who are converted. Civility can rightly be enforced, but morality never. And genuine religion



prospers best, and is maintained in the greatest purity, where no effort is made to enforce it. In the words of Judge Welch of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio (23 Ohio Reports, Granger, pages 249, 250):—

When Christianity asks the aid of government beyond mere impartial protection, it disowns itself. Its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both.

The National Reformers profess to believe in the separation of *church* and state, but in the union of *religion* and the state. This is a distinction without a difference. There can be no union of religion and the state apart from a union of church and state. To attempt to make such a distinction is to juggle with words and with the facts of history.

In the article with which we are dealing, the *Statesman* inquires: "Are we to infer that LIBERTY does not wish that prayer ["Thy kingdom come"] answered, or that prophecy [Rev. 11:15] fulfilled?" In reply we are glad to say that we are constantly praying that that prayer may be answered, and that that prophecy may be fulfilled, but we are depending upon the power of the gospel of Christ as the means of accomplishing that result rather than upon the civil power. We do not believe that the responsibility for answering that prayer or for fulfilling that prophecy rests in any degree upon either state or national legislatures.

We are opposed to the movement for the federation of the churches because we firmly believe that the practical result of this union will be that the combined influence of the churches will be exerted in affairs of state, under the mistaken idea that by securing legislation which will enforce "the laws of Christian morality" they will thereby advance the interests of the kingdom of God. In thus confounding the two spheres, the spiritual and the temporal, we

shall have a repetition of the experiences of the early part of the fourth century, when, as Draper observes, "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." The downfall of the Roman empire and the great apostasy in the church may be directly traced to this unholy union of religion and the state. The lesson of that history ought to be sufficient to save us from going over the same road.

We are accused by the *Statesman* of being unable to understand and appreciate the American republic and the ideas of its founders and upholders. We confess that we are unable to discern in the Constitution of the United States or in the discussions of that time anything which indicates that the founders of this republic believed in or advocated a union either of church and state or of religion and the state. On the contrary, we find abundant evidence to justify us in saying that they believed in neither. It is true that in the original colonies there was a union of church and state in almost every instance, and then they burned the witches, whipped the Baptists, and banished Roger Williams. But the founders of this republic repudiated these ideas of the Dark Ages when they established a new nation with a new order of things. They believed in the Christian religion, and because of this belief they made an entire separation between church and state, and declared, in the words of James Madison, that "religion is essentially distinct from human government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both. There are causes in the human breast which insure the perpetuity of religion without the aid of law."

In order to make it clear that others besides ourselves read the history of those times in the same way, we will quote from respectable writers who have expressed themselves plainly concerning this matter. George Bancroft, in his "History of the Formation of the Constitution," says:—

Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the



new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.

Happy will it be for this nation if mistaken reformers do not succeed in reversing the purpose of the founders of the republic.

The American principle of civil government is defined by Samuel T. Spear, D.D., in the following paragraph:—

Those who drew the plan of our national government built the system upon the principle that religion and civil government were to be kept entirely distinct; and, for the most part, all the State governments are constructed upon the same theory. The general character of both is that they neither affirm nor deny any doctrine in respect to God, and that they command no duty as a religious duty. They deal with the temporal rights and obligations of citizenship, without any reference to the question whether the citizen is a religionist or not. His religious faith is no part of his citizenship, and no criterion of his rights. It confers upon him no immunities and imposes no disabilities. It is a matter between himself and his God, and with it the civil authority does not concern itself. He is not forbidden to be an atheist, and not commanded to be a Christian. He forfeits no rights by being the one, and gains none by being the other; and as between these two extremes of opinion, the state does not undertake to decide which is the true and which is the false opinion. Such is the great American principle in respect to the sphere of civil government.

In harmony with this view is the clause in the treaty with Tripoli, written by a Congregational clergyman, and adopted by men who lived contemporaneously with those who founded this nation, which states:—

The government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.

We might add much more, but this is quite sufficient for this time at least. In

the closing paragraph of its article the *Statesman* says:—

We salute our antagonist with knightly courtesy and with every purpose of fair and honorable discussion. We will never knowingly misrepresent its position or its utterances. If we have misunderstood its purpose, or given to our readers in these sentences any wrong view of its designs, we will make immediate and ample correction.

We thank the *Statesman* for this fair and candid statement, and invite it to consider some of the principles laid down in this article.

W. W. P.

### The Railway Rate Bill and the "Sabbath"

It is not the business of Congress to legislate upon questions of religion. Religious questions can not properly come before political bodies. Reason and revelation assert this to be true, and all experience confirms it. But in spite of this testimony it has often happened that men have been asked to settle religious controversies by legislation, and the "powers that be," which are simply ordained of God, have been put in the place of God himself.

The wise men who established this republic, admonished by the experience of other nations, sought to guard against the commingling of politics and religion, by providing in the fundamental law—the Constitution—that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Notwithstanding this, Congress has been repeatedly importuned to legislate upon the question of Sabbath observance, than which there is no more vital part of religious worship, and has so far yielded to the clamor of men who claim to be the successors of the ancient prophets, that it has decreed Sunday closing of expositions in a number of instances; and finally, as a climax to these repeated efforts, an attempt has been recently made to secure Congressional legislation directly commanding "Sabbath" observance on the part of persons engaged in interstate com-



merce; and the basis put forward for the proposed legislation was the fourth precept of the decalogue, the Sabbath commandment relating to the seventh day. This attempt was made incidental to the consideration of the railway rate bill, which occupied so much of the time of the last Congress. We quote from the *Congressional Record* of May 16:—

*Mr. McLaurin.*—I have another amendment that I want to offer. Before it is read, I wish to say that the Republican Senate seems to me disposed to vote down every amendment, and I suppose it would vote down the Lord's prayer if it were germane and offered as an amendment. I offer the amendment that I send to the desk, and I will say just a few words on it.

*The Vice-President.*—The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

*The Secretary.*—It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following:—

"It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in interstate commerce to operate as such interstate common carrier for compensation any steam-propelled vehicle for transportation of passengers or freight between sunrise and sunset on the Sabbath day."

*Mr. McLaurin.*—Mr. President, I am going to discuss the amendment but a little. I should like to have the Chair hear what I am about to read. I simply want to state that while this is not the Lord's prayer—offered as an amendment to the pending bill, because that would not be exactly germane—it is a part of the ten commandments, and it is germane to this bill. I want to read verses 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the twentieth chapter of Exodus, so that when a Senator, if there is any Senator here who has not read this, comes to vote on this amendment, if he votes against it, he may know that he is voting against one of the ten commandments, and one that is also germane to this bill. [The speaker then read from the Bible the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, enjoining the observance of the seventh day.]

*Mr. Rayner.*—I suggest that that applies only to persons. It does not apply to corporations.

*Mr. McLaurin.*—If any corporation can run its trains on the Sabbath day without the agency of any person, it may be permitted to run them. But if it requires the service of any person—manservant or maidservant—to run them, then this commandment applies to such corporation.

*Mr. Clark, of Wyoming.*—I ask to what

the amendment is directed. Is it directed to the bill, or does the Senator propose it as an amendment to the commandments?

*Mr. McLaurin.*—I can understand how a man who has not read the Bible would not know, but one who is familiar with the Bible knows that what I have just read is itself one of the commandments.

*Mr. Clark, of Wyoming.*—The reason why I ask is because of the fact that a part of the commandments is read from the other side of the chamber.

*Mr. McLaurin.*—I did not catch the last that the Senator said. It seems not to be understood on the other side, and if that side is to get any of the benefits of the Scriptures at all, it must be read from this.

*Mr. Daniel.*—Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

*Mr. McLaurin.*—Certainly.

*Mr. Daniel.*—Do you propose to stop telegraphic messages and mails on Sunday, too?

*Mr. McLaurin.*—I would stop the whole business and let everybody rest. I would let the telegraph operators and the railroad employees—the men who run the trains on Sunday and never get a Sunday and never know what a Sunday is—rest. I would stop all those trains. I would allow the train crews and laborers a rest of one day in seven, as commanded by the Almighty. That is what the Almighty, through Moses, commanded, and I would give Moses a fair chance in this. [Laughter.] . . .

*The Vice-President.*—The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

When religion is mixed in with the proceedings of Congress or other legislative body, and members of the same talk about the commands of Jehovah as being "germane" to or a part of certain measures they wish to see advanced, and tell other members that if they do not vote for such measures they will be voting against the decalogue, fighting against God, etc.; and the sacred things of religion become the basis of a heated political word-controversy or the butt of a joke,—how much will this add to the peace and dignity of our legislative bodies, and how much will it advance the interests of justice or of any worthy cause? In the name of religion as well as of justice, we protest against any such attempt to start Congress on a career of religious legislation.



## Does the Sabbath Need Protection?

Is the Sabbath in danger of destruction? There are many good people who talk to-day as if it were, and the only way they can see to avert such a calamity is to secure legislative enactments to make all the people observe it. So they are continually calling for the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws.

If Sunday were the true Sabbath, it would still be true that Sunday legislation is not necessary to preserve the Sabbath from destruction. It would still be true that God's institutions do not need to be stayed up by human hands. The strength of such institutions is derived from their Author, not from man.

The Sabbath is the Lord's. "The Sabbath of the Lord" is a prominent phrase in the Old Testament. There was another thing to which the phrase denoting possession was usually applied, and that was the ark which Moses made at God's direction to be put in the most holy place of the tabernacle. "The ark of God" was its accustomed title. The ark was sacred; so also is the Sabbath. In the history of the ark a striking lesson is taught regarding God's care over a thing that is sacred to him. The ark was captured by the Philistines, and was set up by them in the temple of their god Dagon. Dagon twice fell on his face before the ark, the second time having his head and limbs lopped off. Other judgments came upon the Philistines till they were afraid to keep the ark, and sent it back to the Israelites. After it was again in the latter's hands, as it was being drawn upon a cart by oxen, the oxen stumbled, and Uzzah, to save the ark from falling to the ground, put out his hand and steadied it. Immediately God struck him dead.

Uzzah was very zealous for the ark, and thought that harm would come to it if a human hand was not put forth to save it. He made a terrible mistake. The ark did not need any such protection, and no human being had any business to offer it. No human hand was to be brought in contact with that sacred chest. God had plainly specified this, and Uzzah should have known

and remembered it. The mere appearance of needed protection for the ark did not alter the fundamental truths pertaining to its character and ownership. We must look deeper than the surface of things, and not be misled by mere appearances.

The "Sabbath of the Lord" is as sacred as was the "ark of God." If it seems to be in danger of falling to the ground, this does not signify that legislatures must put forth their human hands to stay it up. Remember Uzzah. Let God steady the ark. He will preserve Sunday if it is his institution; and if it is not, then in the name of Christianity, let it go down.

## Man in the Place of God

WHEN men make decrees binding their fellow men in matters of religion, they put themselves in the place of God, who alone has the authority and the right to bind the conscience. It was through man-made decrees binding the consciences of men that the papacy arose, and a man was finally exalted to a position where he "as God" sat "in the temple of God," and received worship as a divine being. The like course followed to-day tends to produce the like result. The enactment of religious laws tends to put the human law-makers in the place of God, not only by their assumption of a divine prerogative, but because their fellow men look to them as to God, they flatter them as being the mouthpieces of God to the people. Note the following illustration on this point:—

In a report of a Sunday-law hearing before a committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature at Harrisburg, in 1894, Prof. David Steele, D. D., is quoted as having addressed the legislators in this fashion:—

You are our Christian representatives. We honor you: you have power over us, and we are to bow to your authority. The powers that be are ordained of God, and you are the powers that be. You represent God. Therefore you are God to us, and we beg of you not to make any laws that will lessen the respect for our sabbath.

Such talk savors little of Christianity. The man who consents to be exalted by his fellow mortals is in danger of being humbled by the Lord.



# General Articles

## The Present Church Federation Movement

### What Does it Mean?

R. C. PORTER

IN November last there met in New York City the greatest and most significant church council that ever convened in America. One of the objects, as stated in the plan of federation, is "to bring the Christian bodies of America into harmonious service for Christ and the world." Another, "To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life." It is further stated, "It has no authority to draw up a common creed, or form of government or worship, or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it."

All this seems proper enough, and no doubt many of those forming this federation saw in it, and meant by it, no more than is here stated.

Thirty-two Protestant denominations are joined together in this federation, representing twenty million people. They have extended a cordial invitation to the Catholic Church to join them in Christian fellowship in their work.

The history of Catholicism is well known. Her principles on individual liberty and religion have been written with the blood of martyrs. Recently a Roman Catholic journal announced that the time had come "to build a Catholic America." This statement is very suggestive to a student familiar with the history of the rise of the papacy. The papacy was established through the influence of church councils and petitions for Sunday laws. This revives the memories of the past when speaking of the reasons urged by the church for the first Sunday laws known to history. Sozomen says they were urged "that the day might be devoted, with less interruption, to the purposes of devotion." The church in Carthage in A. D. 401 petitioned that should be transferred to some other day than Sunday, because "the theater was

often vastly more frequented than the church." This law was delayed, but passed in 425 A. D.

The great church federation of the fourth century was as harmless in the statement of its purpose, and as fair in assurances that the objects sought by that confederation were harmless, as the church federation of to-day. One of the objects of that early church confederacy was the improvement of public morals. That confederacy, in the accomplishment of its purpose to improve public morals, established Sunday as a day of religious worship, and stopped games, theaters, races, and sports upon that day by legislative enactments. In the enforcement of the laws thus enacted, martyrs for Christ fell everywhere, until the earth was red with their blood. The success of the present confederacy means a repetition of the scenes following the great confederacy of the fourth century, unless like causes fail to produce like results.

The Sunday laws of the fourth century were religious laws. Eusebius says, "All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day," meaning Sunday. This confederacy not only enforced Sunday observance, but intentionally transferred all the religious rites pertaining to the Sabbath to Sunday. They did this in the very face of the law of God commanding Sabbath observance. Eusebius further declares that Constantine, in enacting Sunday laws, did it for religious purposes. His words follow: "He (Constantine) commanded, too, that one day should be regarded as a special occasion for *religious worship*." Again Eusebius says, "Who else has commanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord's day, and to observe it as a festival, not indeed for the pampering of the body, but for the comfort and invigoration of the soul by instruction in divine truth?" Thus, according to Eusebius, a leading bishop of the early church, the object of Constantine's Sunday laws was purely religious.

Duruy, in his history of Rome, says, "In determining what day should be regarded as holy, and in the composition of a prayer for national use, Constantine exer-



cised one of the rights belonging to him as Pontifex Maximus; and it caused no surprise that he should do this." "Emperor" was Constantine's civil title. "Pontifex Maximus" was his religious title. Milman says it was by "his authority as Supreme Pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy days." It is clearly evident from the testimony of all these historians that Sunday laws, from their very inception, were religious laws. They were understood by both churchmen and statesmen to be such.

At the great church council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, it was enacted, can. 29, "*Christians shall not Judaize, and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honor, and as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.*"—*Hefele's "History of the Church Councils."*

Neander says, "In this way the church received help from the state for the furtherance of her ends." In the light of the foregoing facts, no rational student of history will attempt to deny that the Sunday laws of the fourth century and onward were religious, and not civil, laws. This is confirmed by the fact that the first Sunday law enacted by Constantine calls the day by a religious title, "The venerable day of the sun."

The last act in this religio-political drama of the early centuries was opened by the prominent churchman, Augustine, with this teaching: "It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord like wicked servants by the rod of temporal suffering before they attain the highest grade of religious development."—*Schaff's "Church History," Vol. II, Sec. 27.*

Of this theory which brought the climax of all this system of religious legislation,

and filled the world with the greatest religious despotism of history, Neander, one of the greatest of church historians, justly says, "It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."

This is the road over which the early church traveled in forming the great papal theocracy which despoiled men of their most sacred rights of conscience, and crushed religious freedom for more than a thousand years. It began by the petitioning of churchmen for Sunday laws, and by their forming a great confederacy to improve public morals. It ended in the rack,



INQUISITION BUILDING IN LISBON, PORTUGAL

the stake, and the Inquisition. What have we before us in the great church confederation of to-day? History is repeating itself. Senator Blair, at the solicitation of churchmen, on May 2, 1888, presented a bill for enforced Sunday rest before the United States Congress. This bill was supported by petitions from nearly all religious denominations that observe Sunday as the Christian rest day. It was opposed by many citizens, and defeated. The Breckenridge Sunday rest bill followed. It was supported by the same class of citizens. It was likewise opposed by many citizens, and defeated. Then came the Sunday closing bill for the Chicago World's Fair. It was likewise supported by nearly all the churches that hold Sunday as a day of religious worship. It passed Congress, but was throttled by a technicality. At last there came the Sunday closing act for the



Louisiana Purchase Exposition, which passed Congress, and was enforced during the fair. Dr. W. F. Crafts, who styles himself a "Christian lobbyist," boasted that he wrote the bill, and lobbied it through Congress. It was also supported by the churches in general. The success of this measure, like the conquest of Babylon, Lydia, and Egypt by the Medes and Persians, has said to these religious national reformers of our day, "Arise, and devour much flesh." The last significant advance was the attempt to secure a law for the District of Columbia compelling the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools. This measure was defeated, but a secret undercurrent favoring such legislation is still marching steadily forward in various parts of the United States.

This influence is affecting the decision of learned jurists to the extent that "judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off." Isa. 59:14, 15. Note the following recent decision of the Supreme Court of Minnesota:—

"ST. PAUL, January 12.—An opinion of the municipal court of Minneapolis holding that the Sunday closing law is equally applicable to Jew and Gentile, was upheld by the Minnesota court to-day.

"The case was that of the State of Minnesota against M. W. Weiss, who was arrested and convicted upon a charge of selling groceries on Sunday contrary to the Sunday closing law. Weiss, who is a Hebrew and whose Sabbath comes on Saturday, asserted that this law is unconstitutional, the Constitution providing that no preference shall be given by any law to any religion. The Supreme Court did not sustain this view, but announced the doctrine that the 'Sunday law is justified as a sanitary measure, and as a legitimate exercise of police power.'"

Now comes the great church federation. This was the last step that was taken in the history of the early church in the establishment of the papacy. A few statements gleaned from addresses delivered at the recent church federation will be sufficient to show the trend of this movement.

The chairman of the conference said: "This is one of the most notable assemblies of believers in Jesus Christ that has ever been seen." The object of the federation was stated by one speaker to be "to cor-

rect such social evils as gambling, the liquor traffic, and Sabbath desecration."

Dr. Dickey said, "It is our province in the name of our Supreme King, and seeking the good of mankind, to ask rulers to respect the code of our kingdom. This federation will compel an audience, and it will speak with power, if it will put aside its differences, and make its agreement its argument."

Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, said, "A federation without creedal expression or denominational control will exert a mighty Christian power. It will make possible the throwing of the whole compact power of the United Church solidly on the side of right and justice. Such a power, wielded in righteousness, would redeem New York, reform Philadelphia, and make Chicago clean. That power exerted upon the nation would lift it at once to a higher plane. I am sure that the influence of the federated churches upon the nation would make it that there should be no more war, nor preparation for war. The commission of Sir Walter Raleigh, the compact in the 'Mayflower,' and Colonial acts prove that this is a Christian nation."

Dr. Dickey further said, "I trust that one of the practical results of this conference will be the organization of a force that lawbreakers and lawmakers will respect and heed when great questions of morals are involved."

Is it any wonder that the papal pontiff should recently have declared that "what the church is losing in Catholic countries she is gaining in America"?

The *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of Cardinal Gibbons, in its issue of December 2, published an article on Christian Unity, in which the writer, Rev. Morgan M. Sheehy, says, "The desire for the reunion of Christendom is a striking characteristic of our time."

He must be blind indeed who can not see the truthfulness of the statement of the twentieth United States Congress, whose Senate committee, when reporting adversely on a proposed Sunday bill, said, "Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. . . . All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins



to operate upon the political institutions of the country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences." "Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion for enforcing religious observance."

This report was concurred in by the United States Senate, and the Sunday bill was dismissed. To favor the passage of Sunday laws, or laws providing for the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools, is to turn squarely against the teaching of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the great Protestant Reformation, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. It is time



#### AN EXAMPLE FOR CHRISTIANS

Jesus Christ, the author of liberty, said: "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not."

that the protest of the princes at the Diet of Spires should be revived. "In matters of conscience," they declared, "the majority have no power." Where is the spirit of Protestantism to-day that believed in God, spurned tradition, stood upon the platform of God's Word, renounced all religious legislation, and suffered martyrdom rather than support despotism?

The United States Congress in the days of our fathers recognized Sunday laws to be religious laws, as did both the church and the state in the fourth century. Under the influence of church petitions and church lobbyists, Sunday laws are now passed as "civil enactments." This "civil" dodge is

all sheer hypocrisy. We have laws protecting religious assemblies from disturbance upon any day of the week already. No doubt many, like Paul, verily think they do God service in supporting religious legislation. Let us pray that such may meet the Man of Calvary, as did Paul upon the Damascus road, and preach Christ, and renounce religious tyranny forever.

It is not difficult to follow the trail of this church federation movement to its logical terminal. The forecast of a religious despotism that will form an image to the papacy, and persecute those who keep the commandments of God and have the faith of Jesus, as predicted in Revelation, chapters 13 and 14, is as certain as that night follows day.

"Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record  
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt  
old systems and the Word;  
Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever  
on the throne,—  
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and,  
behind the dim unknown,  
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping  
watch above his own."

— Lowell.

The cry of peace and safety that accompanies this movement is another evidence that sudden destruction is soon to overtake those who are deceived by it, "and they shall not escape." 1 Thess. 5:3.

It is time to raise the cry given in Isaiah 8: "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." It is time to go out quickly, and bear aloft to "every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people," "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," while proclaiming the warning against the worship of the "beast" and his "image," and the reception of his "mark," as given in Revelation 13 and 14. It is time that all true watchmen give the trumpet a certain sound.

No individual is answerable to civil government here in that for which civil government can not answer for him in the hereafter.



## Things Move

J. W. RAYMOND

THE following is an editorial of the Binghamton (N. Y.) *Press*. It shows that the recent federation of churches is already operative, and that this keen-eyed editor sees the possibility of serious danger through the agency of this combination. And now let the same concerted action be brought to bear on Sunday enforcement legislation that has been in this instance on the question of temperance, and who can fail to see the result? And you may look for it, for it is sure to come. The editorial referred to under the title, "Churches a Legislative Factor," follows:—

"A notable example of the power of organized public opinion was exhibited at the State Capitol Tuesday, when, in response to the votes taken in the churches in this State, the Tully-Wainwright local option bill was taken from the Assembly Excise Committee and placed on the Assembly calendar. The Excise Committee had twice voted against reporting the bill, and the action of the lower house, in voting to discharge the committee from further consideration of the measure, was a deserved rebuke to those who sought to pigeonhole the bill.

"Whether or not the Tully-Wainwright bill becomes a law this year is of minor importance in comparison to the importance of the concerted action of so many thousand church-members. The real meat of the situation is this: on a given day, in a regular disciplined manner, men and women of many denominations asserted themselves and sent definite instructions to their legislative representatives to do a certain thing. What they asked was done—almost immediately.

"An assemblyman who gets a petition signed by a large majority of the church-members in his district is under strong pressure to either do what they ask or give a convincing reason for refusing to comply with the request of those who petition him.

"The churches of a community, State, or nation can exert great political power if their members so desire. But care should be taken by church-members to make sure that this power is not misdirected, or made of use by men or interests that may be actuated by motives not altogether disinterested or Christlike."

## Sunday Legislation in Louisiana

S. B. HORTON

FOR several years there has been little if any agitation concerning Sunday laws in the Southern States, with the exception of Louisiana. The reason for this lies, perhaps, in the fact that most of the Southern States have stringent statutes on Sunday observance already. In fact, the religious feature and intent of the Sunday law are to be found in every State except in Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Texas, in which States the ordinary name of the day, Sunday, is used in the statutes. But in all the other States the titles "Sabbath" and "Lord's day" are applied in mentioning the day, thus showing the religious sentiment underlying the legislation in behalf of Sunday observance.

This year has witnessed some effort in the direction of amending the Louisiana statute so as to make it more restrictive. The present Sunday law of Louisiana in its terms does not appear to carry with it any religious sentiment. For the most part the law is designed to prevent the sale of whisky on Sunday, but does not prohibit ordinary labor, picnics, festivals, and excursions on that day. Nor does it prohibit baseball and other games and amusements. Since 1886, however, repeated attempts have been made to make the law more restrictive, to the end that Sunday observance in Louisiana should bear the stamp of the so-called "American sabbath," instead of continuing to be recognized as the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times," the State having been anciently composed of Latin peoples and their descendants. One amendment closing the barber shops on Sunday in all parishes outside of Orleans parish was passed in 1892. Further legislation on the subject has failed until this session of the legislature, which has before it an amendment applying to the parish of Orleans. It seems likely at this writing that this amendment will pass, giving to the city council of New Orleans the privilege (if it is desired) of closing or regulating the tonsorial profession on Sunday.

This amendment is the outcome of an agitation carried on by those barbers who desire the day off, but fearing that those who do not wish to close their shops on Sunday may secure more than their share of the trade, want to compel the closing up



of all shaving parlors. The "Sunday closing" barbers belong to a labor organization which is part of the local federation of all unions. The local ministers have also entered the lists of champions of this amendment. It will be seen that the ordinary legislator will recognize the potency of such a combination, and desiring political preferment, will do the bidding of the combine.

An interesting feature of the recent agitation before the legislature was the introduction and passage of an amendment to the Sunday law permitting the cigar stores to do business on Sunday openly. This measure was passed by the House about three days before the measure closing the barber shops was passed. However, it was killed in the Senate committee because of

Monticello in his "Notes on Virginia;" he foresaw the retrogression in public opinion on the matter of the individual's religious rights:—

"Besides, the spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims. It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going downhill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion."



STATE CAPITOL, BATON ROUGE, LA.

the storm of opposition brought about by protesting ministers.

The sentiment in behalf of more stringent Sunday laws in the State of Louisiana is becoming stronger, and apparently it will not be long before the church will control our legislators, as it did in the fourth and subsequent centuries. It is strange that the Southland, which justly prides itself upon giving to the world those staunch Virginians, Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, the great exponents and doctrinaires of civil and religious liberty, should take the steps which must ultimately lead to a condition of state ecclesiasticism against which those and other true Americans contended. Listen to the sage of

observance was included in that against which this warning was given; for in the twenty-first Congress a bill was introduced making national recognition of Sunday as a religious day. Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, communicated to the House an unfavorable report against the measure, saying among other things:—

"If Congress shall, by the authority of law, sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy, in which Christians themselves are at issue. . . . It is perhaps fortunate for our country that the proposition should have been made at this early period, while the spirit of the Revolution yet exists in full vigor."

We doubt not but that legislation for Sunday



The preceding Congress had the same issue before it, and the Senate committee in reporting against any action in the matter of closing the post-offices on Sunday, said: "It should be kept in mind that the proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike."

The question for the South as well as for all other sections of our common country to face is, Shall we return to the faith of our forefathers by renouncing religious legislation, of which Sunday observance is the central thought? or shall we continue to assist the trust-and-combine idea by adding the Sunday trust?

### Recent Sunday Crusade Developments in Pennsylvania

C. S. LONGACRE

RECENT developments in Pittsburg and many other cities of the State of Pennsylvania, show conclusively that the church organizations no longer intend to preach the gospel of love, but a mandate of force. In more than a score of our large cities the ministerial alliances have appealed to "the big stick" of the mayor, and asked him to use it "to punish violators of the Sunday law," and in one city urged him to proceed "without fear or favor with respect to belief."

As a sample of this domineering spirit, we will cite what occurred in Pittsburg, May 21, as reported in the Pittsburg *Chronicle Telegraph*:—

"Representatives of the Allegheny County Sabbath Observance Association, fifty in all, called on Mayor George W. Guthrie, and presented a long memorial asking him to enforce the Sunday laws. The committee was composed of the ministers of the various ministerial alliances and a few laymen."

In concluding the reading of the resolutions and address, the chairman dictated to the mayor thus:—

"We ask you, therefore, that you issue such orders as will secure respect for the law, and the suppression of the wide-spread disregard and desecration of the first day of the week." "We will support you to the man as a ministerial association in any

movement you may make for a better observance of Sunday."

They urged the mayor "to enforce the law" universally without respect to belief, lest some would "become a privileged class."

Everybody who is acquainted with history knows that the Catholic Church by precisely the same sort of ecclesiastical scheming in political affairs, by appealing to "the big stick" of the civil magistrate to enforce her decrees, legalized her church dogmas, and whipped every foe into subjection to her mandates. She obtained control of the Roman government, and even the throne itself, and from thence made, administered, and executed her laws under the ban of the carnal sword for twelve hundred and sixty years. And then because of her cruel oppression, her own papal States revolted, and in the year 1798 the French Directory sent an army under General Berthier and took Pope Pius VI prisoner, dethroned him in the Vatican, and sent him into exile. Then and there the Church of Rome lost her civil authority over the nations, and the pope lost his church kingship in state affairs.

And now the strangest paradox of all is that the very Protestant churches that helped to separate the arms of the Roman church and state, are now beginning to embrace one another in this republic to further one another's interests, even to the treading down and whipping into subjection of those who conscientiously differ from them.

There is nothing plainer to the student of history than that the Protestant churches, in this very Sunday movement in which they and civil magistrates are united, are repeating the history of papal Rome. Already dissenters to their movement are branded as "anarchists" and enemies to the government and to the church. Persecution has already raised its venomous head in this country.

No heathen power has ever been as cruel upon the throne as the church upon the throne. From the creation of the world there was never seen greater persecution than was witnessed during the twelve hundred and sixty years of papal supremacy. The civil power endeavors to soften and ease the pangs of death for the guilty, but the church upon the throne hired men to invent schemes of inexpressible torture for



the really innocent, the truly loyal and faithful saints whom they denounced as heretics and anarchists.

May God delay the reign of the church upon the throne until the blessed truth of the pure gospel has been proclaimed to all the ends of the earth.

## The Lesson of the California Earthquake

J. O. CORLISS

THE late California earthquake will doubtless go down in history as a most extraordinary event, because of the extent and power of its operations. Many minor

very readily, and that is that the California calamity is nothing less than a judgment of God visited upon that section because its statute-books carry no law obliging the people to rest on Sunday.

In reasoning from cause to effect on any other question than the one of Sunday legislation these advocates draw conclusions rationally like all other people, and demand proof for assertions like sane persons, but when it comes to this point, their bald statements alone seem to be very satisfying evidence to their hopeful enthusiasm. If asked how they know that the earthquake was sent of God to punish Californians for having no Sunday law, they will, in substance, say



THE GREAT LISBON EARTHQUAKE

movements of a seismic nature have preceded this one in the same locality, but all of these are as nothing when compared with the one which occurred on the morning of April 18, 1906.

Speculation has been rife as to the cause of this manifestation, and learned theories of its origin are nearly as numerous as the knowing ones who have opinions to express regarding it. But none of these speculations receive much general attention, because so few of the common people are able to grasp the minute deductions set forth by these erudites.

There is, however, one thing which some, of a certain turn of mind, seem to grasp

that, from the very nature of the case, there could be no other cause for such a manifestation, and thus they satisfy themselves, and try to make others believe that their case is clearly made out.

But this is a matter which would be interesting to investigate to some extent. Believers in the infinite greatness and power of Jehovah, must agree that he is unchangeable,—is the same “yesterday, and to-day, and forever.” This being true, he certainly would treat alike all those who have the same moral standing, and that, also, in one age as well as in another.

Nov. 1, 1755, the capital city of Lisbon, in Portugal, was reduced to a heap of ruins



by an earthquake, and that without a moment's warning. The fire which followed, completed the work of destruction, bringing to death more than thirty thousand persons. Yet no more devout people lived at that time than those of that doomed city. Indeed, a great portion of those who were destroyed, were at the time worshipping in the numerous churches of the metropolis. Can any one suppose for a moment that the Lord destroyed all those devout worshipers because, perhaps, some portion of the city's inhabitants were not up to the mark morally? What a reckless charge to prefer against One of whom it is affirmed that "he doeth all things well." As a rule, the Portuguese people have ever been Sunday-keepers, and as strict in this respect as any churchgoers of Europe. In the face of this fact, what cause would our Sunday-law advocates assign as the means of Lisbon's overthrow?

Again, the city of Charleston, in South Carolina, was overthrown by an earthquake about twenty years ago, and was almost totally destroyed. Everybody acquainted in that part of the United States knows that the strictest sort of a Sunday law has long stood on the statute-books of the famous Palmetto State. What, then, was the cause of its overthrow? Surely not the lack of a Sunday law. Some other cause must therefore be studied up for its desolation.

Pennsylvania is the very home of Sunday-law legislation, yet less than two months ago a very noticeable earthquake shock was felt in Berks County of that State. True it was not a regular twister, like the one that twirled about buildings on the Pacific Slope, but what was even that slight tremor for, in the Keystone State, only to remind her people that her Sunday laws are not yet up to the mark of stringency? If this were not so, then why should any one surmise that the late disaster came as a retribution upon California for her not having a Sunday law?

The fact is that between the years 1606 B. C. and 1850 A. D. more than six thousand earthquakes are recorded as having taken place, and as having been distributed all over the world, touching most heavily at those great lines of elevation which divide the oceanic basins, and can not therefore justly be counted as special judgments of

God upon the desecrators of Sunday rest.

Lack of space forbids the discussion here of the prophetic significance these earthquakes bear to the world. The Saviour told his anxious disciples in reply to a question relative to the end of the world, that along with famine, pestilences, and numerous wars, earthquakes would occur in different places (Matt. 24:7), but not a lisp do we hear from his lips that these were to come to any nation or State because it failed to enact a Sunday law.

The reason is obvious. In the same chapter, the Saviour anticipated the destruction of Jerusalem to occur forty years after his death, in A. D. 70. He pointed out to his disciples the perils of that time, and the necessity of their leaving the city by a certain time to avoid being destroyed. He then added these significant words: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Verse 20.

These Jewish disciples knew well enough that the Sabbath day always fell on the seventh, or our Saturday. This is the last recorded instruction the Saviour ever gave regarding the Sabbath. He died, leaving this as his last will and testament on that point. Inasmuch as after the death of a testator, no one can add to, or take from, his last will (Gal. 3:15), Christ's instruction which we have just quoted stands to the end of the Christian dispensation. How, then, could he consistently destroy men for not giving homage to another day, put in the place of the one he has commanded all to observe? The Lord has not yet thus stultified himself, but is infinitely more consistent than many of those who claim to represent his will in the earth. Let us be more careful to follow the Word in our lives, and then we shall not be so desirous to legislate others into our way of thinking.

J. O. CORLISS.

### What Will Save the Nation?

TEN great sermons have been preached by the apostles,—sermons that led the way for all the gospel sermons that have come in these later days. The power of God and of the Holy Ghost was with Peter. If that power rested upon the church to-day, we could drive the rum devil from the world. Human nature has not changed in the last nineteen hundred years. Preach a different



gospel from that which was successful in the apostolic days? O, bosh!

There will be riots and revolution all over this land if things go on another twenty-five years as they have been going. What can prevent such horror? What can save the life of the nation? Only the strength of a quickened church, and the church can only be quickened by a visitation of power such as the old apostles knew! May we get back that old apostolic fire again.—  
*D. L. Moody.*

## Do Working Men Need Sunday Laws?

E. T. RUSSELL

HIGHLY to be respected are the honest toilers, as they form an important part of the great web of humanity. All classes should recognize their worth, as by their toil we enjoy the blessings and comforts which are the products of their hands. We are dependent upon them by the law of mutual dependence which affects all classes of society. Even the rich are forced to purchase the products of their brain and muscle, and also to employ them to minister to their comforts.

A certain class, seemingly in recognition of their worth to society, and because of a tender solicitude for their bodily welfare, demand in their behalf enforced Sunday rest. They claim that, owing to the greed of great corporations, working men are compelled to labor on Sunday. But it is a fact that the reason why they demand for them compulsory rest on that day is because it is an institution of the church, and back of the demand is religious sentiment, as the following quotation will show:—

“Be it remembered that without a Sabbath there will be no great ingatherings seen into the churches; while, with a Sabbath guaranteed to all classes of laborers, we make it possible to develop a proper home life among the laborers, and make it possible for church influences to touch them.”—*Michigan Christian Advocate*, Aug. 26, 1899.

Thus it is seen that the true object they have in securing Sunday rest for all classes of laborers is that there may be “great ingatherings seen into the churches,” and to “make it possible for church influences to touch them.” The interest is more to get

people into the churches on that day than to secure rest for the weary toiler. They care more for the working men's support of enforced Sunday rest than for their physical rest.

Every well-advised person knows that working men are not forced to labor on Sunday. Sunday labor may be required of them, but they have both the right and the privilege to say No, to any such demand coming from any source whatsoever.

According to the laws of our country, no person can be compelled to labor on that day or on any other day of the week, except such as are in penal servitude. But, if it should be admitted that this claim is true, such labor would be in violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which positively says, “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

It is further stated that because of Sunday labor the conscientious are compelled to violate their consciences. I can not comprehend how this can be. A truly conscientious person would not, contrary to his convictions, labor on that day in violation of his conscience. Believing it to be sin, he could not, and would not, even for the fear of punishment or the promise of reward, be induced to do so. When a person claims to observe a day and labors for wages on that day, it is evident that he has more faith in mammon than in his Creator.

Rev. W. F. Crafts, the great apostle of Sunday legislation, bears testimony to the effect that conscientious observance of the day by individuals tends toward financial gain rather than financial loss. He states:—

“Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: ‘Do you know of any instance where a Christian's refusal to do Sunday work or Sunday trading has resulted in his financial ruin?’ Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, *not one is affirmative*. . . . I have never known a case, nor can I find one in any quarter of the globe, where even beggary, much less starvation, has resulted from courageous and conscientious fidelity to the Sabbath. *Even in India, where most of the business community is heathen, mis-*



*sionaries testify that loyalty to the Sabbath in the end brings no worldly loss. On the other hand, incidents have come to me by the score, of those who have gained, even in their worldly prosperity, by daring to do right in the matter of Sunday work."*

"Doubtless some cases of permanent financial loss by fidelity to the Sabbath might be found by a thorough dredging of recent Christian history,—possibly some cases of financial ruin, or even martyrdom,—but they are so rare that neither the author nor his two hundred correspondents, nor other writers on this subject, have been able to find them; so that refusal to do Sunday work can hardly be called self-sacrifice for principle. The incidents to the contrary that abound afford illustration of Christ's profound words, 'He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it;' while, on the other hand, those who selfishly and sinfully seek to save life or living by Sabbath-breaking, often lose it. Such withholding from God 'tendeth to poverty.' *The seeming self-sacrifice of Sabbath wages is really 'the scattering that increaseth.'*" (Italics ours.)

Dr. Evart, in speaking of the Sabbath (Sunday), says, "It is a test of all religion." We do not believe this is true. But, if it were true, to compel unbelievers to rest on that day, and by law to say that all labor on that day should cease, would be to require of them a religious test, which would be contrary to the spirit of Article VI of our federal Constitution. A large per cent of laboring men do not keep any day, and they would not keep any day conscientiously if compelled to do so by law. To enforce the observance of Sunday or any other religious institution upon unbelievers would be to enforce sin, since "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Such legislation could only develop hypocrites. Compelling religious believers by civil law to observe Sunday would tend to cause their service to God to degenerate into cold formalism, and make them servants of men, rather than servants of God.

Well did Rev. C. H. Spurgeon say: "Let the Lord's day be respected by all means; and may the day soon come when every shop shall be closed on the Sabbath, but let it be by force of conviction, and not by force of policemen; let true religion triumph by the power of God in men's hearts, and

not by the power of fines and punishments. . . . The Sabbath belongs to God, and therefore is not to be rendered to Cæsar" (civil government).

No laboring man can afford for one moment to give his consent to any such legislation. Some ten or twelve years ago there was scarcely any demand on the part of labor unions for Sunday laws, but at the present time the majority of them are in favor of enforced Sunday rest. By churchmen, it has been said, "Here is the place for effectively using the machinery of organized labor." They assert that labor unions must join the church everywhere in the protection of "Sunday as a day of rest and recreation." By uniting with the churches to enforce Sunday rest, labor unionists will compel those of their own membership who have no regard for Sunday or religion to act as if they were religious. Such legislation can tend only to breed insincerity and hypocrisy. Being compelled by law, men will be outwardly religious from policy while sinners at heart. It would work not for Christianity, but against it, as a gospel of force is opposed to the gospel of love. Every fair-minded, liberty-loving workman should utter a vigorous protest against such legislation.

The New York *Independent* foresees evil in the present movement for enforced Sunday rest, and presents the situation thus: "The unions have erected Sunday into the Sabbath of the faithful. The trade unions embrace possibly two and a half million members. If they are to become dogmatic religionists, the days of persecution for the faithful are not over."

Why have Sunday laws? Why not have Monday laws? or laws requiring the cessation of labor on any other day of the week? Working men would receive the benefit of physical rest as well upon some other day of the week. Would not other days be as desirable for recreation for the weary toiler? If any workman desires to observe the Sunday, let him do so through religious conviction, and not because of legal enactments. If the Sunday institution is so destitute of divine power that it needs the support of the civil law to uphold it, the fact is a wonderful confession of its inherent weakness.

In many places only eight or ten hours of service is required of working men, thus



allowing from fifteen to sixteen hours out of every twenty-four for rest and recreation. If this is not sufficient, and, as a sanitary measure, it is necessary that they have more time allotted them in which to rest, then it is their privilege to work fewer hours a day. But let there be no compulsion in any matter pertaining to the worship of God.

### Equity

H. E. GIDDINGS

WHOLESALE law admits of no partiality. Any law which provides for one class in such a manner as to grant privileges or immunities to its members, which are not enjoyed by all citizens alike, is manifestly unjust and subversive of the ends of law. Civil government is the security that each citizen has, and the law is the embodiment of the government's guarantee of justice and equity.

Sunday lawmaking is class legislation favoring one party without considering the rights of others. A prominent leader of the Sunday law crusade urges the making of such laws on the ground that "the right of rest for one demands a law of rest for all." That is to say, If one has a right to rest and worship on a certain day that he may choose, then he is entitled to a law compelling everybody to rest out of respect for him. It seems that the absurdity of this position would be so apparent as to destroy all the argument based upon it.

Those who desire to do so have a right to rest on Sunday. Therefore those who have a right to rest on Sunday are entitled to (demand) a law requiring all to rest on Sunday. Let us extend this logic a little. We certainly must admit that other people have equal rights with those who desire to keep Sunday. Since this is true, other people have a right to choose another day for rest and worship, and they have a right to rest on that other day.

Equity pleads for perfect uniformity and impartiality before the law. Then the same logic will apply. Seventh-day observers have a right to rest on the seventh day of the week. "The right of rest for one demands a law of rest for all."

Conclusion: Therefore those who desire to rest and worship on the seventh day of the week are entitled to a law compelling all to rest. Where would this end?

Other parties would be equally entitled to the same right, if right it is, and the nation would be compelled to enact laws stopping the wheels of industry much of the time, and possibly all of the time, to respect the rights of its citizens.

Another specious argument is this: Sunday can not be kept unless all people cease from toil and amusement on that day. If it can be proved that this is true,—that is, that no one can properly rest on and observe a day as a day of worship and devotion unless everybody else is compelled to cease from labor on that day and show becoming deference to its claims as a holy day,—we shall have a most serious problem for our legislators to solve.

They will either have to deny the right of each individual to conscientiously select the day upon which he shall rest and worship, and so destroy the guarantee of equity by legislating in harmony with the wishes of one party alone, or make laws, as in the other case, requiring absolute quiet on each of the days chosen by the various parties. Tyranny or absurdity, which?

If we will only be reasonable and admit that the only protection necessary for religious worship on the Sabbath is that civil order which the law insures on every day of the week, there will be no perplexity.

THE Creator might have compelled all his creatures to do right, as being almighty he had the power to do; but he left them free to do wrong. He permitted Lucifer to sin in heaven, and the human family to transgress his will on earth, as a result of which sin and woe and death have filled the world for six thousand years. But terrible and contrary to his will as this long record of evil is, it was preferable in his view to a system of government which would compel the conscience, and leave no place for the free-will service of God. Yet there is a class of people in this country who are persistently seeking to educate the people to the idea that men ought to be compelled by law to obey God, and they are continually lobbying in Congress and the State legislatures to get laws enforcing the observance of the "Sabbath." The evil of what they are trying to accomplish is worse in God's sight than all the evil that has resulted from the freedom he has given mankind to sin. He must view such work with abhorrence.



# News and Notes

ORDERS have been given by the department of public safety of Scranton, Pa., "that the police must enforce the Sunday closing laws."

EIGHTEEN ministers representing the local ministerial association waited on Mayor Turnbull at the city hall in Canton, Ohio, on May 14, and asked him "to enforce the Sunday law by closing saloons and theaters and stopping all Sunday baseball."

A DISPATCH from Fort Worth, Tex., reports that "Tarrant County authorities state that in future attention will be given to violation of the Sunday law where clerks are compelled to labor on the Sabbath when there is no necessity for their doing so," and that "one indictment has already been returned."

It was reported from Elmira, N. Y., on May 26 that "the Civic Federation, composed of local ministers, has served formal notice on Mayor Brockway and the police board that unless Sunday baseball games are stopped in this city, efforts for the removal of the mayor and police commissioners from office will be made."

By a vote of nineteen to five the city council of Grand Rapids, Mich., has enacted "a Sunday theater closing ordinance," which "is in harmony with and supplementary to the State law regarding Sunday amusements." The action of the council "is receiving a great deal of comment, both favorable and unfavorable."

A MINNESOTA newspaper observes that "Sunday closing appears to be getting popular" in that State, and notes that at New Olm recently "the saloon-keepers took the lead, and a majority of them petitioned the city council for a strict enforcement of the law." And "the novelty of Sunday closing is being experienced by a great many other towns of the State."

ON the charge of violating the Sunday law against labor four employees in the metal factory of Samuel Hauer, at 23 Richardson St., Brooklyn, N. Y., were arrested at the factory on Sunday, May 20, and were held for trial. "Several members of a church in the neighborhood complained of the noise made by the men," and "another complainant was Samuel Stein, a former employee of Hauer, who is now in business for himself." "Recently Stein

was compelled by the police to stop running his factory on Sunday, and he believed Hauer was back of this action."

"For keeping his place of business open on Sunday," John Marty, a butcher, was fined one dollar in the police court at St. Paul, Minn., on April 25. "Mr. Marty argued to the court that it was a godsend to the poor people who could not purchase ice, to have butcher shops opened on Sundays, and said it was owing to his not employing union men in his shop that he had been prosecuted for Sunday opening."

REV. A. P. ZECHEL, of Appleton, Wis., had such a zeal for the Sunday closing law which had been put in force there that he himself violated the law in order to secure evidence against a saloon-keeper who was breaking it. He went into a saloon on Sunday and purchased a glass of beer, contrary to the law, the result being that he was arrested on the charge "working on the Sabbath," was brought into court, and found guilty. He appealed the case.

THE Commissioners of the District of Columbia on May 12 received a petition protesting "against Sunday baseball playing on a vacant lot adjoining Mount Tabor church in Georgetown," which "was signed by a large number of residents in the neighborhood." The matter was referred to the chief of police with instructions "to make the complaint the subject of an investigation, and, if necessary, to have the ball players arrested."

A DISPATCH from Greenwich, Conn., under date of May 6 reported that "Sunday baseball playing, which was a feature in Greenwich all last season, came to a sudden stop to-day, when Sheriff Ritch and four town constables, acting under orders from Prosecuting Attorney Henry B. White, called off two games and sent three thousand spectators home." It is stated that "the churches suffered in the matter of attendance" because of the Sunday games.

STRICT Sunday closing of business places was recently secured in Greeley, Colo., through the influence of the W. C. T. U. Proprietors were notified by the sheriff that they must close up, and the day following, this notice appeared in the window of one of the drug-stores: "The city marshal was ordered by the W. C. T. U. to close all business houses on Sunday, therefore this store will remain closed till further notice,



no matter how necessary it may be for the sick to have medicine. We positively and absolutely refuse to open our doors under any circumstances whatever, until the 'ordinance' and whatever influence has caused its enforcement is annulled and condemned by public opinion or otherwise." Two other drug-stores posted similar notices.

ON May 22 Mayor Barth, of Louisville, Ky., "issued a proclamation announcing that after a conference with Governor Beckham he had determined rigidly to enforce the Kentucky statutes and city ordinances providing for Sunday closing, not only in Louisville, but in Jefferson County outside the city limits." "All saloons, theaters, road houses, beer gardens, and amusement parks must close, the only pursuits to be tolerated being household duties and works of necessity."

STRICT Sunday enforcement against saloons at St. Cloud, Minn., which has obtained there during the past few months, has been modified by a new mayor, who permits the saloons to remain open on Sunday "except during the hours of public worship" in the forenoon. This new order of things went into effect on April 15. The Fergus Falls *Journal* remarks that the saloons are required to close at the time specified "in order to give the bartenders an opportunity to attend church."

AN arrangement has been made between Rev. Father Theodore Waring, of Dyersville, Iowa, and the management of the local baseball team, whereby the clergyman holds his Sunday afternoon church services half an hour earlier, and the ball game is called half an hour later, than formerly, in order that there may be no conflict between the two, and "that the 'fans' may attend divine worship and afterward go to the baseball game." It is said that Father Waring "realizes that Sunday baseball has come to stay."

STRICT Sunday enforcement against all business prevailed at Kokomo, Ind., on Sunday, May 13. "Never before in the history of the city has it been closed tighter." "Signs were posted in practically all the retail stores in the city warning their customers that no sales would be made on Sunday," and "even the drug-stores and fruit stands were closed," so that "it was impossible to purchase a cigar, or even a glass of soda-water, or other harmless refreshments during the day." "Even the J. G. Leach Ice Company plant suspended business for the first time since the plant was built, and no deliveries of ice were made in any part of the city." "The vendors of

newspapers, although expressly excepted in the Sunday law, were interfered with, but finally were allowed to proceed with their deliveries and street sales."

"FOR selling meat after midnight on Saturday" twenty Jewish butchers, who understood "that Police Commissioner Bingham had announced that he would not take any action against Jewish butchers for Sunday selling while the Passover feast was on," were fined five dollars each in the Harlem police court, New York City, on Sunday morning, April 15. The complainant in each case was a representative of the benchmen's union. In imposing the fines Magistrate Cornell said that he did so reluctantly, and declared with regard to the Sunday law under which the arrests were made and the fines imposed, "I wish the legislature would repeal this absurd law."

RESOLUTIONS refusing to grant "a request by the W. C. T. U. and others praying that this council enforce the Sunday laws relating to barber shops and other places of business" were recently adopted by the council of Paynesville, Minn. The council took the ground that, "being a body representing the voters of the town, it is in duty bound to carry out the will of the majority of said voters," and that it had "no right to act in the matter until assured by a petition signed by a majority of the voters that the people want the Sunday laws enforced." The council pledged itself "to at all times carry out the will of the people as expressed by the majority."

It having been announced recently at Niles, Ohio, "that an effort would be made to play baseball on Sundays" at that place, "a great stir was created among the ministers of the city," one of them declaring "that such an undertaking was an outrage, and that he would do everything in his power to see that the game was not played on Sunday in Niles." "He said he liked baseball on week-days all right, but declared, 'I object to such desecration of the Sabbath.'" A local newspaper thought it likely from the "indignant state" of the ministers that they would "make some move to stop the games," but remarked that "as Sunday ball has been legalized in Ohio, it is not seen how they can accomplish anything in this behalf."

FOLLOWING the recent suppression of baseball playing on Sunday at Greenwich, Conn., it was announced that the clergymen of the place, headed by Rev. Matthew Patton, would next turn their attention to golf playing on Sunday, and would "draw up a protest for their congregations to sign,



asking that the blue-laws be enforced against both golf and ball." It is said that H. O. Havemeyer and other millionaires of the wealthy summer colony at Greenwich joined with the ministers for the suppression of Sunday ball playing, but it is thought they will not join in this later move for Sunday enforcement, as golf playing is a popular form of Sunday recreation with them. In retaliation for the suppression of their form of Sunday recreation, "the disappointed 'fans' now vow that they will 'boycott the churches.'"

By a vote of four to two the council of Tullahoma, Tenn., on April 9 voted for enforced Sunday closing at that place. The question "has been a live issue there for several months, and was made the paramount issue in the late election for city officials," and the action of the council is regarded as marking "a complete victory for Sunday closing," and as an assurance that "for the next two years at least Tullahoma people will enjoy the strict observance of the Sabbath." The meeting of the council at which the above action was taken was "crowded with people interested in the Sunday closing question," and "there were present the pastors of the churches, who were accorded a hearing, and pleaded the cause of a holy Sabbath and morality."

"AFTER stating that he believed that the ministers of Council Bluffs were disregarding the commandment to keep the Sabbath holy by conducting Sunday funerals," Mayor MacRae, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, at a meeting of the city council on May 18 "asked that some action be taken to compel the ministers to do their work in the six days allotted to them." "He said he made the request on behalf of the carriage drivers' union, and that a large number of hack drivers had requested him to use his influence to do away with the Sunday funerals." "It was his opinion that the ministers of the city ought to do their part toward making the day one of rest, and he insisted that they must refrain from conducting funerals on the Sabbath day."

ON the charge of violating the Sunday law against barbering, Christopher Treola, a barber shop proprietor of Patchogue, Long Island, was arrested at that place on Sunday, May 27, and fined three dollars and costs. The arrest was made on complaint of two journeymen barbers who found a barber at work in Treola's shop on that date, and was the beginning of a movement for the suppression of Sunday barbering at Patchogue. "In past years the barber shops have been opened on Sundays during

the summer months, but recently the merchants' association took up the matter of having them remain closed Sunday the year round," and "now the journeymen barbers have taken up the cudgel." And now since he is compelled to close, "Treola says he will see that no other shops are opened on Sundays in Patchogue."

THE appointment of a special recess committee "to consider and revise the laws of the commonwealth relative to the observance of the Lord's day" was recommended by the committee on ways and means of the upper house of the Massachusetts Legislature on May 28. It was recommended that the committee consist of two members of the Senate and three of the House.

RECENTLY a convention of the W. C. T. U. was held at Calvin, I. T., at which much was said about the importance of Sunday laws and their enforcement, and the necessity of Sunday closing of the saloons. Just preceding the convention a sermon was preached by the Baptist minister, in which he very lucidly showed that no business could prosper that was run on Sunday. As an example he cited the banks; they close on Sunday, and they are prosperous. Now some one has raised the query whether this is why the W. C. T. U. are working for Sunday closing of the saloons. It would certainly seem that if a business that is run on Sunday is bound to fail, the W. C. T. U. should be anxious to have the saloons run on Sunday full blast. This Baptist clergyman and the W. C. T. U. of Calvin should compare notes.

"CHARGED with having violated the Sunday law," Hayman Bernstein, a Jewish butcher, was arrested by two officers at his place of business at 163 Rockaway Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sunday, April 15, and the next morning was arraigned in the Gates Avenue police court. "The policeman claimed to have seen Bernstein sell meat to a woman, and that he had other meat exposed to view in the store," but Magistrate Voorhees was not impressed with the enormity of the conduct alleged, but on the contrary rebuked the policemen by saying to them: "Almost every saloon in the city sells beer and whisky on Sunday, which is a direct violation of the law, but you pick out a man who is selling meat and bring him here." "Yes, your honor, but this was in a religious community, and its peace was being disturbed," replied one of the policemen, whereupon the magistrate declared, "Well, I will adjourn this case to give you a chance to produce here in court the people whose religious liberty was disturbed by this man's selling meat."



## Notes

"IN matters of conscience majorities have no power."

THE church can not be the light of the world by descending into the arena of politics.

WHEN religion gets into politics, it is only to be expected that politics will get into religion.

IF the kingdom of heaven could be set up by vote, it would be liable to overthrow by the same means.

THE prayer, "Thy kingdom come," will never be answered by any attempt of the saints to outvote the sinners.

To ascertain the real nature of Sunday laws one has only to go back in history to the Dark Ages and look up their parentage.

THE purpose of the gospel in the world is to set men free. All that a Sunday law can do for a transgressor is to lock him up.

CHRISTIANITY means self-surrender, self-sacrifice. For the state to be Christian it would have to sacrifice itself, and so cease to exist.

IF the state has the right to profess religion, who shall deny it the right to join the church? And then who can say anything against a union of church and state?

PEOPLE who are anxious for legislation to make people idle on Sunday, should remember that they will thereby provide the devil with an opportunity to become busier than ever on that day.

A LAW which interferes with conscience is destructive of conscience in those who yield to it; hence such laws must tend to make men poor neighbors and bad citizens, and thus to weaken rather than strengthen the state.

THE National Reform idea of government—the laws of God upheld and enforced by the laws of men—represents an inverted pyramid, since the divine law, which applies even to the thoughts of the heart, and covers all acts, is vastly greater than the statutes of men. "Thy commandment is exceeding broad."

YOU can not preserve the spirit—the life—of an institution by law. A Sabbath preserved by law would be much like any other "preserved" article—all the life would be out of it. And a dead Sabbath

means a dead religion. What men need is a spiritual Sabbath, full of the life of God. This Christianity supplies.

THE more power the church receives from the state, the more spiritually impotent she becomes.

THE Christian religion demands the crucifixion of self; a state religion demands the crucifixion of conscience.

"SIX days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," says Jehovah. When people rest on the seventh day according to this commandment, what right has a legislature to revoke the Creator's permission and direction to them to labor on the other six days?

IF the minority can get along in the observance of the seventh day without the support of a Sabbath law, why can not the majority get along without such support in observing the first day? And if the unpopular seventh-day Sabbath can prosper without legislative support, why can not the first-day sabbath, with popular custom behind it, do as well?

HUMAN law, since it can not go beyond the restraint of outward acts, can do nothing to make a man good. Though it could make him a saint in outward appearance, he might be a devil inwardly. "Satan himself," says the Scripture, "is transformed into an angel of light;" and he is never so wholly and completely devilish as when he has on this angelic garb.

A SUNDAY law is demanded to shut off competition in trade; to enable a man to "keep the Sabbath" without losing any business; to be religious without costing him anything. But a religion which costs nothing is too cheap to be worth anything. Christianity costs something; the price of it is marked on the cross, and there has been no fall in the price since Calvary.

EVERY member of Congress, every member of a State legislature, every official of the federal or State government, is a representative of the people. In his official capacity he acts only as such a representative; and as no person can represent others in religion, but each one can represent only himself, it is plain that representative assemblies and government officials of any class can have nothing to do as such with religion; and when they do meddle with religion, they simply usurp power which does not belong to them. Every step taken in this direction is a step toward the overthrow of republican government.



# LIBERTY

WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY, 1906

L. A. SMITH - - - - - Editor  
 W. A. COLCORD } - - Associate Editors  
 W. W. PRESCOTT }

Subscription Price - - 25 cents per year  
 To Foreign Countries - 50 " " "

Published Quarterly by

REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.  
 TAKOMA PARK STATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter, May 1, 1906, at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

THE question of the enforcement of Sunday observance is coming to the front in all sections of the country. In our News and Notes department we give a few instances, but only a few, showing the activity on the part of those working for Sunday legislation in this country.

RELIGIOUS liberty in Canada is threatened with invasion by a rigid Sunday law, refusing exemption to observers of the seventh day, passed at the instigation of the Lord's Day Alliance. The religious title of this organization and the religious profession of the men composing it, as well as the religious character of Sunday, show beyond question that it seeks the aid of the civil power to further a religion, and that it aims to commit the Canadian government to a policy of religious legislation.

As noted on another page, one member of the Canadian Parliament, in speaking against the exemption clause proposed for observers of the seventh day, said that if such people would not conform to the program of one rest day, *and only one*, in Canada, they should get out of the country. This is parallel with a statement made some years ago at York, Neb., by Rev. E. B. Graham, vice-president of an association which aims to make the United States a Sunday-enforcing government. The two statements should travel in company. Mr. Graham said:—

We might add, in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die.—*Christian Statesman*, May 21, 1885.

Do the church people of this country or of Canada admire the spirit which prompted such utterances? Do such sentiments savor at all of tolerance, of charity, of Christianity?

THE International Reform Bureau, or "Christian lobby," at Washington makes this announcement:—

The battle for the complete Sunday closing of the gates of the Jamestown Exposition has been fully won. The committee of Congress reported in favor of closing only the "exhibits and amusements"—not the gates. The superintendent of the International Reform Bureau went to Norfolk and persuaded the exposition management to vote complete closing, and the law will therefore close the gates by contract.

We are not concerned over what the exposition management may decide to do about Sunday closing. We oppose nobody's right to observe Sunday and to take whatever action he pleases regarding such observance so long as he acts only for himself. Let the exposition management close the gates if they see fit; that is a vastly different thing from Sunday closing of the gates by act of Congress. What we strenuously oppose is the acting of one person *for others*, in religious matters, on self-assumed authority. The members of Congress are the elected representatives of the people. What Congress does is done in the name of the people, and by the people. This is all right so long as it is confined to secular matters; but when Congress takes action in favor of Sunday as the Sabbath, it assumes authority to act for the people in religion. But Congressmen are not chosen to represent the people in religion; and even should they be so chosen, it would be contrary to Christianity. Sabbath observance lies in the realm of religion and conscience, which the civil power has no right to enter.



# An Address to the Czar

Presented by the Conference of Seventh-day Adventists of Russia, in  
Response to the Czar's Edict Granting Liberty of Conscience



WE, AS representatives of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination in all the world, and in a special manner as representatives of their churches situated in the empire of Your Majesty, in view of the difficult situation in our fatherland, take pleasure in most respectfully expressing our deep sympathy by uniting our prayers with the prayers of all loyal subjects in the country, hoping that through the help of the Almighty, peace and prosperity may soon prevail again.

We are filled with gratitude to God, by whose providence the heart of Your Majesty has been moved to grant the long-desired liberty of conscience to all Christian denominations. We herewith submit an expression of our thanks, by expressing the hope that the full blessings of this liberty may be ours to enjoy.

At the same time, we most respectfully submit to Your Majesty the principles of our denomination:—

We acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God. We believe in the God therein revealed, and in Jesus Christ his Son, by whom the world was created, and which he still upholds. We believe in redemption through the blood of Christ, and in his speedy return in glory, as well as in the divine power of the Holy Spirit.

We see in the law of ten commandments, the law of God laid down, with the seventh day as the Biblical, divine, and perpetual Sabbath. We believe in Biblical baptism, feet washing, and the Lord's supper.

We believe in the unity of the faith of the children of God on earth, as revealed in the Bible, and hold to Church organization in harmony therewith, having in our midst apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. In order to preach the gospel in all the world, and to sustain the ministry, we observe everywhere the Bible rule for its support.

As to our relations to the higher powers, we believe that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that we are, in accordance with the Scriptures, obliged to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, as taxes, tribute, fear, and honor, and to pray for those in authority; but we also believe that we are to give to God what is his, in obedience to his commandments.

We believe in the Bible doctrine of marriage, and in the Christian education of our children. As we recognize Christ to be the True Physician in things pertaining to the body, we endeavor to follow his council with regard to healthful living, and abstain from all intoxicating drinks, as well as from hurtful stimulants. To further these principles, we already possess some fifty sanitariums, conducted on a scientific basis, and located in all parts of the world, as well as a number of flourishing industrial schools for the education of our youth. We also endeavor to enlighten the people in divine things by the publication and circulation of a rich literature.

Our denomination numbers eighty thousand, of whom two thousand two hundred members are loyal subjects of Your Majesty.

We respectfully submit these statements to Your Majesty, praying that God may prosper Your Majesty for a long time, to the good of our fatherland.





THE OLD LIBERTY BELL