

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1902

No. 4

### True Self-Government

By Alonzo T. Jones

GOD made man to govern himself. He made him that he should govern himself *in Christ*. For Christ is *the Word*—the expression of the thought—of God; and “I would have you know that the Head of every man is Christ, . . . and the Head of Christ is God.” 1 Cor. 11:3. Thus the true and original self-government is individual self-government directly by the power of God through Jesus Christ.

This—self-government by the power of God—is the only true self-government that is possible to mankind. The race of man was started upon this principle, and if the principle had been adhered to by all men the world would have escaped all the evil that has ever befallen it, or that ever can befall it. And even since all the evil has flooded the world any man can escape all the evil that this world knows, or can know, simply by accepting that principle and steadily adhering to it.

That the race of man, even since the fall, and even since the flood, was started upon this principle, is declared by revelation; and is witnessed to by mankind itself. The Anglo-Saxon race with all its kindred, equally with the most ancient, Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian,

witnesses to a time and a condition in which God was the only king, the only lord, the only ruler known to themselves; and such widespread and independent testimony is conclusive evidence that that was a time and condition in which God was the only king, the only lord, the only ruler known to mankind.

But men chose to experiment for themselves in government: to try to govern themselves without God and without Christ. The experiment failed. It failed so completely, men so lost the faculty of self-government, that it so fell out that they must be governed. And since their loss of the principle and faculty of true self-government had developed such violence among them that they must be governed, it followed, in the very nature of the case, that he who would establish a government over such, must be more violent—must have the will, and be able, to exert more force—than those whom he would govern. Accordingly, of the first man who ever established a territorial government or state, it is written: “He was an exceedingly wicked tyrant before the Lord.” That man was Nimrod; and this very name “signifies rebellion, supercilious contempt; and, accord-

ing to Gesenius, is equivalent to 'the extremely impious rebel.'"

Nimrod was the first man who wore a kingly crown. By him there was established among men the principle of human sovereignty. By him was begun kingship among men in this world: the rulership of man over man, and subjection of man to man, instead of the rulership of man over himself—self-government—and subjection of man to God only.

Nor was it *only* kingship that was by Nimrod begun; not merely kingship or sovereignty over a single city or territory, but sovereignty over separate peoples and territories. For though "the beginning of his kingdom" was the important cities and territories of "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar," his ambition of kingly rule was not satisfied with these; but "out of that land he went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah." Thus it was not only kingship, but kingship expanded into empire, that was begun by Nimrod in the world.

Through a long period of ages Nimrod's example was followed, through the rise and expansion into empire of Elam, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Grecia. Then there arose a people who threw off and utterly repudiated *all kingship and all idea of kingship*; set up a claim of the principle of self-government; and so established a republic—the republic of Rome—a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

But this government of the people, abandoning its claimed principle of self-government, likewise expanded into empire, degenerated into monarchy and imperial despotism, then to such utter corruption that in terrible ruin it was swept totally from the earth.

From the tribes of barbarians who accomplished the destruction of Rome, there were established ten distinct *kingdoms* in the territory that had been Roman. Thus there was again established the principle of distinct *kingship* in government in the world.

Then again, through a period of ages, kingship expanded into empire in a succession of rises and falls, when, in 1776, there arose another people who threw off and utterly repudiated *all kingship and all idea of kingship*; proclaimed the principle of self-government; and so established *another republic*—the republic of the United States—a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

And now this second great republic, which arose upon the repudiation of kingship; upon the proclamation of the principle of self-government; and upon the establishment of government of the people, has also expanded into empire.

Thus the whole history of this world from Nimrod's day unto this year 1902 is expressed in two series of kingships expanding into empire, each followed by the total repudiation of kingship by the enunciation of the principle of self-government and the establishment of a republic—a government of the people, by the people, for the people—and each of these itself expanding into empire: the first, expanding into empire and irretrievable ruin; the second, expanding into empire and — what?

This is an interesting parallel. It is more than interesting: it is intensely suggestive, because the parallel stands, not only in the fact that twice in the world's history has a long period of kingship been followed by the utter repudiation of kingship in the establishment of a republic, but the parallel likewise stands in the careers of these two republics—even to close details.

# Local Option and Sunday Enforcement

By the Editor

WITH the question of local option in its ordinary relation to the liquor traffic we do not deal here, nor is it one with which THE SENTINEL is especially concerned. But the question of local option as related to Sunday enforcement, which is prominent just now in this city and State, is something in which we are concerned and interested.

It is true that the problem of the liquor traffic figures largely in this matter just now, but it is equally true that it is subordinate to the question of Sunday enforcement. The agitation with regard to local option now raging has to do with local option in the regulation of the liquor traffic *on Sunday*. And it has to do with the liquor traffic *on Sunday because of the religious character of that day*. Those who are now denouncing with all the vigor they possess the proposition of local option for New York are not opposed to local option with regard to the liquor traffic, *but to local option in the matter of Sunday observance*. Here are the words of the *Christian Advocate*, which is easily the most able champion of the cause of Sunday enforcement in this matter, on the local option proposition as made by Dr. Lyman Abbott:

This is a strange proposition with regard to *the Sunday question, whatever it might be with regard to the existence of saloons*. The two are wholly unlike. Without a restriction in the law, liquor could be sold exactly like cheese or vegetables; *but Sunday observance is a different question, belonging to the State.* (Italics supplied.)

Scores of other quotations might be given to the same effect, but this is sufficient to confirm what we have stated. The question now raised by the proposi-

tion for local option in New York is whether the State shall control the matter of Sunday observance, or whether it shall be controlled by cities, boroughs, or wards. It is true that the question is raised in connection with the liquor traffic, but nevertheless this is the question.

The attitude of one side in this debate is that it is not a matter to be decided by one locality for another locality, nor for the legislature to decide for all the localities of the State, but for "the people to decide for themselves" by local option. Something is said of "personal liberty," the "right of the individual to decide for himself what is right," and "the right to be governed by the dictates of individual conscience;" but it is not proposed by those who employ such language to do anything more than have the question decided by the smaller political units. It is still to remain a matter for civic action to be decided by ballots and legislation.

The attitude of the other side is that, while local option with regard to the liquor traffic itself might be all right and unobjectionable, the proposition for local option in a matter affecting Sunday observance is nothing less than sacrilegious, and in practise would be utterly demoralizing. On this point we quote again from the *Christian Advocate*:

The effect of submitting the question of open saloons on Sunday to a vote of the city of New York, either as a whole or by boroughs, would be morally disastrous. The average man who voted for open saloons could not be expected to have any deep moral sense of regard for Sunday. The young men who would be dragooned, persuaded, or otherwise induced to vote for open saloons on Sunday would have their sense (if it already exists)

of regard for that day very seriously weakened, if not destroyed.

Notice, the "morally disastrous" effect lies not in the attitude toward the liquor traffic, but in the attitude toward *Sunday*. Again on the same point:

To say that a city should have power to allow the most damaging trade in the whole land, a trade which for hundreds of years no State or city has dared to allow to rank with other trades, but from stern necessity has subjected it to stringent measures of repressive management; to give, we say, a city the right to set an example to the whole State of bestowing the privilege of doing this business on a day on which no business but works of charity and necessity is allowed, would be the transferring to the city a power of legislation upon a class of subjects which cannot be transferred to any subordinate organization whatever without universal demoralization.

\* Owing to its length the above sentence may not be perfectly clear at first, but a second reading will show that the thing which it is declared will bring about "universal demoralization" is not the transfer of the control of so damaging a trade to a city, but the transfer to a city of the power to bestow upon this trade the privilege of doing "business on a day on which no business but works of charity and necessity is allowed." The rub comes not in the power to deal with the liquor traffic, but in the power to regulate Sunday observance, and in this lies "universal demoralization."

Those who are against local option in this matter profess to be astounded at the idea that Sunday observance should be submitted to the test of the ballot-box. The prospect of a man's having the opportunity to vote against the laws which enforce Sunday observance is to them something fearful to contemplate. They cannot understand why the principle of local option should be applied to "the Sabbath." From many sources come words similar to these:

This is not a question of expediency or local convenience. It is world-wide in its character and eternity-reaching in its influence. It is scarcely worth while for men to talk about the law or laws regarding the observance of the Sabbath. Men are free to make laws, but there are laws that were never made by men, and laws which no man can repeal. They are the laws which were thundered down Sinai, and which we call the Ten Commandments.

Such words are supposed to be sufficient to end all debate with regard to local option on anything involving Sunday observance and enforcement.

Now, the plain truth is that both parties to this debate are occupying untenable positions, and out of the mouths of those who hold it is the position of each condemned. The true position in this matter of Sunday observance is that which leaves the action of every individual to the dictates of his own conscience. The most sovereign political power is too local, its sphere is too circumscribed, for it to legislate regarding religious duties and observances, and the smallest political unit is too great and too sovereign to deal with such matters. Such things are to be decided for each individual by his own conscience, and can never rightfully come within the sphere of action of either the greatest or the smallest political power on earth. When those who advocate local option talk of "personal liberty," "the dictates of individual conscience," "the right of the individual to decide for himself," and declare that "the right conscience has no right to impose its will upon the wrong conscience," they strike the right principle. But they fall very far short of its application in the proposition of local option, for the matter is not left with the individual conscience then any more than it is when it is decided by the voters of an entire State.

The proper "local option" in this mat-

ter is that clearly expressed by one who is an authority even to those who hold up their hands in horror at the proposition of local option. Paul, the great Apostle to the Gentiles, who certainly should have known something about the Christian Sabbath, and how its observance was to be regulated, wrote: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own Master he standeth or falleth.

. . . One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*" And One greater than Paul, with equal plainness, laid down the same principle in these words: "If any man hear my words, and believe not [does not obey them], I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, *the same shall judge him in the last day.*"

It is clear that they who suppose that such matters as these are subjects for political action and decision, even if it be done by the very smallest of political units, are mistaken. They who talk of the right of the individual conscience in the matter of Sunday observance and then turn round and propose that the matter be settled at the ballot-box by local option, are inconsistent.

But the inconsistency of the other position is even greater, and it is occupied by people who certainly should know better. If it is such a shocking thing to have local option on the matter of Sunday observance, if it is "a question world-wide in character and eternity-reaching in its influence," if it is such a terrible thing for men to tamper with "the law or laws regarding the observance of the Sabbath," if it is such a monstrous thing for a city to legislate

with regard to "the laws which were thundered down Sinai," by what warrant has the State of New York or any other State or political sovereignty whatever a right to legislate on this subject, and what justification is there for the legislation that exists? What right has any State or government to take "the laws which were thundered down Sinai" and, placing its own construction and interpretation on them, enforce them upon every individual regardless of the rights and dictates of conscience? This differentiation between State and municipal authority in this matter is the idlest kind of nonsense. They who insist that the State shall control this matter are preëminently the advocates of local option in a matter which the Creator of men has withheld from all human authority.

We are told that the effect of submitting this question of Sunday enforcement to the vote of a city, "either as a whole or by borough, would be morally disastrous," because the man who voted against it "could not be expected to have any deep moral sense of regard for Sunday," and the young men who were called upon to vote on such a question "would have their sense of regard for that day very seriously weakened, if not destroyed." Now it is quite likely that people who got the impression that the morality or sacredness of a certain thing depended upon the way the majority took a notion to vote on election day, would not be inspired with any deep moral sense of regard for such thing, and if they already had any such sense of regard for it that it would soon be "very seriously weakened, if not destroyed." The man who had the degrading impression that moral duty could be determined by political action would not be likely to have any very

deep moral sense of regard for anything. But who can explain why voting on a question in a municipal election would be so morally disastrous, while voting on the very same question in a State or national election is all right? The effect must of course be the same, yet the advocates of Sunday enforcement profess to be astounded at the one while by their very demand for such enforcement they are heartily in favor of the other. They see in the one terrible moral disaster, and in the other everything that is desirable!

The laws of the State and nation must rest upon the popular will, and they who demand that Sunday enforcement shall be a part of these laws are no people to be crying out about the morally disastrous effect of voting on this question. They are the people upon whom rests the responsibility for making this a matter to be settled by ballot, and their attitude shows that they believe that such moral and religious matters as Sabbath observance can properly be settled in that way. Let them, then, not be so ready to decry the test of local option. If religion is to cease to be a matter of conscience and to become a matter of civil legislation, let there be no shrinking from the methods by which civil legislation is accomplished. If the church is determined that her institutions shall have the force of the ballot box behind them, let her not be surprised that there are those who insist that those institutions shall be brought to the test of the ballot box.

We are told that the transfer "to any subordinate organization whatever" of the power to legislate with regard to Sunday observance could not be made "without universal demoralization." This is said on the assumption that Sunday observance is required by "the laws

which were thundered down Sinai"—in short, that Sunday observance is Sabbath observance. Now, when and where did the Author of the Ten Commandments ever authorize any such "subordinate organization" as the State of New York or any other political power to legislate with regard to Sabbath observance? No such authorization has ever been made, no such power has ever been delegated. But the transfer of such power has been quite widely assumed, and this has resulted in considerable demoralization, and it will certainly end up in "universal demoralization" if it continues. It seems to have so demoralized large numbers of very earnest religious people that they cannot see that "the laws which were thundered down Sinai" had nothing whatever to say about Sunday observance. It seems to have so demoralized great numbers of American Protestants that they seem perfectly willing to disregard and to trample upon that great American and Protestant principle which denies to the civil magistrate the right to intrude into matters of faith and conscience. It seems to have so demoralized able and intelligent men that they can take the most illogical and inconsistent positions. While demanding the enforcement of a religious observance purely and simply because of its religious character, they declare that they would never think of claiming the right to enforce that observance as a *religious* institution! Verily, demoralization has resulted from the assumption that the Creator of the Sabbath has transferred to civil government the right to regulate its observance.

Now, we are aware that all this will appear to have very little practical bearing on the present question of local option in New York. But we are confident

that it all has a practical bearing on the question of Sunday enforcement, whether it be considered from the standpoint of local option or otherwise. As we have shown, there is no essential difference, so far as the true principle in the matter is concerned, between the position of those who want local option and those who insist upon State control. Of course local option presents the better aspect, and, if Sunday observance were a proper subject for civil legis-

lation, it certainly would be the most fair, just and sensible way to deal with the matter. But Sunday observance is not such a subject; it does not come within the proper sphere of civil legislation. Hence, there is little choice between the two policies now discussed. The agitation affords an opportunity to call attention to the true principle that should govern in the matter, and that is what we have attempted to do in this article.

## "National Christianity" on Exhibition

By W. N. Glenn

OUR national Christianity" is to have a "suitable exhibit" at the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition at St. Louis in 1904, under the auspices of the National Reform Association. It will be interesting to see how "our national Christianity" will suitably represent its death-dealing work in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. It is well known that the professed Christian element took the lead in forcing President McKinley (against his better judgment) into the war with Spain. But for the "Christian" clamor, intensified by the *Maine* incident, there is little reason to suppose that the President would have yielded to the politicians and the speculators. Even after the war he expressed confidence that he could have accomplished the amelioration of the Cuban condition by means of diplomacy, and was on a fair way to a consummation of that purpose when forced into the war.

The death of thousands of Americans, West Indians, and Filipinos, the disabling of thousands more, and the impoverishment of other thousands—to say

nothing of the demoralization of many other tens of thousands by the excitement of war and the infusion of the war spirit among the people at large—is in great measure due to the influence of "our national Christianity." The Christianity of Jesus Christ would never seize the property of a neighbor (even though forcibly acquired and unjustly held) under the pretense of furthering the interests of a third party, and then withhold and virtually appropriate the property. The Christianity of Jesus Christ never would encourage and assist in the devastation of even an enemy's property, and then take what was left to pay the expense. Only a national, political, or otherwise merely nominal, Christianity could find pretext for such work.

It is not difficult to see how a civil government, in its worldly capacity of conservator of the peace, in furtherance of its calling to protect men from the interference of marauders against their natural rights, may come in violent contact with evil men or oppressive nations.

It is easy to see how a policeman, as a policeman, may resist evil men, or even assume the aggressive in order to prevent violence reasonably expected. But the Christian is positively forbidden by his Master to resort to physical combat under any pretext.

The United States Government, as an institution of the world, even in going so far as to interfere between another nation and its oppressed subjects, stands in a position very different from the United States Government in a Christian garb taking up arms even in self-defense. A human government is essentially of the world, being instituted solely for use in the world, because the world is separated from God and will not be governed by His law. Therefore we expect it to deal with those whom it is designed to control, and to take such steps for the protection of all whom it is designed to protect as circumstances may demand or reason require. However, being of the world, and for the world, its legitimate sphere is limited to the world, in contradistinction to the kingdom of Christ, which "is not of the world."

But when a government professes to be Christian it virtually professes to have come out from the world, to have put away the ways of the world, to have become "a new creature," with a new nature and a new purpose. Professing to be Christian, it professes to fashion its life after the life of Christ, and to set up the Golden Rule as its standard of life. Professing to be Christian in principle, it is obligated to put away the principles of the world, to lay down carnal weapons, to love its neighbor as itself—yea, even its enemies—and when smitten on one cheek to meekly turn the other. This is the way the true Christian individual does, and the National Reformers have all along maintained that the nation is a

moral person, amenable to the law of God as such. Therefore, while not assuming to criticise the acts of the Government in its legitimate sphere as a world power (and the best in the world), we have a right to expect, on its profession of Christianity, that it will put away the ways of the world. The Government has no more right than an individual to misrepresent Christianity by a false profession.

Assuming for the nonce that "this is a Christian nation," and that its warfare on Spain and on the Filipinos was and is in line with "our national Christianity," what would be the nature of a "suitable exhibit" at such an exposition? True Christianity cannot be put on exhibition in that way. Its good works are shown in ministering to the needy throughout the land. Its fruit is "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance"; and these cannot be placed on ostentatious display. So, if we are to have a "Christian" display on popular exhibition, it must needs be of "national Christianity," or of some other fictitious sort.

In such an exhibit, patriotic pictures of the "Christian" conflict in which our nation has been engaged would be appropriate, for ornamentation at least. War always includes all its adjuncts and incidents, and the government that assumes the responsibility of carrying on a war is deemed accountable for all the acts of its army. Before suggesting a picture to grace the "suitable exhibit" it is proper to call attention to the fact that it is "civilized warfare" that our "Christian nation" has been waging in the Philippines, and that "our national Christianity" is trying to impress the natives with the beauties of such profession through a "suitable exhibition" of it in their midst.



In this connection two pictures suggest themselves. One would represent a scene described by a returned sergeant of a Western regiment, who seemed to relish its recital. A member of the regiment deserted and went over to the enemy. Some time afterward he was wounded in an engagement and captured. His captors did not belong to his particular regiment, but some of them had known him, and now recognized him. So, without further ceremony, he was run through with bayonets, held up, and shot to death in that position. The sergeant who told the story to a press reporter boastfully said that if the deserter had fallen into the hands of members of his own regiment he would have been served worse than that.

The second picture would represent a scene where the dead bodies of Filipinos were used to fill up a moat so that some army wagons could be drawn over. This was told to the writer by a young private soldier who had witnessed the act. The same young man, who was wounded in the battle of Manila, told of seeing his comrades coolly shoot down inoffensive, unarmed natives just for sport. And when he remonstrated with them, they derided him as being a "nigger lover."

It is not the purpose of this article to show that war by the Government of the United States is any worse than war by

any other government. These instances would not be mentioned at all but for the persistent claim that "this is a Christian nation." It is not the Government as such that is under consideration; it is the claim of Christianity for a government that engages in work to which such scenes are incidental. The acts of the army to which allusion has been made were committed under the flag of the Government; so that if the Government insists on its Christian profession, logically these acts must pass as "national Christianity."

Neither is it the purpose of this article to detract one jot or tittle from the good Christian work that has been done by individuals of the nation, either under their own responsibility or under the auspices of churches and societies. But such work is not "national Christianity." All that can be said in the nation's behalf is that it has in the main (although there have been exceptions) protected men in their right to live out and to proclaim the gospel of Christ. Yet this has been done to more or less extent by every government on earth to-day, as far as known, even by those professedly opposed to Christianity. Therefore a mere police protection is not Christianity. The idea of "national Christianity" is sheer fiction, and every attempted display in that name can be only fictitious.



The State superintendent of the press department of the New York W.C.T.U. says with regard to the demand for the legalizing of Sunday liquor selling: "Scientific temperance truths with the authority of reputable and able scientists are the replies needed, rather than the moral and religious argument in regard to Sabbath-keeping." This is a wise ob-

servation. "The moral or religious argument in regard to Sabbath-keeping" is no argument upon which to base civil legislation, and the W.C.T.U., in its efforts to secure legislation against the liquor traffic, will do well to turn from this argument to those that are more consistent with the proper objects of civil government.

# The Papal Theory of the Relation Between Church and State

## I.

[No one can understand the subject of the relation of religion and government, or can be prepared for the religio-political subtleties of these times, who is not well acquainted with the theory of the Roman Catholic Church in this matter. The Papacy is the outward and organic expression of the idea of the union and alliance of church and state, and the papal theory is the masterpiece in this matter. Its philosophy and its history must be understood by those who would be useful to the cause of freedom. In order that the readers of THE SENTINEL may have the benefit of an exposition of this theory from a Catholic standpoint, we will reproduce in a series of articles an essay on this subject from a work entitled, "Essays on Religion and Literature" (second series), edited by Archbishop (later Cardinal) Manning, and published by Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1867. It was written by Edmund Sheridan Purcell, and the full title is: "Church and State, or The Relation Between the Spiritual and the Civil Powers." In order that the author's meaning may not be obscured in any degree, punctuation and capitalization will be followed exactly. Occasional comments in the form of notes will be made. This essay not only shows that the declaration sometimes made by Catholics in this country that that church does not believe in the use of force in religious matters and is in accord with the doctrine of separation of church and state, is without foundation, but to those who will give careful attention it will show the still more important fact that the theory with regard to the relation between religion and civil government that is now commonly proclaimed in the ranks of Protestantism in this and some other countries is identical with the papal theory.—Editor.]

THE relation between the spiritual and temporal powers has two aspects, it may be viewed either theoretically or historically; but the historical examination is unsatisfactory without having a theory to work up to, a perfect ideal before the mind's eye to serve as a criterion to the judgment. Such an ideal is to be found in the character which Christianity gradually impressed on the civil power in its relation to the Church. After tracing out the true principle which governs these relations my object is to illustrate the theory by a rapid examination of those great facts and turning-points in history, in which the Church and the State, either in unity or in antagonism, played so conspicuous a part. In the beginning, indeed, the Church had to show that she could stand alone, that she had no need of king or kaiser. Men had to be attracted towards her by her own inherent power; kings had to learn that their rule stood in need of her sanction, their royal authority of her consecration. After three centuries of persecution the Civil Power stretched forth its hand, as I hereafter propose to show, not by way merely of reconciliation, but for a close and intimate alliance. The Christian theory of this intimate union between the

Church and the Civil Power is in a great measure to be gathered from the teachings of the Popes themselves; for this purpose I have consulted many of the most important of the Papal Bulls and Decretals, together with the critical comments of the annotators. The opinions, too, of some of the most approved authorities of antiquity in support of this theory will be found either quoted or referred to in frequent notes. Among modern authorities I owe much to an eminent German Catholic writer on history and canon law, whose learning and orthodoxy are beyond question, but on some important points, on which his judgment is, as it seems to me, in decided opposition to his own principles, I have not hesitated to differ from his views; and, finally, to every statement quoted, after verifying it, I have given its proper reference. I say so much in order to avoid the appearance of making statements on so difficult a subject without at least such support as the quoted opinions of writers of authority, either ancient or modern, must ever needs impart.

If, then, the care of divine things, as is laid down by the greatest philosopher (Aristot. *Polit.*) of heathen antiquity, be the first business of the State, how much

more is not a Christian entitled to claim religion as the primary basis of all government. Although with the Jews only God made His covenant, and though to His chosen people alone He gave the new promise, yet the law of God was written in the heart of the heathen, and the Pagan State prepared the way for the coming of the Church. The State, divine in its origin, preserved among the heathen nations the principle of authority and the idea of religion. Though distorted and confused, the primitive revelation was dimly visible in the laws and usages, in the oath and in the curse, in the prayer and the sacrifice of the heathen world. Even in the human sacrifices the idea is reflected that the sin of man can only be redeemed by the blood of man. The image of God, then, though distorted and transmuted, was everywhere visible in the heathen world. Cicero tells us that: "Ipsisque in hominibus nulla gens est, neque tam mansueta, neque tam fera, quae non, etiamsi ignoret qualem habere Deum debeat, tamen habendum sciat." (Cic. *De Off.*) But wherever the idea of God existed there religion was a public institution. A State without religion, public life without a sacrifice and a sacrificial priest, was an idea unknown to the Pagan world. Such an idea is due to the fictitious enlightenment of the nineteenth century, and its practise is reserved to the United States, in the New World, and in Europe, as yet, to Belgium alone.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph is important. Let it be carefully noted that the doctrine that the care of divine things is the first business of the state, and that religion is the basis of civil government, is of heathen and pagan origin, and from that source it was received by "the Church." Let it also be noted that the idea adopted by the United States with reference to the relation of religion and civil government was one "unknown to the pagan world," and which we are told "is due to the fictitious enlightenment of the nineteenth century." As we shall see later, the papal doctrine in this matter is but a continuation of the pagan doctrine under the externals of Christianity; for "the Pagan state [divine in its origin," and with the care of religion as its chief business] prepared the way for the coming of the church [which perpetuated the same practise of the union of religion and the state, with this change, that the state was no longer su-

In some of the nations of antiquity, as in Egypt, the sacerdotal authority even absorbed the royal power; in the Roman Empire, on the other hand, the high-priesthood was annexed to the Imperial dignity. But Christianity, rejecting these two opposite extremes of error, introduced just relations between the temporal and spiritual powers. The Church was not identified with the State, neither did it absorb the royal power. The two powers were united, but distinct. One of the first relations, however, of the Church to the State is its recognition of the divine origin of the civil power and its inculcation of the universal duty of obedience. But this obedience is not to be of a slavish character, but a willing and lawful subjection. It is the duty of the State on its side to protect the rights of every man and to provide for all a quiet and well-regulated life, and in this manner to cooperate with the Church, whose divine character it is bound to recognize, in the common end of leading men to salvation. The Church, on the other hand, in virtue of the power which she has received from God, has the right to require from the civil governor, as from the individual Christian, that he should receive from her hands the divine law, and act in obedience to her interpretation of its precepts. In this obedience lies the basis of the relation between the Church and the Civil Power. (Philipp's *Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii.)<sup>2</sup>

preme, but became the tool of the ecclesiastical machine]. This last state was worse than the first.

<sup>2</sup> That is, the basis for the proper relation between the church and the civil power, from the papal standpoint, lies neither in the absolute union nor in the separation of the two powers, but in the absolute subserviency of the civil power to the church. This sort of distinction and separation between church and state is gaining favor rapidly in this country today. This idea is supposed to be something new by those religio-political "reformers" who, with Sunday bills and other religious measures in their hands, blandly declare that they are as much opposed to a union of church and state as anybody; that all they want is that the state shall be "animated and controlled by religion." This idea is as old as the Papacy—in fact the Papacy is this idea manifested in visible and organic form.

The Church confirms civil authority by teaching that it is a divine right: "Altogether by divine providence are the kingdoms of men founded," says St. Augustine; (*Prorsus divina providentia constituuntur regna humana.* Augustin. *De Civitate Dei*, vol. 1.) not that individual kings are immediately instituted by God, but that the power by which they rule is of God. Kings are the representatives of God, the executors of His will, but only when they are members of the Church can they have a right conception of their dignity, and of their duties. The Christian Emperors were conscious of the divine source of their power. Unreproved by the Church they applied to themselves the designation "our divinity;" (L. *Decere*. 3. para. ut autem. 4. Cod. d. summa Trin.) they regarded their commands as "divine precepts," (L. *Decere*. 3. para. Quoniam. 3. i.) their ordinances as "divine favours," (L. *Sacrilegii*, s. Cod. d. divers. resc. ) and denounced disobedience to themselves as "sacrilegious." But these ideas of their own dignity in the Christian Emperors, unlike those of their heathen predecessors on the throne, were not that they thought themselves gods, but only in order that the divine authority might be the more honored in them and in the ordinances which they issued on behalf of the Church. The imperial dignity was regarded from the same point of view, also in the Church. Pope Leo, the Great, in his letters to the emperors, without on that account considering them priests in any way, spoke of their "royal power and priestly zeal," (Leon. M. *Epist.* 115. ad Marcianum, c. 1.) of their "royal and priestly mind," (*Epist.* 155 ad Anatol. c. 2.) of their "royal power and priestly knowledge," (*Epist.* 116 ad Pulcher. c. 1). In this sense the council of Chalcedon hailed Marcian as "priest and em-

peror." Constantine likewise, conscious of his position in regard to the Church, called himself "episcopus ab extra."

In the same way, during the Middle Ages, the imperial dignity was looked upon as a priestly office; on solemn occasions the emperors, therefore, wore the deacon's robe, representing themselves thereby as the advocates of the Church. (Philipp's *Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii., chap. x.) Though they were less than priests, they were more than laymen. They were the anointed of the Lord, the ministers of God's eternal justice. In this conception of their character there was, it is true, an obvious danger in the opportunity and temptation to encroach upon the domain of spiritual government.<sup>3</sup> However that may be, human nature is so constituted that to attain its proper end it stands in need of external assistance, and since the end of this life is happiness in the hereafter world, so, as St. Thomas teaches, it is the business of the Civil Power so to order society as to be best adapted to the attainment of that end. (Thom. Aquin. *de princip. regim.* lib. i. c. 15). But in this ordering of society it stands to reason that the Civil Power, since the end to be worked for is beyond its jurisdiction, must labour in subordination to the Church. Just in this respect the Civil Power is the servant of God; following the directions of the Church "it helps," as St. Gregory says, "those who are in-

<sup>3</sup> The danger that they might encroach upon the rights of the people over whom, according to "the Church," they ruled by divine right as "the anointed of the Lord," does not seem to occasion any apprehension or anxiety on the part of the exponents of this theory whereby civil offices are made priestly offices, and the basest of men, if they happen to be in some position of civil authority, are thereby "advocates of the Church" and may don "the deacon's robe." The only occasion of concern seems to be the danger that they may "encroach upon the domain of the spiritual government." Never mind how arrogant and despotic the civil ruler may be, the only concern of "the Church" is that he is in subordination to her authority. This whole theory with regard to the position and character of civil rulers has been one of the most fruitful sources of despotism that the world has known.

clined to good, it makes broader the narrow way, and thus the earthly serves the heavenly kingdom." (Gregor. M. lib. iii. ep. 65.)<sup>4</sup>

## A Great "Trade-Mark" Stolen

[The following article, which was sent to us by a seventh-day observer of Camden, N. J., who requests that his name be not published, strikingly calls attention to a vital fact that has a very important bearing on the matter of Sunday enforcement. The question as to what day is the true Sabbath does not of course affect the principle of the enforcement of a religious observance by law; that is wrong whether the day be the true Sabbath or not. But it is very interesting in connection with the demand for the enforcement of Sunday as the Sabbath to recur to the facts which show that Sunday is not the Sabbath in any sense whatever, and has no right whatever to the title which it has not only fraudulently appropriated, but by the power of law seeks to compel all to receive and accept. There is every reason to believe that this fraudulent character of the Sunday "sabbath" is what gives rise to the application of the false principle of religious enforcement in its behalf.—Editor.]

IN the commerce of the world it has been deemed desirable to protect the rights of each individual from being encroached upon by wrongdoers, and to this end nations have set up a law for the protection of trade-marks, so that when a person shall have created a particular device which distinguishes the goods which such person shall have manufactured, no one else is permitted to imitate such designating brand or mark, and if there is such an overstepping of the bounds of what is considered common honesty, the law can be invoked to stop the infringement of the trade-mark.

The trade-mark laws of the United States, entitled "An Act to authorize the registration of trade-marks and to protect the same," leads persons, firms and corporations to register their trade-marks, and the law gives them protection in the use of the same for a period of

thirty years. One of the principal objects of the law thus enacted by Congress is to prevent another from appropriating such trade-mark for use in the same class of merchandise, or one so nearly resembling it as to be likely "to cause confusion or mistake in the mind of the public, or to deceive purchasers." It is considered to be wrongdoing to imitate another's trade-mark, or to make a similar device which will be likely to confuse the mind of the public or deceive purchasers, and the courts of the nation give careful attention to the facts brought before them in suits for infringement of such a right to such a device. The defense of a right under this law is considered so important that the judges of the Supreme Court devote themselves to a most careful review of the matter, and upon proper showing those who infringe the right of another by appropriating a trade-mark are severely fined and enjoined to desist.

Now, the same grave judges who pronounce against a comparatively trivial infringement of trade-mark rights, and the sixteen or more nations which have entered into an international arrangement for the protection of such rights, completely ignore this principle in a matter of far greater importance. By many decisions and many laws they have

<sup>4</sup> There are many "saints" of the Gregory type to-day who proceed on the theory that under the direction and control of the church the civil government can be brought where it can be said of it: "It helps those who are inclined to good, it makes broader the narrow way, and thus the earthly serves the heavenly kingdom." Notice, it is recognized that the attainment of "happiness in the hereafter world" is an end beyond the jurisdiction of civil government. But instead of that being recognized as a sufficient reason why the civil power should let the matter of the attainment of happiness in the hereafter life entirely alone, it is looked upon as simply meaning that the civil power, in pursuing its "business" of so ordering society that it will "be best adapted to the attainment of that end" (the end beyond its jurisdiction), "must labor in subordination to the Church." Nothing must deprive the ecclesiastical machine of the control of the civil power.

imitated Another's trade-mark in a way that is likely to confuse the mind of the public, and to deceive those who are seeking for the true way in the matter. They declare Sunday to be the Sabbath, and have done what they could to make Sunday the Sabbath. This is simply to do on a very large scale what on a small scale is pronounced by human laws, by these very nations and judges themselves, to be wrongdoing, for it is most certainly an attempt to infringe upon the rights of the Lord of the Sabbath and of all for whom the Sabbath was made.

The attempt to make Sunday take the place of the Sabbath *as the Sabbath*, by calling it such, is comparatively modern. The languages of the Latin races indicate that the change in the use of the title which the seventh day of the week has always had—the Sabbath day—has not taken place in their use of words, as would probably have been the case if the title of the Sabbath had been accorded to Sunday by the Roman Catholic Church during a long period. In the language of “the eldest son of the church”—Spain—there is a clear distinction made between the Sabbath and Sunday, and as this is in the very language itself it has a very important significance. The days of the week as told off in Spanish are:

Lunes .....	Monday
Martes .....	Tuesday
Mierceles .....	Wednesday
Jueves .....	Thursday
Viernes .....	Friday
Sabado (the Sabbath).....	Saturday
Domingo (the Lord's day).....	Sunday

In a catechism of the Roman Catholic Church, entitled “A Catechism of Christian Doctrine,” prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1890, is the following question (p. 62):

Q. Why does the Church command us to keep Sunday holy instead of the Sabbath?

Here is a clear distinction made between Sunday and the Sabbath, and the possibility of calling Sunday “the Sabbath” in this connection is cut off. The leaders of the people know full well that Sunday is not the Sabbath day, and that there is no sanctification attaching to Sunday as a day to be religiously observed as the Sabbath day.

In the very end of the sixteenth century the Rev. Nicholas Bound, of England, gave the title of “the Sabbath” to the first day of the week, and the first religious body to make use of this title as its official name for Sunday was the Presbyterian denomination. Both the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian churches publish officially “Lessons for Sunday,” and observe the day as Sunday.

When the protesting branch of the church, under the leadership of Luther, emerged from the rule of Rome, the new denomination, which is now known as the Lutherans, published its creed under the name of “The Augsburg Confession,” which is still the rule of faith and practise of that denomination. On page 40 of an edition of this creed, published at Philadelphia, it is stated in italics that, “if any person thinks that it is necessary to observe Sunday, he is mistaken.” But this great denomination went on from that first day of their existence keeping Sunday. Why?

Calvin, the head of orthodoxy, stated that there was no need of Sunday observance and no moral obligation attaching to its observance; that Thursday would answer as well as Sunday, and that it was not obligatory to keep any day. Yet Calvin kept Sunday to all outward appearances, although he privately played “bowls” or tenpins, as we term it. Why did Calvin do as he did?

The early Quakers published their views of Sunday observance as follows:

"We know no moral obligation by the Fourth Commandment, or elsewhere, to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or of any holiness in it." But they kept Sunday. Why? The reason is given by Barclay, the Quaker writer of two centuries ago. He tells of the convention at Augsburg, in the year 1530, where the Elector of Saxony was commanded by the Roman Catholic Emperor, Charles V., to be present at mass, that he might carry the sword before him, according to his place, which the Elector of Saxony scrupled to do, but the ministers of the newly-formed Protestant faith, taking more care for the prince's honor than for his conscience, persuaded him to do it against his conscience. The refusal to perform the duties of his office would have made the Elector a breaker of the law, and might have cost him his life. It was easier to perform the slight but wrong act than to be led into a deadly conflict with the Emperor, who had armies at his disposal.

The same conditions existed with regard to Sunday observance. While the ministers and the protesting people dared to publish that it was not necessary to observe Sunday, they were careful to obey the law, and to observe the day. So, too, were the followers of Calvin, and the early Quakers.

There are also modern religious leaders who have spoken plainly what they knew to be the real facts regarding Sunday observance and the unwarranted custom of calling that day the Sabbath. A bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church has, not so very long ago, stated publicly that it seemed desirable to change the day to be religiously observed from Sunday to Thursday, and others have discussed the same change. Cardinal Gibbons, the highest Roman Catholic

authority in this country, in his book entitled, "The Faith of Our Fathers," p. 111, in urging that Sunday is strictly a Roman Catholic Church day, and separating it from the Sabbath day, says:

You may search the Bible from Genesis to Revelation and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday.

And within the present generation admissions have been made to the same effect by prominent representatives of almost every Protestant denomination.

The observance of Sunday in former times under the stress of force might be excused had the people returned to the observance of the true Sabbath when the fear of force was removed. But things went from bad to worse, and now not only is the spurious day of rest observed, but it has been given the title of the Sabbath, in open defiance of Him who named the seventh day the Sabbath, saying: "*The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.*" In this God is robbed even as a man is robbed when his trade-mark is taken by another and placed upon other goods than those which it was designed to mark.

God is the Lord of the Sabbath, which is the seventh day of the week, and when this title is used as it is by those who place it upon the first day of the week, then the distinguishing mark of God's day is infringed upon, so that the public mind is deceived and the true seeker for the right way is confused and a great wrong is wrought. Those who thus appropriate the Sabbath title should learn a lesson from the principle which obtains among men with regard to trade-marks, and should be just as careful not to appropriate God's trade-mark as they are not to appropriate the trade-marks which belong to men.

# The Great Subject of Sunday Legislation

[Preface to the new and revised edition of Dr. A. H. Lewis's work on "Sunday Legislation." For notice concerning this book see page 261].

**I**N view of the immediate attention directed toward Sunday legislation in the State and city of New York, and its increasing and pressing importance in other States where new legislation is being considered or is in progress, and in response to a demand frequently expressed, this volume has been revised and brought down to the current year.

\* \* \* \* \*

The acute and widespread interest in the situation in New York is justified by the gravity of that situation. The late municipal election in that city turned upon the question of Sunday legislation and its relation to the liquor traffic. The widely divergent opinions of those who must meet the issues forced to the front by the present situation indicate the need of a study of the whole question of Sunday legislation such as has not been made by the American people nor by their legislators. This book furnishes ample and accurate material for such study.

The purity of municipal government in the United States is a potent factor in national politics and destiny. New York City determines the political status of the Empire State in a large degree. Sunday legislation is now a determining factor in the politics of the city. The reform party in power came in on that issue, and coming elections will turn around the same issue. It will be possible for the State of New York to decide the next national election; hence the question of Sunday legislation in the immediate future may determine who shall be the next President of the United States. With such possibilities in sight, the facts

spread over the following pages may well command attention and study.

Sunday legislation, unsupported by a state church, has had no adequate test in history until within the last century in the United States. The organic unity of history and the relation between causes and effects must be recognized in considering the present situation. That situation has not come by accident. It has been evolved through the loss of religious regard for Sunday, compulsory idleness on Sunday, and a system of legislation which has made the liquor traffic a great commercial and political power, protected and legalized on other days, but made criminal on Sunday. Sunday is the harvest-day for the saloon and the brothel, in no small degree, through the causes just mentioned. The powerful liquor traffic will continue to fatten on Sunday by legal permission, or by purchased permission, through blackmail. Leisure demanded by religious convictions is a blessing. Idleness enforced by law is a curse which fosters all the lower vices. These facts form the *crux* of the present situation touching Sunday legislation in New York and in the United States. Every man is bound to study such a situation and the causes which have produced it and which will continue it unless new ground is taken. No intelligent consideration of the case, as it is now focalized in New York and as it exists in the country at large, can be made without a knowledge of the sources from which Sunday legislation has come and the results its evolution has produced. Hence the value of this book at this time.

It must also be kept in mind that the



present situation is not fortuitous, but inevitable. Adequate and imperative causes lie back of all such results in history. The evolution of fundamental principles creates such crises, and these come with little regard for our choices, though our experiments and mistakes may hasten or retard them. Epochs and crises are the verdicts of history concerning the plans and theories of men. To escape from these verdicts is impossible. To persist in a given course against them is ruinous. Neither prayers, creeds, nor ballots can check the evolution of history or discount their final results.

Sunday legislation began in the pagan state church of the Roman Empire, as the following pages show. To the Romans religion was only a department of civil government. The emperor had absolute power to appoint days in honor of the gods, and the first Sunday edict was purely pagan in honor of the Sun God. Much of the genius of the Roman Empire passed into the first great state church—the Roman Catholic. Legislation touching Sunday and many associate days was a prominent feature in the history of that church through the centuries of its supremacy in Europe. The reformers of the sixteenth century continued such legislation. Puritanism invented a new religious theory of Sunday observance and supported it by rigid civil laws. These were fully enforced under the theocracy of the colonial period in America. From that time to the present the evolution of Sunday legislation in the United States has gone forward rapidly, and the following verdicts now demand consideration:

(1) The successful enforcement of Sunday legislation has never been attained except when men have had conscientious regard for it because imposed by the state church, as under Roman

Catholic rule, or because of divine authority believed to be embodied in the civil law, as under Cromwell and in the New England theocracy.

(2) The evolution of Sunday legislation under the state-church system in Europe has resulted in the "Continental Sunday." That result was inevitable.

(3) Christians and non-Christians now agree that Sunday laws cannot be enforced on religious grounds; nevertheless, the Sunday laws continue to be self-contradictory by making things which are intrinsically good and desirable up to 12 o'clock on Saturday night criminal for the next twenty-four hours. A law which makes it a crime not to be idle for a specific number of hours in each week cannot stand the tests of logic and common sense in this twentieth century.

(4) Enforced idleness, under Sunday laws, strengthens the saloon and the brothel, and makes Sunday their best harvest-time. This is one reason why the saloon seeks for legalized opening.

(5) The worst evils of the present time will continue and increase until idleness on Sunday is made permissive and not compulsory. Compelling all men to be idle on a given day, when religious convictions do not demand idleness, fosters the lower types of holidayism and debauchery. The situation in New York City is an index of the situation in all our larger cities.

(6) Two alternatives are at the door, and the American people must choose between them:

(a) The strengthening and perpetuating of the liquor traffic and its associate evils, through the present system of compulsory idleness on Sundays and legalized saloons on all other days.

(b) A new departure which will secure permissive and protected rest to each employed person for one day in the

week, the day being determined by the employed person and the employer. Meanwhile, legislation touching the liquor traffic *should separate that traffic from all other forms of business.*

(7) These are some of the verdicts which history has recorded concerning Sunday legislation; prayers and politics will strive in vain to evade them or the logical results yet to follow.



## A Sunday Observer on Sunday Enforcement

[Under the heading, "Sunday Observance: Church and State," there appears in a recent issue of *The Church Standard* (Episcopalian), Philadelphia, a communication from Mr. Frederick S. Jewell, who is evidently a strict churchman and an earnest believer in the sacred and binding character of Sunday observance. But he sees the wrongfulness of the attempt to enforce that observance by law. We are glad to reprint such words, and we sincerely wish that instead of one there were hundreds of such articles being written by Sunday observers. We are certain that if the great mass of the believers in Sunday sacredness would take the position here expressed that their influence would be far more effective against "the inroads of the Continental Sunday" than it is ever likely to be as a result of the attitude now assumed.—Editor.]

WITH regard to the observance of Sunday, the question for us is one of morality and religion. This phase of it falls outside the province of the state altogether. So far as morality is concerned, the state, as has been seen, has only a limited, indirect, restrictive power. With religion, here as elsewhere, the state has nothing to do. We have no state religion; no one sect can be recognized; and what is euphemistically called "our common Christianity" is too vague, diffuse, and fog-like to be civilly tangible. The protection which the state gives to religious bodies and their assemblages is no more than is the right of all peaceable and well-meaning citizens. The favor shown to church property is due to the unspeculative character of church institutions, and their influence in favor of general peace and good order. Beyond this the state has to maintain a position of practical neutrality with regard to religious questions.

With the church the case is quite different. Her field is that of morality and religion. It is her express work to cultivate virtue and piety. In fact, she exists for no other purpose. Whatever else she does must be genuine and purely subsidiary to that end. It must be a congenial

and consistent means to that end. Manifestly the state has and can have no such function. There is another radical and irreconcilable difference between the two: the state seeks to regulate or control the outward act only; the church labors to transform the inward disposition. The state, therefore, concerns itself with the individual simply as related to the whole; the church, on the contrary, concerns itself with the whole as simply a reflex of the individual. And this of necessity, for virtue and piety are the attributes of individuals. There is no such thing as a corporate virtue and piety. Furthermore, there is this other difference: the state operates as an authority with an appeal to force. The church can act only as an influence, or through its exemplification of the True, the Beautiful and the Good. It is "a city set on a hill"—a model from which the world may learn, and after the pattern of which it may build, if it will. It is "the light of the world." It may illuminate and reveal to the state and society the only path to purity and peace. But it may do this, not by striving to kindle their own light, but by keeping alive the effulgence of its own beams.

Hence, with regard to the observance

of Sunday, the proper work of the church is, as with all so-called reforms, not that of reforming society and the state, but that of reforming itself, and thus presenting them with a reformed and righteously regulated society or body politic, as a guiding and inspiring model. So far as any other species of public reformatory effort is concerned—certainly any direct attack on either social or governmental abuses—the New Testament Scriptures gives no sign of any such privilege or prerogative as belonging to the church. On the contrary, both in precept and principle, their whole tenor is adverse to the notion that she has, or can have, any such world mission. Moreover, history shows that whenever she has taken any direct part in the affairs of the state, either ruling or reformatory, she has been forced into worldly compromises; and, whether she has bettered the state or not, she has been herself proportionately corrupted.

When, then, the church in its organic capacity, or as represented by her chief officers, or as speaking through the pulpit, descends into the arena of public affairs, and denounces the state, its officers, or its laws, or seeks to control its legislation or engineer its reforms, it is arrogating to itself a prerogative which the state, as concerned for the whole, may with even greater consistency insist upon exercising over the church. If the church may undertake to reform the state, why may not the state, if it sees fit, return the favor, and impose its reforms upon the church? However this may be, the student of the Christian Scriptures cannot but see in such a course in the church and its ministers a grave departure from the terms of its original, divine commission, and an assumption of a power and a privilege which are wholly of human devising, and the exercise of which will

prove in the end a detriment to itself rather than a benefit to others.

Applying these principles to the question of Sunday observance, it will be seen that the proper work of the church as a Christian organization is, first of all and directly, and positively, only within itself. Its duty is, not to attempt the elevation of the general public to, or even towards, its own proper standard of observance. For the laboring masses, Sunday is practically a survival of the old Jewish civil day of rest. Many things in the hard conditions of multitudes of forlorn wage-earners demand for them a Sunday license which it were a sin and a shame for the church to tolerate within its membership. For the church, indeed for all who profess and call themselves Christians, Sunday as the Lord's Day is—as the Mosaic Sabbath was not—holy time, a day not legislated into formal being, but begotten of the sacred and solemn associations of the Resurrection, and as such, spontaneous in the grateful devotion of the church, transformed into a period devoted to spiritual refreshment as well as to secular rest, and to the worship of God as well as to the improvement of man. It is designed also to stand as a constantly recurring token to the surrounding world of the fact that man has a spiritual nature, the claims and capabilities of which transcend everything which attaches to his mere physical being.

But in the conduct of how many church members does it stand out before the world in any such high and consistent character? In how many—except for a convenient attendance on a service or two—is there noticeable any special difference between them and the non-religious respectables? Where is the day made to shine out before the latter with the convincing power of its own sacredness as a day of genial Christian inter-

course, worshipful devotion, spiritual refreshment, living charities, and generous sympathy for the tired and toiling wage-earners? Might not these justly cry out, "Observe the day according to your creed and professions, as one of religious consecration, before you exclaim against what you call its desecration by us"? May not one soberly and even sorrowfully ask, whether in our deprecation of the growing desecration of Sunday we may not also question whether the time is not also come "when judgment must first begin in the house of God"?

[In a later communication Mr. Jewell further emphasizes the distinction between what the church may expect in the matter of Sabbath (Sunday) observance, of those who adhere to her and those who are wholly outside her pale. Even the "Puritan Sabbath" may be perfectly proper for church members who voluntarily adhere to a church which holds to such observance, but neither the "Puritan Sabbath" nor any other kind of a "sabbath" is a proper thing to enforce upon people either by church or state.]

There will be those who from honest though mistaken convictions will object to the view taken of proper Christian Sunday observance in the previous communication to *The Church Standard*. For example, some will exclaim, "But this is to demand of all churches and communicants that they return to the

strictness of the Puritan Sabbath." Well, why not, at least in its real substance? It is the fashion to denounce the Puritan Sabbath without measure, and in some part without reason. Within its just and proper bounds, that is, within the inner circle of actual church members, the Puritan rule was perfectly consistent with a sincere and masterful devotion to the Christian religion; and their much-decried strenuous observance of it was, notwithstanding its incidental defects, the very foundation of those stalwart virtues to which the nation owes so much. The error of the Puritans was one from which our own reformers are none too free—that of not distinguishing between church and state, and of striving to force their religious observance of the Sabbath upon society and state. They ignored the fact that young non-professors were incapable either of understanding its claims or enduring its rigor; and that the non-religious, the irreligious, and the profane were not only wholly outside of its bounds, but were also morally unable to render any other than either a hypocritical or a hostile obedience. This was a tyranny closely akin to that exercised by the state over the church which drove them to seek a freer home in the New World. That error we may reasonably condemn; but to decry their rule as an interior law for their church members is not so clearly just.

Dr. Crafts of Washington, D. C., recently spent two days in this city, speaking of the reforms necessary in successfully operating a world's fair from a moral standpoint. Many of his suggestions were excellent, but very insidiously he brought in as chief among the needed reforms, the Sunday closing of the exposition. He boasted that the

reform bureau which he represented had already secured an act of Congress closing the St. Louis Exposition on Sunday, and that he had the honor of drafting the bill. He said also that they had successfully conducted through Congress fifteen other acts during the last four years.

The fact that so much success had at-

tended their engineering of reform legislation seemed to give new inspiration to their work. One feature upon which I noticed that he builded with much confidence was the fact that President Roosevelt was in sympathy with their reform work.

They are planning to make the present

winter a season of special education along Sunday-closing lines by sending out literature for free distribution all over the country in defense of the Sunday-closing act of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and other reforms.

R. C. PORTER.

*St. Louis, Mo.*

## *The Sunday Saloon Question Debated*

*By the Editor*

ON the evening of February 16 a discussion on the Sunday opening of saloons took place in the great hall of the Cooper Union, in this city, before a large audience of people evidently keenly interested in the question. The affirmative side of the question, for Sunday opening, was represented by Rev. Dr. Thomas R. Slicer, pastor of All Souls' Unitarian church, and the negative position was defended by Mr. Robert Graham, secretary of the Church (Episcopal) Temperance Society.

Dr. Slicer stated that he was not an apologist for the liquor traffic, and that on the question of whether or not another drop of liquor should ever be brewed or distilled in the future, he would vote in the negative. But he declared that the question at issue was not the liquor traffic itself, but was "one between personal liberty and the convention which we call our Sunday." Under present conditions he could see little advantage in the attempt at Sunday closing. There were too many people in favor of the liquor traffic on Sunday, too many people who saw nothing wrong in it on that day, for it to be either possible to accomplish or

wise to attempt to enforce absolute prohibition on Sunday. He had been informed by a reputable lawyer that if there were as many people in Greater New York who believed that stealing was no more wrong than was the purchase and sale of liquor on Sunday that it would be impossible to enforce the laws against larceny. He thought the wishes of so large a number of people should be heeded, even if it meant open saloons on Sunday.

Strict enforcement of the present law was a physical impossibility, because there were only 2,200 policemen on duty at one time, while there were some 12,000 saloons. He had recently heard it declared that the law could be enforced, and that it should be even if a militiaman had to be stationed at the entrance to every saloon. He thought there would be wholesale resignations from the militia when soldiers were "set to guarding bottles," and that the spirit of democracy would revolt in no unmistakable manner against that sort of an "American Sunday" that had to be maintained by martial law. He thought that in this matter men should be, and would have to be,

largely trusted to take care of themselves, and allowed within the bounds of fair and just restriction to act according to their own choice and judgment. The state could interfere in the matter only because of the burdens entailed upon it by the liquor traffic; because crime and poverty were thereby greatly augmented. If it were true that the sale and consumption of liquor could be carried on without causing men to become disturbers of the peace and a menace to the rights of others, with the consequent burden of crime and pauperism entailed upon society, then the state would have no right to interfere with it, and it should be subject to no restrictions but those common to ordinary traffic.

Turning to what he called "the convention which we call our Sunday," Dr. Slicer asked: "What is this American Sunday, anyway?" As an answer to this he read several of the first Sunday statutes enacted in America, as given in the Plymouth Colony Records for the period between 1650 and 1660. The reading of such penalties as a fine of ten shillings, to "sit in the stocks four hours," or to "be publicly whipped," which were prescribed in these statutes for those who should "do any servile work on the Lord's day," or "neglect to come to the public worship of God," seemed to amuse the audience considerably. There are Sunday statutes still in existence in this country, which have been revived and enforced in recent years, that have penalties attached to them that are by no means as ludicrous as were those inflicted in Plymouth Colony three centuries ago. To-day a man may not be "publicly whipped" for engaging in peaceful, honest labor on Sunday, but in some States he may be thrown into the chain-gang and kept there for months as though he were a burglar or a murderer. The gov-

ernment of Plymouth Colony did not go to this length.

Dr. Slicer declared that these Plymouth Colony statutes of the seventeenth century brought plainly to view what is now called the "American Sunday." He said that it had taken all this time to get over that kind of a Sunday, and that such a Sunday was not needed in these times. But, he said, this Sunday had not yet entirely passed away, for every driver of a vehicle on the speedway in this city on Sundays was a violator of a law still upon the statute books of the State.

At this point the speaker showed that he was by no means opposed to all Sunday legislation. He had already stated that on this question of Sunday saloons he thought there should be a compromise between the church people and those who desired to drink on Sunday, so that the rights and liberty of both would be protected. With this in view he stated that he favored absolute closing on Sunday morning, the portion of the day principally devoted to religious services, and allowing opening in the afternoon and evening. As to Sunday itself, he thought it was an American institution, but that it should be observed in an American manner. He thought that the sacredness of the day depended upon the use that was made of it. While men were not allowed to work, he did not think it was right that everything but the churches should be closed. He thought people had the right, and should have the privilege, of spending the day in the manner that seemed most restful and beneficial to themselves. He exclaimed that he believed with Socrates, that "a man should have the right to do a great wrong in order that he may do a great right." Although he named over a number of things that people might do, in

connection with his declaration that they should have the privilege of spending the day as seemed best to themselves, he did not intimate that a man, in doing what he considered most beneficial for himself, should have the privilege of engaging in any useful labor or business.

At the close of the debate opportunity was given for questions from the audience. Dr. Slicer was asked to explain the difference in principle between a law which compelled people to be idle on Sunday in order that they might worship if they wanted to (such law having been declared proper by him), and a law which compelled people to be idle and to go to church in order that they might there worship if they chose to do so, as was the case in Plymouth Colony; and, further, if both were not equally in violation of the principle of separation of church and state? He replied that he thought the two were different, and did not regard the ordinary laws stopping business on Sunday as in violation of the principle of separation of church and state. He had but just a few moments before dwelt with great emphasis on the dignity of free action, and the necessity and duty of trusting men to rule and direct themselves. This was with regard to the saloon and the liquor traffic. But on this point of Sunday rest, observance, and worship he declared that the workingman was helpless, unable to take care of himself, and therefore there must be some Sunday legislation. The cultivation of the moral nature was something of great importance, and without a day of rest the workingman would have no opportunity for such cultivation; hence, owing to his "helplessness," his inability to secure a day of rest for himself, it was the duty of the state to secure it for him by Sunday legislation. It would seem that the principle of manly independence

and self-direction should apply in this matter of Sunday observance, in the matter of a weekly day of rest, as much as it should anywhere else, and certainly as much as it should with regard to the saloon. It is certain that if it does not apply in this matter it applies nowhere, neither with regard to the saloon nor anything else.

A number of times Dr. Slicer, by intimation, gave approval to the expression, "American Sunday," although at the opening of his remarks he seemed to scout the term. When approached after the debate and asked why the observance of Sunday, which came over with the Puritans and other Europeans to this country, should be known as American any more than the religions which came with them, he replied that of course the observance of Sunday extended far back into the past and was really of pagan origin, as was shown in the early laws enforcing it, but that he had avoided that phase of the subject in his discussion because it was too great a field to enter upon on such an occasion.

The remarks of Mr. Graham, of the Church Temperance Society, had to do largely with his investigations concerning the liquor traffic since coming to this country from England twenty years ago, and the facts and figures presented by him constituted an indictment of the liquor traffic as a business at any time. His contention seemed to be that so terrible a business should not be allowed greater privileges than other businesses, and as others were compelled to respect "the Sunday," the saloon should, also, be made to do so. He could not see why saloon-keepers and their patrons should be allowed to violate a law which he had to obey. He briefly emphasized the claims of "the Sunday" as a religious institution, calling attention to "the re-

spect that was due to the day of rest, recreation, family reunion, and worship," and declaring it to be one of "the grappling irons of our civilization."

In replying to Mr. Graham's remarks, Dr. Slicer said that he thought that the principal part of his argument was applicable to the liquor traffic upon all days alike, and that with regard to the traffic itself he was thoroughly in accord with Mr. Graham. He thought that it would be an excellent thing if the traffic did not exist, and that he proposed to do everything that he could to bring about a substitute for the saloon, which would take its place every day in the week.

At the conclusion of the debate a vote was taken on the question. Some 1,200 of the audience voted for Sunday opening, and between two and three hundred for Sunday closing. The audience which assembles at the Cooper Union on Sunday evenings is made up of persons of many nationalities, and of all sorts of persuasions, religiously and politically, and is said to be one of the most representative and impartial assemblages in the city. The chairman, Mr. Charles Sprague Smith, says that all discussions are carried on absolutely independent of religious and political bias. Hence, it is thought that this vote fairly represents metropolitan sentiment in this matter. However, it must be admitted that the Cooper Union audiences are composed chiefly of workingmen, and are marked by the presence of many persons who not only have very little patience with what is called "orthodoxy" in religion, but are also dissatisfied with what may be called orthodoxy in politics, for they are very

much in favor of the reorganization of society upon a far more democratic model than is the case at present. Of course such an audience would not be inclined toward rigid legal restrictions of the sort among which Sunday enforcement must be numbered.

To one who looks at this question of Sunday enforcement from the standpoint of true civil and religious equality, this discussion greatly emphasized the fact that there is great need for the kind of work which *THE SENTINEL* is attempting to do. The vital principle involved in this matter needs to be presented to the people, and its application to the question clearly pointed out. There are many able men, and even some clergymen, who, notwithstanding the seemingly inconsistent position in which it places them in the minds of a great many people, are willing to appear upon public platforms in opposition to Sunday enforcement so far as it affects the "personal liberty" and "inalienable rights" of those who wish to buy and sell liquor, but who are not at all ready to advocate the true, logical and consistent principle of civil and religious freedom which condemns all Sunday enforcement, and which stands as much for the personal liberty and inalienable rights of the man who abstains from intoxicants and labors on Sunday as it does for those of the man who drinks and "loafs" on that day. The cause of true freedom, in its relation to this Sunday question, has none too many advocates; and among them are not found many of those who profess to be very "liberal," both theologically and politically.



# A Sunday-Law Hearing in Massachusetts

By K. C. Russell

THE first hearing for 1902 of a Sunday bill in the Old Bay State, was held at the State capitol, in Boston, on February 4. As is customary on such occasions, there was present a delegation of those who seek to enforce the observance of Sunday by civil enactments. Among those of this class in attendance was Rev. Martin D. Kneeland, the secretary of the New England Sabbath Protective League; also the president of the Massachusetts W. C. T. U. organization, and other champions of Sunday legislation.

The bills that were presented at the hearing were not especially significant, only to the extent that the principle which underlies all religious legislation was involved. The bill that received the most attention was one that was introduced for the purpose of modifying the present Sunday law so as "to make the Lord's day open season for birds and game."

The author of the bill, in the main, clearly presented the principle of religious liberty. Following his address an opportunity was offered for others who were in sympathy with the bill to speak. Elder G. B. Wheeler and the writer responded by emphasizing the true principle of religious liberty, and hence the limits of civil authority. It was shown that Sunday laws were productive of great evil in that they brought about idleness of the worst species—involuntary and enforced. To confirm this statement the opinion of an officer of the law was cited, who said, in effect, that it was more difficult to preserve order and conformity to the laws against incivility on Sunday than on other days of the week.

When those who spoke in favor of the bill had finished, opportunity for remarks was given those of the opposition, and it was evident from the spirit that characterized some of the speeches that what had been said in defense of the true principles of liberty had aroused that same old spirit that is always awakened when the two-edged sword of truth cuts its way to the hearts of men to whom it is unwelcome. The theological aspect of the question, as is the case at most all hearings on questions involving religion, was the all-important one. The religious phase was discussed to such an extent that the chairman of the committee tried at different times to have that feature in the discussion eliminated, but it was with great difficulty that he made an impression on the speakers. And, indeed, it is not strange that the religious phase was so prominent in the discussion, when that is the real basis on which the legislation under discussion rests.

The president of the Massachusetts W. C. T. U. was asked whether she wished the enforcement of the law because the violation of the Sabbath was wrong and wicked. She replied at once in the affirmative.

It was evident from the attitude of the committee that one who is prominent in working for more rigid Sunday-law enactments at every session of the legislature, is not growing in favor with them.

One could not fail to note at this hearing that on the same field where Puritanism once did its baneful work in persecuting those who conscientiously refused to obey its wicked laws, there still lurks the same gloomy, intolerant spirit of religious bigotry.

# How About Sunday Buying ?

By J. N. Loughborough

NOTICE in the THE SENTINEL for January an account of the arrest in Minneapolis of R. S. Keller for "selling goods in his store on Sunday," in which it was stated: "Mr. Keller says he was in his store opening his mail when a man entered and desired to purchase an umbrella, and he sold one as an accommodation. The man was a member of the clerk's association, and he at once brought action against the merchant."

Again, in the February number of THE SENTINEL I read this item: "On January 5, John J. Barry, a delegate for the Association of Grocery Clerks, was busy in the interests of Sunday enforcement on the West Side, in New York City. He purchased a four-cent box of stove polish at one place, and a ten-cent can of peas at another. These he exhibited as evidence against the two grocerymen, whose arrests he had caused, in the West Side police court the next day. Both men were fined \$5 each."

If I get a correct idea of the Scripture teaching relative to true Sabbath-keeping the *buyer* on the Sabbath day would be just as guilty as the man who sold. It seems that the matter was so understood in the days of Nehemiah. We read: "There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah [the buyers], and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city?

Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." Neh. 13:16-18. From this it is clear that Nehemiah considered it a profanation of the Sabbath to *buy* on that day as well as to *sell*.

The query arises: What about those who regard Sunday as the Sabbath being so zealous to guard against *selling* on that day, but who say nothing about the *buying*? Why not have a penalty for the man who *buys* as well as for the man who *sells* on Sunday, and especially if he is going out of his way to *buy* on purpose to entrap the merchant or seller?

In this connection I call to mind a case of "fishing on Sunday," which was tried in a justice's court in the State of New York, near to where I lived some fifty-five years ago. The law of the State, at that time, forbade traveling on Sunday, "unless in cases of charity or necessity, or in going to or returning from some church or place of worship."

After the justice had heard the evidence of the witness against the man for fishing, he imposed the fine stated in the law. Then he turned to the witness and inquired, "Where were you on that day?" The answer was, "I went out to watch this man fishing." "Did you go to church?" "No." "Then," said the justice, "you *traveled* out there to see the man fish, which was *illegal traveling* upon the first day of the week, so I impose a similar fine upon you for Sabbath-breaking—*illegal traveling* on that day."

This justice saw the folly of the whole thing; but as they wanted to enforce the law he would let them have the *full* force of it according to its very letter. We heard no more of arrests for "Sunday-breaking" in that locality.

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights from the standpoint of Christianity. The only periodical in the United States wholly devoted to exposing and opposing the increasing movements and tendencies of the present time which either directly aim at or logically tend to the employment of the power of law in the domain of conscience, in subversion of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Editorial Contributors:

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

Entered as Second-class matter at the New York Postoffice. (See close of reading matter for terms of subscription, etc.)

### DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

*We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.*

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

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

*We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.*

*We believe it is the right and should be the privilege of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or not to worship at all if he so chooses.*

*We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to oppose and prevent religious legislation, to the end that every individual may enjoy the inestimable blessings of liberty.*

VOL. 17. MARCH, 1902. No. 4.

"Virtue and piety are the attributes of individuals; there is no such thing as corporate virtue and piety;" and, therefore, no such thing as a Christian government.

Human legislation cannot impart a divine sanction where none exists, and neither can it transform into a moral duty that which moral law does not require.

No civil government can be Christian; police duty is not Christian work.

The people who are so much disturbed about the proposition for local option on the Sunday question are not disturbed at all about local enforcement of Sunday observance.

The state has as much right to control the church as the church has to control the state; one is just as proper as the other. Neither is Christian or American in the true sense.

The position taken by the advocates of Sunday enforcement in New York State in the matter of local option with regard to Sunday enforcement would nullify all such local enforcement in California.

The most sovereign political power on earth is too local and circumscribed to deal with the matter of Sabbath observance; and the smallest of political units is too sovereign, too alien a power, to control what the Creator of man and the Sabbath has left to the conscience of the individual.

If the State of New York had no Sunday law, and the majority of the people of New York City were in favor of Sunday enforcement, there would be no more enthusiastic champions of local option than those who now declare that the transference to the city of the power to legislate on this subject would result in "universal demoralization."

The opening or closing of saloons is not all there is in the Sunday question by any means. That is merely a phase of it, and a very unfortunate phase at that. The Sunday question involves the deepest and most far-reaching principles of freedom, and it is unfortunate that it has

become mixed up with the regulation of the liquor traffic. It should be judged in the light of history and its own character, and not in the light of something with which it has become temporarily associated.



Infinitely more important to the Sunday cause than the maintenance of any human law for Sunday observance is the discovery of some divine law for such observance. When some divine sanction that will afford a moral basis for such observance is found there will be no necessity and considerably less eagerness for the support of human law.



The maintenance of public order is a good thing, it is in the interests of civilization and is an important part of civilization itself; but it is not Christianity. Inasmuch as the greatest good and highest attainment of civil government lies in this very thing of maintaining public order, it follows that the functions of government are not Christian, and that government itself cannot become Christian. Christianity is order, but it is something infinitely more than public order; public order is a good and excellent thing, but it falls very far short of Christian order.



As a temperance measure the Sunday law is not even a half measure; it goes only one-seventh of the way toward bridging the gulf of intemperance; it may slightly narrow the channel, but does not at all lessen the flow of the evil current within it; on the contrary, it gives it a depth and a strength that it did not have in its wider flow. What the Sunday law does do is to call attention to Sunday as a special day, set apart by the church and upheld by law as a church day, contrary to American, republican, and all right

principles of government. Let it not be forgotten that the saloon closed by law on Sunday is by the same law sanctioned during the remainder of the week.



If the Sabbath is American it can not have recourse to the religious authority that is urged in its support. With reference to it there can be no consistency in quoting the Fourth Commandment and the words of the prophets and apostles concerning the Sabbath. The example of the Lord of the Sabbath has no place here, and it is useless to ask, "What would Jesus do?" If the Sabbath is American there can be no better authority on the subject than Americans. Whatever Americans do on that day it is proper to do on that day. If Americans want to go fishing, play ball or golf, keep open stores or engage in any business or pleasure on the "American Sabbath" it should be all right. The "American Sabbath" can have no more sacredness and sanctity than it derives from Americans, and fishing, ball playing and business are bound to derive just as much sacredness and sanctity from them as the "American Sabbath." There is no reason why the "American Sabbath" should be any more sacred than ball playing, or why anything that Americans choose to engage in on the "American Sabbath" should not become a part of its sacredness and sanctity. If the Sabbath is American it should accommodate itself to the uses which Americans wish to make of it, rather than that Americans should be made to conform to ideas of Sabbath observance which had their origin long before America was ever heard of.



In former times people were compelled by Sunday laws to repair on that day to

the place of "the public worship of God," so that they could worship there if they chose to do so. To-day throughout the United States, and in other parts of the world, people are compelled by Sunday laws to stop all labor, "except works of charity and necessity," so that "they can worship on that day if they want to." It would take a very wise man to explain the difference in principle between these two things. One simply went a little farther than does the other. The person who was compelled to come to church on Sunday in Plymouth Colony was not compelled to worship when he came; he was simply made to *come to* "the public worship of God." The man who is now compelled to stop labor on Sunday in order that he may worship if he wants to, is not compelled to worship, but he is compelled to *come to* "the public worship of God" as verily as were the dissenters in New England in former times. The difference is that then the public, political, legal "worship of God" on Sunday included among its forms attendance at church, while now the public, political, legal "worship of God" on Sunday no longer includes going to church; but it does include cessation from labor and from everything that is regarded as inconsistent with the character of the day *as a day for the public worship of God*. In his recent message to the New York legislature Governor Odell, in referring to the Sunday laws, spoke of "rendering to God, who has blessed us as a nation, the homage that is due Him." And there can be no doubt that, in the minds of the great mass of those who support such legislation, Sunday laws are regarded as necessary in order that the State, the people in their political capacity, may render to God "the homage that is due Him." And all who are compelled by such laws to stop work, or to

do anything else that they would not have done otherwise, are compelled to join in rendering this public, political, legal homage, though individually and personally they may be as far from worshipping God as was no doubt the case many times with those who in the seventeenth century in Plymouth Colony went to church on Sunday so as not to be punished for violating the law.



### *Some Important Points on the Sunday Question*

Even if it be true, as is so persistently declared by the advocates of Sunday enforcement, that present tendencies mean the "destruction of the Sabbath," it cannot be denied that this destruction will be brought about in much the same way as the observance of Sunday began.

The Sun-Day was originally observed in the "Continental" fashion that is so abhorred by its defenders and champions in these days. It was a pagan festival day, a holiday, given up to pleasure and rioting. The first legislation in the Roman Empire enforcing its observance spoke of it as "the venerable day of the sun," and from this legislation has sprung all the civil statutes in succeeding times enforcing the observance of the so-called Christian Sunday.

Beginning in the third and fourth centuries, A. D., "the Church" gradually transferred (for herself and all who would accept her authority in the matter) the obligation of Sabbath observance from the seventh to the first day of the week. But it took about a thousand years for "the Church" to make Sunday "the Sabbath," for it has been known as such for only about three centuries. Sunday was never completely divested of its "Continental" character until it was shrouded in the garb woven for it by

Puritanism. "The Church" which was responsible for the adoption as a Christian observance of this pagan holiday, does not yet know it as "the Sabbath," and is still in favor, so long as due regard is had for "the Church," of its being used largely as a holiday.

It would seem like the irony of fate that the observance of this day, which has come to be regarded by almost the entire Christian world as the Sabbath, the Lord's Day, should by a recurrence of the very conditions in which its observance began, be brought back to its original state as a mere holiday of pleasure and rioting.

But to those who look beneath the surface of things, such is the prospect. It is not possible that a day which has no divine warrant for its observance can be indefinitely imposed upon the mass of the people as such. If its outward observance is compelled by law, then such compulsion simply hastens the return of the original Sunday—"the wild solar holiday of all pagan times."

Instead of devoting their time to agitation for Sunday enforcement, those who are frightened at the prospect of the "Continental Sunday" should turn their attention to the far more vital matter of finding some substantial and enduring basis for the Sunday "Sabbath." If there is divine warrant for it, let it be shown; if there is not, let it be no longer assumed. Let the facts be faced; let the real authority and warrant for Sunday observance be recognized.

A candid investigation into the history of this observance, into the sources from which it has been handed down to the present time, will show that one of the quickest and most effective ways to bring about the complete reign of what is called the "Continental Sunday," is to compel men to be idle on Sunday. In

order for the observance of a weekly rest-day to be helpful and beneficial, physically and morally, its observance must be accompanied by a sense or a conviction of moral duty and divine sanction. The observance of Sunday can be had on these grounds only so long as people are uninformed, and certainly it cannot be obtained on these grounds by coercive legislation.

The truth is that it is because the observance of Sunday cannot be supported by divine sanction, and, therefore, lacks the essential quality of moral obligation, that recourse is had to civil legislation to enforce it upon people. But legislation cannot impart divine sanction to an observance which has no such sanction, and neither can it impart a sense of moral obligation where none exists in the mind and conscience.

Hence, there can come no good, but only evil, from Sunday enforcement. The "Continental Sunday" has nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by enforced idleness on Sunday. It has nothing to gain, but a great deal to lose, by perfect freedom to honest industry on that day.

It is time that people who are so exercised on this question were brushing aside all shams and looking at the matter just as it is. We submit that the above propositions are not sectarian nor dogmatic, but are in harmony with the indisputable facts of history and the dictates of common sense.



A sermon preached in this city in December by Bishop Wm. R. Huntington, on the interrogation, "Shall We Slur Sunday?" is now having quite a wide circulation in the religious press. What is meant is, Shall Sunday be deprived of any of the legal "protection" that it now has? The important question in this connection is, What right have the

friends of Sunday to assume that it is slurred when it is not supported and enforced by law? This is the very tactic of the Papacy herself. She holds and always has held that "the Church" was slurred if she was not allowed to monopolize the power of the state. She considers to-day that she is slurred in Italy, in France, in Mexico, and in the United States. In every country where it has been decided to take from her in any degree the powers which she has enjoyed by virtue of an alliance with the state, she has always gone around in agony asking, "Shall We Slur the Church?" There is no more reason for legal support and "protection" for Sunday observance than there is for legal support and "protection" of "the Church," and the assumption that either should have such favor from the state is a slur upon human rights, upon liberty, upon justice, and in this country it is a slur upon the most fundamental principles of the nation.



### *The "American Sabbath"*

We hear much in these days about the "American Sabbath" and the necessity of having its "sacredness" and "sanctity" preserved by law. No explanation is offered as to how an institution of universal obligation has become limited to one nation, or as to how the Sabbath, a religious institution, has become American in its nature, or as to how an *American* institution can have any sacredness or sanctity to preserve.

The strange spectacle is presented of ministers and religious bodies demanding the preservation and protection of "our American Sabbath" in the name of everything that is religious and very little that is American. They go to the Old and the New Testaments and to all the

authorities which deal with the Sabbath as an institution appointed by God for man—not for nations—in behalf of the "American Sabbath." But why should recourse be had to these sources when the "American Sabbath" is concerned? Would not American authorities be far more appropriate on this subject? In dealing with the "American Sabbath" it would be more consistent to confine one's self to American history. Instead of going back to the Puritans, the "fathers," the apostles, the Lord of the Sabbath, the Israelites, the Fourth Commandment, and the creation for information as to the "American Sabbath" and the manner in which it should be observed, would it not be more fitting to turn to American records? Surely so important an institution as the "American Sabbath" is alleged to be—one upon which we are told depends the most cherished of American institutions, and even the very "existence, stability and greatness of the American Commonwealth" itself—has not been ignored in those records, but has received attention commensurate with its great and supreme importance.

But, strange to say, this is not the case. In vain do we search American history for the origin and institution of the "American Sabbath." When a boy the writer read with avidity everything that pertained to early American history. There were the American colonies, the American Declaration of Independence, the American Revolution, the American Constitution, the American nation, the American flag, army, navy, etc., but strange to say there was no mention of the "American Sabbath."

So the friends of the "American Sabbath" are not altogether wrong in looking far back of the beginning of American history for information con-

cerning this institution and authority for its observance. The trouble is that they go to the wrong sources, and obtain information and authority regarding an entirely different institution. This institution now called the "American Sabbath" has a history, and it is a history that extends back for more than a thousand years previous to the discovery of America, and which shows it to be a very different institution from what it is now represented to be. The salient features of this history are briefly summarized in our frontispiece this month.

There is no such thing as an American Sabbath, or Jewish Sabbath, nor any other national Sabbath. There is only the Sabbath that was instituted for man at creation, and which all men were commanded to *remember* in the Fourth Commandment. God is the Author and Sovereign of the Sabbath, and therefore it is properly called in the Scriptures the "Lord's Day." Aside from this day there is no Sabbath. But there is a religious observance which has attempted to usurp the place of the Sabbath, and which assumes, indeed, to be the Sabbath. When this work of usurpation began it was known as "the venerable day of the sun;" it is now known in this country as the "American Sunday," or "American Sabbath."

The term "American Sabbath" is very suggestive of the aims and efforts of those who employ it. American is a word of secular and political significance; Sabbath is a word of wholly religious and divine significance. The combination of the two words means the union of the political with the religious, or, in the ordinary phraseology of this country, the union of church and state. And it is for this identical purpose that the term "American Sabbath" was invented and for which it is constantly

employed. Those who use the term know that the Sabbath is wholly religious, and had its origin long before America came upon the stage of action. But they desire to have American political authority enforce Sabbath observance; hence the term "American Sabbath."



### *Another Element in the Anglo-American Bond*

Much has been said in recent years about an Anglo-American alliance, and many things have been cited in proof of the declaration that "blood is thicker than water." Synchronous with the announcement that the influence of England prevented a European coalition against the United States during the Spanish-American war there now comes something else that has a bearing on this point of Anglo-American sympathy and coöperation that has not been heard of very much in the past, but which will, no doubt, become more prominent in the future.

From London, under date of January 18, Mr. Paul Villars, special correspondent of the Paris *Figaro* and the Hearst newspapers in this country, sent the following in a dispatch to this country:

Few items of American news have been received with greater approval by staid, old-fashioned Britons than that describing a Washington pastor's denunciation of the efforts of foreign diplomats to inaugurate in the capital city of the United States what the backbone of the English race reprobates and most dreads—"the Continental Sunday." If the prominent clergymen of the United States will put themselves on record as supporting the plea of the Rev. Teunis Hamlin for the preservation of the "Sabbath of our forefathers" they will receive most cordial moral support here. The provocation of this plea is regarded as peculiarly fortunate, since it emphasizes the chief source of danger—the innovations of foreigners of high social and political standing. Being pastor of the church regularly attended



by Secretary Hay and his family, and by members of the legations, the Rev. Mr. Hamlin was in a position to give his utterances the widest publicity and influence.

In this correspondence a few weeks ago I referred to the efforts of the rank and file of the British clergy, backed solidly by the mass of English men and women, to counteract the influence of foreigners living in this country for loose observance of the Lord's day. This influence is most apparent in the large cities, where the toiling masses are not affected by the restraining spirit of smaller and more orthodox communities, and are eager for any excuse to turn a day of rest into a period of recreation. Less moderate than the German and French, English and American working people cannot be expected to take their Sunday pleasures as decorously as those who have long been accustomed to the "Continental Sunday." The result is disorder and growing impiety. This is the view of English clergymen and the mass of their parishioners. All efforts on the part of their brothers in America to discountenance breaking away from the Scriptural injunction respecting Sunday will be most warmly applauded.

The chief difficulty with this whole matter is that there is no Scriptural injunction respecting Sunday observance. In the language of a leading church organ of this country (the *Church Standard*, Philadelphia, December 14, 1901), "Christianity was first recognized as a world power by the establishment of the Lord's day as a Sabbatical institution, when the Emperor Constantine decreed that on the first day of the week, the great day of the Sun, all public works should be stopped and all public courts and offices closed. *That was the first institution of the Christian Sun-Day.*" (Italics supplied.)

It remains to be seen whether the maintenance by law, and every other means that can be employed, of a religious observance that owes its origin as a "Christian" institution to the pagan Emperor Constantine and the scarcely less pagan leaders of the church of his time

who were willing to deny the whole Gospel for the sake of political power—we say it remains to be seen whether such a cause will be one of the potent factors in bringing together and cementing the friendship of the two great nations of the Anglo-Saxon world. If such shall be the case there is no reason to believe that the result will differ very much from the like alliance between Constantine and the bishops, which brought about the union of church and state and sowed the seed for the Dark Ages.

And the bishops and emperors, in establishing Sunday observance by law as a "Christian" institution, did so for reasons very similar to those that prompt its friends now. They were opposed to the "Continental Sunday," and as it was "the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows" (Neander), it was ordered that "the public shows be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast-days, to some other day of the week." But the remedy proved to be worse than the disease.



According to an exchange "a new political party on a strictly secular basis" has just been formed at Cincinnati. "It demands the complete separation of church and state, the abolition of army chaplains, church taxation, and the abandonment of Sabbath observance. The organization of the party took place on Sunday. It is needless to say that its adherents will be few and far between." It is difficult for the average person to see what a political party has to do with Sabbath observance, either by way of abandonment or otherwise. No political party can abandon Sabbath observance, because no political party can ever attain to Sabbath observance. It is doubtless

meant that this party demands the abandonment of legally enforced Sabbath (Sunday) observance. This is something that every political party should abandon, and so far as we know there is no political party that has identified itself with such enforcement, unless it is the National Prohibition Party and the Republican Party in New York State. Political parties as a general rule rest "on a strictly secular basis," and there is no other proper basis for them to rest upon.



### *The Papacy in the Philippines*

The Papacy has strong expectations that she will yet be able to secure the teaching of the Catholic religion in the public schools of the Philippines, as was the case when Spain ruled the islands. The correspondent of the *Catholic Standard and Times*, Philadelphia, writes from Rome of an interview with the Archbishop of Manila, in which the archbishop expressed himself regarding some of "the stock arguments of Catholic critics," and added "one testimony the more to the general accord existing between the American Government and the Apostolic See." When asked as to the truth of the report of a lack of accord in "the matter of the system of education established by the American authorities," he said:

Well, in this respect it is partly true. The exclusion of religion from education, frankly, does not please the Philippine Catholics, but nothing is being done by the Government to unroot Catholicism in the archipelago. The system you refer to is the neutral educational system of the United States, and not that of the hostile school. Of course, the Filipino, being accustomed to see religious instruction given in the schools, is displeased with the new system on this account. But I think that the matter can be remedied.

The correspondent hastens to explain that Mgr. Nozaleda de Villa "meant that the remedy could be supplied from without, that is, from Catholic energy supplying the needs left unsatisfied by state schools," but the statements which follow show that it was not meant nor expected that this sort of a remedy shall be anything but a temporary expedient:

He assented to my opinion that the American Government might perhaps eventually come to regard the matter in a more favorable light. He showed himself surprisingly well informed—if I may so speak—on this point, and this made clear to me that the matter had been well threshed out *at the Vatican in the course of the negotiations between the Holy See and the American administration.* He spoke in the most friendly way of the administration; this is his wont; kindly by nature, the archbishop seems to have no *arrière pensée* against things, ideas or persons American. But he made it manifest that the Church *cherishes no illusions about the Philippine school question and that it is resolved to act promptly and practically on behalf of the religious side of education.* (Italics supplied.)

It is plainly evident that "the general accord existing between the American Government and the Apostolic See," in this matter of the inculcation of the Catholic religion in public schools, rests on the confident anticipation that the American Government will eventually yield to the demands of "the Apostolic See."

The archbishop denied that "there was any longer a question of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property." This probably means that the Papacy is willing to accept a huge sum of money for her land holdings, as will no doubt be the case if she is paid for them, as has been recommended by the Secretary of War. It was also stated that "an American element would be introduced into the clergy and hierarchy, but in a greater or smaller de-

gree, and gradually, just as circumstances would dictate."

Contrary to assertions and representations that are frequent in the Catholic press, and especially frequent in the editorial columns of the *Standard and Times*, the archbishop declared that "it is not true that there is going forward in the Philippines an organized effort to uproot the Catholic religion." When asked if the religious orders made themselves "unpopular by ruling in behalf of Spain," he replied:

No. There has been very much exaggeration in this matter. The religious were naturally not indifferent to the interests of the mother country, but they never occupied offices in the State. They wielded influence, nothing more, and the influence they wielded was a merely moral one.

It was not denied that "the religious" were unpopular, but no explanation was offered as to the cause of this unpopularity. No doubt the friars have always thought that they were simply wielding "a merely moral influence," but the fact that so much dissatisfaction is shown over their loss of governmental support and favor shows that the methods used to exert this "merely moral influence" were not at all suited to that purpose. And it is no doubt because of this use of wrongful means that the friars find themselves so detested to-day for having wielded "a merely moral influence."

An exchange says: "Indications point to more communications being received by the New York legislature against Sunday saloon opening than have ever before been received on any one subject. Petitions are already flowing in from all parts of the State, and many of these emanate from churches whose congregations have taken action in the matter. The Methodists are exceedingly active in this sort of thing, and several communi-

cations have been received from Methodist Episcopal churches in various portions of the State."

The churches do not become thus active in matters of civil legislation, and neither do they with regard to prohibition and other measures against the liquor traffic. They may deny the religious character of Sunday legislation, even that closing saloons, but their actions belie their words. Separate religion from the first day of the week and the churches will have very little more to say about Sunday saloons.



### *The W. C. T. U. and Sunday Saloons*

Under the heading, "The W.C.T.U. and Sunday Local Option," Mrs. Ella A. Boole, president of the New York State W.C.T.U., thus plainly and frankly states in the February number of its official organ why that organization is opposed to local option on the question of Sunday liquor selling:

We are asked again and again why we of the W. C. T. U. are opposed to local option on the question of Sunday liquor selling? We answer that there are some questions that ought not to be submitted to the people, because there is a higher law than the people's will. If this question should be submitted there is no reason why a similar question in regard to every other business might not be submitted, so that the question of the observance of Sunday would be a matter of *locality*. We would none of us consider it right to submit any other of the commandments to the vote of the people. Why this one? Again, the object of submission would be to lessen the safeguards about the day, rather than to increase them, and we are opposed to any and every measure that proposes to give to the liquor traffic greater privileges or longer hours.

In the same issue of the *Woman's Temperance Work* Mrs. Boole gave "ten reasons why the saloons in New

York City should not be open on Sunday." One of these reasons reads as follows:

The Sabbath, the day of rest, is not only a religious institution, but it is an American institution, and is essential to the physical and mental well-being of the people. The dry goods stores, the meat markets, the stock exchange, are closed, then why should we make an exception in favor of a business that all acknowledge produces evil, crime and drunkenness in a community?

Thus it is plainly evident that on this question of Sunday saloons the New York State W.C.T.U. relies largely upon "the moral and religious argument in regard to Sabbath-keeping." The Sunday saloon is opposed because of the religious character of the day, rather than because of the blighting character of the traffic carried on. Local option in the matter is opposed because, if that is permitted, "there is no reason why a similar question in regard to every other business might not be submitted, so that the observance of Sunday would be a matter of locality."

The officers and members of the W.C.T.U. know that there is a vast distinction between the liquor traffic and "every other business," but in this question of Sunday saloons they make no distinction whatever. They class all together, and are opposed to Sunday opening of saloons because they fear that will open the way for the operation on that day of other businesses that are totally unlike the liquor traffic. In this they virtually say that there is no distinction between the liquor traffic and "every other business." This is evidence that the question is not one with regard to the liquor traffic as a business which "produces evil, crime, and drunkenness" in contradistinction to businesses which produce none of these things.

The question at issue is just what it is

declared to be: "The question of the observance of Sunday." And this is no question to be argued before legislatures nor to be decided by them. We have every sympathy with the W.C.T.U. in its opposition to the liquor traffic, but we have no sympathy with efforts that are based on the idea that "the question of the observance of Sunday" is a matter for State legislation. This question is no more proper for State legislation than it is for local option.



### *A Sunday-Enforcement Demonstration*

AN enthusiastic public meeting in behalf of the cause of Sunday enforcement took place on the afternoon of February 23 in the large auditorium of the Fifty-seventh Street Branch of the Y.M.C.A., West Side, New York City. Rev. W. S. Hubbell, secretary of the New York Sunday Rest League, was the speaker of the occasion, the title of his address being, "The Present Status of the Sunday Question in New York City." The gentleman who presented the speaker to the audience declared that any person who was not interested in the question of Sunday rest "was scarcely fit to be an American citizen." We can only mention here, briefly and without comment, some of the points made by Mr. Hubbell:

The basis of our civilization is the Sunday rest. If we allow our Sunday rest to be taken from us that means the destruction of our civilization.

If you would preserve Sunday rest, *you must do it by law.* Called upon every person in the audience to write down this sentence, and to rewrite it again and again, until it was so fixed in the mind that it could never be effaced:

"Liberty for rest for each individual depends upon a law of rest for all."

Hoped no one present worked on Sunday, and asked if there was a single person who wanted to lose his Sunday rest. Declared that the 100,000 railway employees of this country who are compelled to work on Sunday are slaves of civilization.

In emphasizing the great importance of Sunday rest, said that he had recently been informed that even a razor must be given a certain amount of rest, because continued use would destroy its temper and fine edge and impair its usefulness. He thought that what was true of razors in this respect was true of men, and that if they did not rest on Sunday their usefulness and ability would be greatly impaired if not entirely destroyed.

Declared that labor organizations are rapidly coming to the decision that Sunday rest cannot be preserved on the holiday basis, but must be secured on the grounds of religion.

Said that there were 50,000 marketmen in New York at the present time who stood for the Sunday closing of butcher shops, with only 300 Polish Jews opposing, who, he added, as if it were a matter only worthy of ridicule, "doubtless want Saturday as their Sabbath." Declared that it was but a matter of time when every shop, store, saloon, and theatre would be closed in New York on Sundays. Declared that the theatres were open on Sundays in plain violation of the law, and read the State statute on the subject. Referring to statements recently made in a public address to the effect that people should have the right to do what they chose on Sunday so long as they respected the rights and liberty of others, he declared such a doctrine to be utterly wrong and foolish—"the very height of folly." He said that anyone

who would take the trouble to read the State laws on the subject would soon learn that there were many things that a person had a right to do on other days that he had no right to do on Sunday.

He gloried in the fact that "many strong Catholics are united with us in our efforts to preserve Sunday rest." He mentioned by name a prominent Catholic lawyer of New York City, who, he declared, was "a member of our law committee." He also read the following utterance as a recent contribution from Archbishop Ireland to the Sunday cause: "Our religion will take care of itself; we need not fear for that; but if we allow the Sunday rest day to be destroyed there will be no way to teach religion, for we will not be able to get the people to church."

Repeated cheering marked the course and conclusion of the address, and on the whole the gathering had far more of the air of a political demonstration than it did of a religious meeting. In the course of his remarks the speaker declared that he was not present for the purpose of discussing the Fourth Commandment, and, notwithstanding the fact that the whole emphasis and burden of his address was with regard to a religious observance which he constantly referred to as "the Sabbath," his references to the Fourth Commandment were made with a lightness so plainly devoid of the spirit of reverence that a large portion of the audience burst into laughter.



The *Christian Advocate* sees in the present agitation in New York an effort "to mortgage Sunday to the saloon." To the extent that they are responsible for Sunday legislation, and in taking the attitude that they do with regard to it they assume entire responsibility for it, the churches have already set a very con-

spicuous precedent in the matter of mortgaging Sunday, for they have thereby mortgaged Sunday to the body politic—to the state. They need not be surprised, therefore, if the state, following the example of the churches, encumbers Sunday with another mortgage, and it thereby falls into the hands of the saloon; for certainly the state can do what it will with its own, with what has been mortgaged to it by the churches. Sunday, as does every other day, belongs to every individual to use as seems to him best so long as he respects the equal rights of others, and all the church-and-state mortgages that have been fraudulently placed upon it should be lifted at once, that it may be the free possession of its rightful owners. ❖

### *The Annual Meeting of the New England Sunday Forces*

The New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League held its seventh annual meeting at Tremont Temple, Boston, during the afternoon and evening of February 2. An address on "The Sunday Saloon Question in New York City," was delivered by Dr. MacArthur, of New York. Dr. David J. Burrill and Dr. A. H. Plumb also delivered addresses.

The chief feature of the meeting was the annual report. This report was quite lengthy, and not only set forth in detail all that had been done during the year for and against Sunday enforcement in New England, but touched upon the present Sunday enforcement question in New York, referred to the work of "our friends across the border" (the "Lord's Day" Alliance of Canada), who "have guarded the Sabbath more carefully than we," and called attention to "the signal victory" won "by the friends of the Lord's day throughout the coun-

try" in the matter of securing a vote of Congress for the closing of the St. Louis Exposition.

The larger part of the report, however, was devoted to emphasizing "the necessity of a weekly rest and worship day," and to protests and complaints against Sunday excursions, Sunday beach resorts, Sunday golf, Sunday baseball, Sunday newspapers, Sunday study, Sunday social functions, etc. A leading feature was some twenty letters from persons of more or less prominence in New England and the nation indorsing and commending the work of the league. These had been received in response to some sixty letters that had been sent out in order "to obtain a partial consensus of opinion on this question." Among those responding favorably were Justice Harlan, of the Supreme Court, the governors of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire, and Booker T. Washington. We shall perhaps call attention to some of these utterances, and other portions of the report, in our next issue. The accomplishments and expectations of this organization are summed up in the following significant statements:

Nearly one million New England people have been addressed, these seven years on different phases of the Sunday question, at about fifteen hundred public meetings. Some ten million pages of literature have been distributed and over twenty anti-Sunday laws defeated. The remarkable results of the past give hope and encouragement for the future.

During the last decade, there has been an awakening as to the fundamental necessity of a weekly rest and worship day as a basis for good citizenship. The advance has not been spasmodic, but continuous. It is along the line of education and development, rather than a revolution. The clergy and better citizens are speaking more positively on this matter. More stress is being placed on legal and legislative restraints and safeguards. Christian

Endeavor is leading its young people into civic activity in this direction.

We are in no danger of swinging back to the old Puritan Sabbath and the so-called "Blue-Laws," nor is this desirable; but we are certainly approaching a middle ground of safe, wise, conservative protection of our Lord's day in the interests of social order, morality and righteousness. May we not call this a *new Puritanism*.

Against the evils of this "new Puritanism," and its chief object—enforced Sunday observance—is a very grave evil, all persons who reverence truth, justice, and right should resolutely set themselves.



"Liberty's torch is to be put out," was the striking sentence with which the following press dispatch, which was sent out from New York on February 14, began:

The lofty light in the hand of the bronze goddess, standing on Bedloe Island, in the upper New York Bay, that has been allowed to grow steadily dimmer since Bartholdi gave the magnificent statue to the United States, is to be permanently extinguished. Sentiment, it is said, which has kept the beacon burning all these years, can no longer keep it alight, and now the Government will snuff it for all time. News of the contemplated extinguishment of the torch has been received here in the form of a notice to mariners, sent out by the lighthouse board of the treasury department at Washington. It states that on March 1, 1902, the light will be discontinued. Installed on the island to furnish current for the torch there is a powerful electric plant, but it is unused. A few lamps of small power furnish barely enough illumination so that the beacon can be made out by passing mariners. Lack of a congressional appropriation is said to be the cause for discontinuing the light.

This seems almost pathetic, but after all it is not the extinguishment of Liberty's torch on Bedloe's Island, but the fading of liberty's torch in the hearts of men that need deeply concern us. But is it possible that the one is the outward manifestation of the other? Certain it

is that there have been in recent years, and continue to be, strange developments in this country, developments which by no means harmonize with what is symbolized by the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World" that has long been a noble ornament to New York harbor, and which are well calculated to lead to the abandonment of this statue to neglect and decay. These are the things that need to concern us most, and if the extinguishment of Liberty's torch on Bedloe's Island serves to call attention to and to emphasize these things it may not be without good results. The Statue of Liberty may serve her adopted country and the cause of humanity best by crumbling to ruin in the light of day and by standing with unlit beacon in the darkness of night.



According to a decision rendered by Police Magistrate Olmsted in this city on February 10 Jewish butchers on the East Side may sell meat on Sunday notwithstanding the State law prohibiting the same. He held that a Jewish butcher who observes the seventh day of the week is entitled to exemption from the operation of the Sunday butcher-shop law, on the principle of the exemption in the general Sunday statute in favor of those "observing another day as a Sabbath" who desire to "work or labor on the first day of the week." In addition to this several minor points were presented as pertinent to the case under consideration. The man who had been arrested had the curtains of his shop drawn, and there was no public display of meat. Inasmuch as the statute prohibits "the public sale or exposing for sale," it was thought that the case in question hardly constituted a violation of the law. Another point was that the great mass of the population in the district where this

arrest was made did not regard the first day of the week as a holy day, and hence "the peace and quiet of the day could not have been disturbed." It was also suggested that the selling of meat in such a community might well come under the definition of "a work of necessity," inasmuch as "orthodox Jews would not eat meat that had been more than twenty-four hours butchered." It was thought that the closing of butcher shops two full days in such a community would entail a hardship upon both the butchers and their patrons. An account of this case is given elsewhere.



A poll of some 430 owners of retail butcher-shops "in the better and middle-class districts" of New York City has been taken by the *National Provisioner*, a journal much interested in the maintenance of the present law which prohibits the sale of meats on Sunday. It declares that 405 of these favored the present law, ten were opposed to it, and five were non-committal. In its issue of January 25 the entire list is published under the large heading, "How the Market Owners Stand on Sunday Closing." The *Provisioner* says that its poll "indicates what is the deep feeling of the shop owners in Greater New York" on this question. It would seem to indicate, too, that there is no necessity whatever for the law in question. If such an overwhelming proportion of the owners of butcher shops have such deep feelings with regard to Sunday closing, why is it necessary to have a law compelling them to close? Certainly ninety-three per cent. should not fear the competition of seven per cent.



"The man who sells split peas on Sunday is a goner. If you want to escape

with immunity from arrest, sell liquor." This was the somewhat ironical and very suggestive advice that a New York groceryman heard recently as he was being fined for making some insignificant sales of groceries on Sunday. Unfortunately there is entirely too much truth in these words of the magistrate. Public sentiment is not much opposed to the sale of liquor on Sunday, but for some strange reason or other there is no sentiment sufficiently strong to protect the man who is caught in the harmless act of selling peas and other necessaries to his fellows. Verily, Consistency, thou art a jewel! The responsibility for this irrational condition of affairs lies equally with those who support "Sabbath" observance by law and those who are persuaded that liquor is a greater necessity to human existence than anything else.



In one of his "Lenten discourses" the other day, in Philadelphia, Archbishop Ryan, in speaking of the treachery of Judas, said: "God will not interfere with our liberty. He will not compel us, because then we would not be men, but machines." This is true; but "the Church" has throughout her history clung to a very different principle, and to-day some of her fundamental principles indorse the doing of what it is rightly declared God will not do.



The *Chicago News* hopes "that the patrons of the stores which keep open on Sunday will stand by the clerks in their present fight" for Sunday closing. It is of the opinion that "the merchant who finds himself without customers on Sunday will speedily take the hint and close his store," and it advises that "customers make it a point to refrain from making purchases on Sunday." This is far better than legislation on the subject.



## SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed in the general articles and the editorial department.

A bill to legalize Sunday fishing was voted down in the Massachusetts legislature on February 12.



The mayor of Park River, N. Dak., has issued a proclamation "calling upon business men to close their places of business on Sunday."



On February 5 W. J. Uttley and W. J. Reynolds, barbers, of St. Paul, Minn., were fined in the police court of that city "for shaving customers on Sunday."



The ministers of Iron Mountain, Mich., "have organized a society to fight vice." "Their first step will be to see that the Sunday-closing law is enforced."



On January 15 Representative Adams, of the New York legislature, introduced a bill "amending the penal code by allowing the sale or delivery of fresh milk at any time of the day on Sunday."



"No more Sunday shaves," is the edict that has gone forth from the barbers of Hankinson, N. Dak., according to the *News*, of that place, which adds that "the rule will be strictly adhered to and no exception made."



Carl Farnella, a groceryman of No. 429 West Thirty-seventh Street, New York, on a recent Sunday was induced by a policeman to commit the heinous (?) offense of selling two eggs. The officer at once caused his arrest, and he was fined \$5.

At a meeting of the Methodist ministers of Baltimore, on February 3, a committee was appointed "to go to Annapolis to protect the provisions of the present Sunday law," which it is thought are threatened by "a liberal Sunday-law bill now pending."



According to the *Omaha (Neb.) News*, Chief of Police Donahue, of that city, "has issued instructions to patrolmen to close all Saturday night public dances at 12 o'clock, and not to permit public dances of any character on the Sabbath evening."



It is reported that "the barbers' union has decreed, and so the police have ordered, no more Sunday shaving in Boston." The names of the barbers who work on Sundays in the business section of the city have been quietly obtained of late "for the purpose of summoning them into court."



The *National Provisioner*, of this city, reports that "the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has been at work for Sunday closing in Kenton, Ohio," and that as a result the butchers of that place have "positively agreed to close and keep closed during the Sabbath day their various places of business."



S. S. Lyeria, a baker and grocer of Alto Pass, Ill., was recently prosecuted for violating the Sunday closing ordinance, but was acquitted by a jury. Those behind the prosecution were not satisfied with the verdict, and "the case will be

tested in a higher court." It is said that Lyeria, who refuses to close on Sunday, will "be prosecuted for each offense."



A dispatch from Pottsville, Pa., under date of February 5, read: "The blue-laws are to be enforced in Minersville. To-day Henry Martz, a barber, was brought to Pottsville and fined \$10 for working on Sunday. The prosecution was brought by the barbers' union. It is said the milk dealers and street-car men also are to be prosecuted."



The New York *Bakers' Review* reports that a bill is now in preparation and will soon be presented to the legislature which will "so amend Section 267 of the Penal Code as to prohibit the sale, or exposing for sale, or delivery, of pies, bread, cake, or any product of a bakery on the day devoted by all decent men to other than debasing drudgery," and declares that "the bill should pass."



Kelly & Kennedy, oil producers of Parkersburg, W. Va., were tried February 4 "on a charge of violating the Sabbath." They had pumped oil from their wells on Sunday. They did not deny the fact, but claimed that the work was necessary, and that their property would have decreased in value had they failed to pump the wells on Sunday. The dispatch did not state the outcome of the trial.



It is reported from Nebraska City, Neb., that "as the result of agitation by the Law and Order League, Mayor Mattes has ordered all places of business closed on Sundays." It is said that a similar order was issued last fall, but that on account of the dissatisfaction caused thereby, it was rescinded after

the second Sunday. But "now the mayor says things will be shut up on the Sabbath as long as he remains in office."



On January 27, to a deputation of prominent citizens who had waited on him concerning the matter, Mayor Low, of New York, expressed himself strongly in favor of local option on the question of Sunday saloons. He thought a special spring election should be held for this purpose, with the boroughs, and not the wards, as units. He favored also such a change in the law as would allow restaurants as well as hotels to serve liquors on Sunday.



The report comes from Cripple Creek, Colo., of the first "dry Sunday" known "since the inception of the gold camp eleven years ago." This was on January 19, and was brought about by the activity of "members of the Law and Order League." It seems that no effort was made to go further than to close saloons and dance halls. It would be well if the members of this league could be so active as to bring about such a state of affairs every day in the week.



During the past month frequent bulletins have been sent out from the office of the Commissioner of Excise of New York announcing the revocation by that office of licenses held by saloon-keepers who had sold liquors on Sunday and otherwise violated the Liquor Tax Law. To the casual observer there appears to be an effort on foot to counteract the effect of the recent making public of instances of serious delinquency on the part of the commissioner's office.



At the opening of the February term of district court at Mankato, Wis., Judge

Cray, in instructing the grand jury as to its duties, called attention to the violations of law by saloon-keepers, one of the points emphasized being that of "keeping open on the Sabbath." The jurors were told that it was "unlawful to dispose of intoxicating liquors on the Sabbath day," and that "all licensed saloons are required to be kept closed during all hours of every Sabbath day."



The Knights of Fidelity, an organization of saloon-keepers of Dubuque, Iowa, has undertaken, with the active coöperation of Archbishop Keane, to "reform" the saloons of that city. A number of "reform rules" have been adopted, prominent among them being that of Sunday closing, but nothing whatever is said about forsaking the business, which would seem to be the first and most important step for a saloon-keeper to take in the interests of temperance, as this movement is represented to be.



The druggists of Greenville, Texas, have united upon this rather peculiar resolution: "Whereas, the Sunday law as it now operates against the druggists renders the Sunday business a great annoyance, and a greater loss in profits; therefore, in order to allow our employes a day of rest and the opportunity of attending religious services, our places of business will hereafter be closed after 10:30 o'clock on Sunday." It is to be hoped the druggists will hold together better than does their reasoning for Sunday closing.



The smaller grocerymen of Indianapolis, Ind., who are in business chiefly in the outer districts of the city, have organized an association for the purpose of opposing the Sunday-closing crusade that

is being waged by the larger dealers. It is known as the Independent Grocers' Association, and has a membership of 350. On February 12, by a unanimous vote, the members of the association decided to open their places of business every Sunday morning hereafter, from six until ten o'clock. The small store-keepers claim that there is a decision on record which protects them in Sunday opening. This grocers' association marks quite a novel departure from the trend of the many associations of grocers and other dealers now being formed, which have as their object the enforcement of Sunday closing.



The barbers' union of St. Paul, Minn., is continuing its campaign of prosecution of barbers found shaving on Sundays. The union does not consider the fine of \$1 for each offense, imposed by the St. Paul police courts, as sufficiently severe, and, according to the *Press*, of that city, has now "adopted the plan of taking alleged violators of the law to Rosemount, where the costs bring the assessment up to about \$5." On complaint of representatives of the barbers' union, five barbers were recently fined for Sunday barbering by Justice Hoyt, of Rosemount.



Five citizens of Nazareth, Pa., were recently arrested and tried "for hunting on Sunday." A fine of \$25 and costs was imposed upon each, the whole sum amounting to \$138.50. The constable of Ross township, Monroe county, in which the arrests were made, and four other men, "who were the informers," received half of this sum. It evidently pays, from a pecuniary standpoint, to run down "Sabbath desecrators" in that part of the country. There is no intimation that the men who spent Sunday so profitably in

hunting these hunters were fined anything "for hunting on Sunday."



The campaign for Sunday closing that was recently inaugurated in Montreal, Quebec, does not seem to have dampened the ardor of those small storekeepers who had previously petitioned the city council to repeal the by-law prohibiting the sale of newspapers, cigars, refreshments, etc., on Sunday. The *Montreal Star* reports that they have printed and are circulating a petition energetically protesting against the movement for closing the small stores, and asking that the by-law in question be repealed without delay. It is said that the petition "is being signed by thousands of electors."



The Binghamton (N. Y.) *Republican* reports that at a recent weekly prayer meeting of the First Baptist church, of that city, "a petition, expressing the voice of the church as against the Sunday opening of saloons in New York City, and asking the representatives in senate and assembly at Albany to oppose such change in the laws, was read and adopted." It is stated that in the course of the discussion one man dissented from the prevailing opinion, and "spoke of liberty of conscience, referring to the struggles of our forefathers, and the fact that you can't force people to be good."



State Senator McCabe, of Brooklyn, has introduced into the New York legislature a bill "so amending Section 265 of the Penal Code as to permit Sunday fishing in the bays, inlets, and salt water creeks of the south side of Long Island." Some opposition is manifested toward the bill on the ground that its passage "would result in bringing out from the city of New York hundreds of disorder-

ly characters, as well as orderly persons, on Sundays to the villages of Freeport, Babylon, Bay Shore, Islip and other suburban resorts along the south side of Long Island, and disturb the rest and quiet and sanctity of the day."



Under the significant heading, "To Force Sunday Observance," the following dispatch from Gettysburg, Pa., appeared in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* of February 13: "A meeting to stir up public spirit for the better observance of the Sabbath, and especially the prevention of Sunday excursions to this place, was held to-night. The ministerial association has been waging a fight along this line for several weeks, but has failed to have ordinances passed to that effect. The clergy have prepared a petition, and say that if no action is taken on it by the council they will form a law and order society to see that the Sunday laws are enforced."



The report comes from Zanesville, Ohio, that that city had its "first experience with radical blue laws" on a recent Sunday. Candy and fruit stands and drug and tobacco stores were compelled to close, and the mayor and chief of police notified the managers of the street railway company, the drivers of milk wagons, and the publishers of newspapers that they must all suspend business hereafter on Sunday. It is stated that "the citizens generally do not take kindly to the new order of things." It seems that the mayor was in favor of open saloons on Sunday, but the courts having ordered them closed, he was determined that all provisions of the law should be enforced.



Marcus Tannebaum, fifty-four years old, of 84 Suffolk Street, was arrested

yesterday morning in a factory at 346 Broome Street. Policeman Heaney, of the Mulberry Street station, locked him up on the charge of violating the Sunday law in doing factory work on that day. When arraigned before Magistrate Brann, in the Centre Street police court, later in the day, Tannebaum admitted that he had been working. "You were violating the law, then," said the magistrate, and then turning to the policeman, he added: "But it is just as fair for these men to work in their factories as it is for the saloons to be allowed to run on Sunday." The magistrate felt forced to impose a penalty, however, and Tannebaum was fined \$5.—*New York Times*, Jan. 27.



Chas. Pappis, a young Greek confectioner, of Youngstown, Ohio, was recently arraigned in the police court of that city, charged "with keeping open on the Lord's day, and displaying candy for sale against the laws of the State." The police had found that he had sold two bags of candy and one or two pies on Sunday. He did not deny the fact, and was fined \$3 and costs, the whole amounting to \$9.25. The *Youngstown Vindicator* says "the court started in to give Pappis a little advice about closing up all day on the Lord's day, whereupon the young man replied that he had as much right to do business on Sunday as lots of others who sell candy and cigars." He was told to make complaint against these other places, and the police would close them up also.



The grocers and barbers of Terre Haute, Ind., are bestirring themselves in the interests of Sunday enforcement. At a recent meeting of the Retail Grocers' Association the cases of "two groceries doing business on Sunday in direct viola-

tion of the law and the agreement among the proprietors of the stores," were considered, and "a warning sounded." It is said that "both the grocers and their clerks are determined to enforce the closing law." At a "lively meeting" of the Barbers' Protective Association, at which all the shops in the city, save three, were represented, the prosecution and conviction of two barbers for doing business on Sunday was indorsed, "and each member pledged his support in the crusade against Sunday work." One member declared: "We shall continue the crusade until all the shops in the city remain closed on Sunday. Hereafter prosecution will follow all violations."



From Middletown, Ohio, the report comes of the first "closed Sunday" in its history. On January 27 all the confectioneries, cigar and other stores and saloons were tightly closed. Some idea of what was accomplished in the direction of curtailing the liquor traffic may be gathered from these statements which we take from the report of the *Middletown Signal*: "Yesterday there were many drunken men on the streets. The saloons did a wholesale bottle trade Saturday night at their places of business. It is said that some of the saloons sold more whisky Saturday night than they did all week." The following Sunday was reported to have been "the quietest in the history of the city," the "Law and Order League having closed every place of business." The sale of cigars and candy was completely prohibited, and it was expected that on the next Sunday the sale of newspapers would be prevented.



At a recent union meeting of the English-speaking churches of Moline, Ill., held in the First Baptist church, "the matter of Sunday closing was generally

discussed." "C. H. Deere came in for commendation because he had said that the bowling alley in the Deere building must be kept closed Sundays. A committee of two was appointed to see if the petition for maintaining the billiard halls on Sabbath could not be withdrawn from the city council. Rev. Bryant, of the Baptist church, suggested that the closing of the billiard halls was a minor matter compared with that of keeping butcher-shops and grocery stores open on Sunday, thus depriving clerks of part, at least, of the day of rest. The additional duty of looking this matter up was given the members of the committee. At the Swedish Union gospel meeting, resolutions condemning the opening of billiard halls in Moline on Sunday were unanimously adopted."



Three Italians were recently arraigned before Alderman Atkinson in Carbon-dale, Pa., and fined \$5 and costs each. "The charge was selling confectionery on the Sabbath." At the same time a warrant was issued against a member of the firm of Bletus Brothers, confectioners, who was in New York at the time. On his return he was fined. On the following Sunday, according to the *Scranton Tribune*, "a local clergyman, who happened in the store, asked the proprietor if he was selling goods. The answer was, 'Yes,' and that he would continue to do so every Sunday. Accordingly a second warrant was served on him for desecrating the Sabbath." It is peculiar how clergymen who pretend that it is such a terrible thing to have a store open on Sunday will happen to be in such stores on Sunday. But no doubt they feel that if they go as spies and informers they are thereby absolved from all guilt and contamination that might otherwise be theirs for setting foot in such unholy precincts.

"For the enlightenment of all who are interested in the subject," the *Middletown (Ohio) Signal*, of February 10, published in full the ordinances relating to the matter of Sunday observance. There were two, one of them containing two sections and the other eight. The shorter one prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday, except by a druggist on the written prescription of a physician. The longer ordinance is entitled: "An ordinance to prevent common labor on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," and the first section reads as follows:

*Be it ordained by the council of the city of Middletown:* That whoever being over fourteen years of age engages in common labor on Sunday (works of necessity and charity excepted) shall, on complaint made within ten days thereafter, be fined not more than five dollars; but this section does not extend to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath.

Other sections prohibit all sorts of sports and public exhibitions, hunting, fishing, the opening of all sorts of stores and places of business, barbering, etc. The ordinance was passed in 1892.



The subject of Sunday street-cars has been a live one in Winnipeg, Manitoba, of late. An animated discussion as to the advisability of recommending to the legislature that the question be submitted to a referendum of the rate-payers took place at a meeting of the city council on February 10. Some of the aldermen, who had recently visited the United States, declared that "every little town and village over there has them" (Sunday cars), and that they could see no reason why "one of the finest cities on the continent should not be up-to-date." Others declared that "we don't take the United States as a criterion to go by," and that if Sunday street-cars were per-

mitted "a lot of men would have to work on Sunday," and that children would thereby be "induced to run away from Sunday-school." They thought that the innovation would be an injury rather than a benefit, and that it was "better for the people to go to church on Sunday than to take trips on the cars." Others thought this was a matter in which the people should be allowed to decide for themselves. The proposition for a referendum on the question was defeated by a vote of six to five.

A spirited hearing on the bill of Assemblyman Adler permitting retail butchers who observe the seventh day of the week to keep their places of business open on Sunday took place before a committee of the New York legislature on February 12. The bill was favored by a delegation of retail butchers from New York City, headed by Mr. Otto Rosalsky, and was opposed by a large delegation said to have numbered "over 300 persons, representing the retail butchers' trade throughout the State." Mr. Rosalsky, Rabbi Drachman, Assemblyman Prince, and other men from New York City spoke in behalf of the bill. Speeches against the bill were made by Mr. Daniel J. Holly, of Troy, Rev. W. S. Hubbell, of the Sabbath (Sunday) Observance Committee of New York City, President Phoeler, of the Retail Butchers' Association, Wm. J. Lavery, of the State Workmen's Federation, and W. J. Wagauer, of the National Association of Butchers. One point emphasized by the opposition was that the bill "was class legislation, and would give the Hebrew butchers undue advantage in permitting them to keep open their places of business and sell meat on Sunday." Of course this was a very sorry point to attempt to make in behalf

of the Sunday-closing law, for certainly it is class legislation if there can be such a thing. At the close of the hearing the committee adjourned without taking any action on the bill.

A dispatch from Montreal states that on January 21 Archbishop Bruchesi (Catholic) gave notice to the effect that "there must not be any more municipal or electoral meetings on Sunday in this city." He declared that there was an ecclesiastical law in the province of Montreal permitting such political meetings only in rural districts, and that "it must be enforced." We do not know whether this ecclesiastical law has the same standing in the municipal law of that portion of Canada as has the ecclesiastical law of Sunday observance, but we imagine that it will not be difficult to secure its enforcement by the civil authorities under the provisions of the Sunday statute itself. The action of the Archbishop was caused by the fact that in a recent municipal campaign political meetings were held on Sunday. He declared that in times past this law against Sunday political meetings "was carefully observed by all political chiefs," and that "it is absolutely forbidden to hold any meetings of electors in the city on Sunday." The Archbishop evidently intends to second with some vigor the efforts of his Protestant brethren who have recently entered upon a campaign for Sunday enforcement in Montreal.

It is reported that a large proportion of the saloon-keepers of Richmond, Va., have formed an organization for the purpose of coöperating with the Sunday Observance League in the enforcement of the Sunday laws, and of even taking the lead in the matter of effecting "the closing of saloons and other concerns on the

Lord's day." It is said that the movement has been initiated by the better element of the saloon men, who, "to a great extent, are anxious to observe the Sabbath." One of the prime movers is reported thus in the *Richmond Leader*:

We shall go to the Sunday Observance League and let that organization know that there are saloon-keepers in Richmond who are law-abiding and anxious to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath. Moreover, we shall cooperate heartily with the League in securing the enforcement of the Sunday laws, and we will succeed in doing so. Justice Crutchfield, I know, is with us, and I am pretty certain that Judge Witt is also.

It is estimated that "sixty per cent. of all the whisky men of the city will stand back of the new reform scheme." Such developments as this are very significant. It will be learned in the course of time, by those who will observe, that Sunday enforcement and the liquor traffic are not antagonistic, but, on the contrary, can readily "work hand in hand," as it is stated will be the case in this instance.



Peter Dahl and Eugene Elberg, barbers of Minneapolis, Minn., were arraigned in court on February 3 because, according to the *Minneapolis Journal*, they were "overzealous in the pursuit of their profession." Complaint was made against them by J. O. Brian, "who announced the fact that the gentlemen then and there did wilfully, unlawfully and wrongfully do and perform labor on said day, the same being the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, in that the said gentlemen did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and wrongfully keep open a barber shop for the purpose of cutting hair and shaving beards in certain buildings known as the Chamber of Commerce and 1013 Third Avenue NE respectively, and then and there did respectively shave the beards of one

Frank Carlin and of another man respectively, this being contrary to the statutes made and provided in such cases." Dahl pleaded guilty, and was fined \$10. Elberg denied his guilt, and his trial was postponed for one week. When tried the evidence showed that while people were being shaved the door to his shop was kept locked, and those who had secured evidence against him had to knock in order to secure entrance. Judge Holt held that this showed that the shop was "not open for business," and discharged Elberg.



On February 6 the city council of Winsboro, Texas, passed an ordinance entitled, "An act to prohibit the sale of goods, wares, and merchandise on Sunday, and to prohibit the opening of any place of business where goods, wares, and merchandise are kept for sale." The first section reads as follows:

Sec. 1. Any merchant, grocer, or dealer in wares or merchandise or trader in any business whatsoever, or the proprietor of any place of public amusement or any agent, or an employee or any such person, who shall sell or borrow, or permit his place of business or place of public amusement to be opened for the purpose of traffic or public amusement on Sundays in this city, shall be fined not less than \$20 or not more than \$50.

In succeeding sections it is explained that a place of business will be considered open in violation of the above section when two or more persons shall enter or leave or be found in such place of business, regardless of whether or not any sales are made, and that each person so found shall be considered as constituting a separate offense on the part of the owner; and, also, that the prohibition against Sunday business "shall not apply to the markets or dealers in provisions as to sales of provisions made by them before nine o'clock a. m., nor the sale of burial



or shrouding material, newspapers, ice, ice cream, milk, nor the sending of telegraph or telephone messages at any hour of the day, nor to keepers of drug stores, hotels, or boarding houses, restaurants, livery stables, bath houses, or ice dealers, nor to telegraph or telephone officers; nor to the sale of drugs or medicines, nor to the sale of intoxicating liquors upon the prescription of a regular practising physician."



Five retail liquor dealers of Winsboro, Texas, which we suppose includes all the dealers in that city, have entered into a contract extending to January 1, next, not to sell intoxicants on Sunday nor to allow persons to enter their places of business on that day. "Believing," runs the contract, "in the enforcement of the Sunday laws of this State, according to the letter and the spirit thereof, we hereby agree and contract with each other that we will not give away, or permit to be given away, to any person or persons on any Sunday hereafter any whiskey, wine, beer or other intoxicant, and we will not allow any person or persons to enter on any Sunday any of our present places of business, or places of business in which we may hereafter become financially interested, and we will not sell to any person or persons on any Sunday, any whiskey, wine, beer or other intoxicant for cash or otherwise. This contract is intended to prohibit the entrance into the said places of business, provided that this contract shall not prohibit any of the contracting parties hereto, from selling whiskey, wine, beer or other intoxicant on the prescription of a reputable practising physician."

A forfeit of one hundred dollars is to be paid by each party to the contract who shall violate any of its stipulations. This action followed immediately upon the

passage by the Winsboro city council of a stringent Sunday-enforcement ordinance, and the contract bears evidence of having been made with special reference to the provisions of that ordinance. So it is not to be supposed that the saloon-keepers are moved by any considerations in behalf of Sunday observance, or that they are at all zealous for the enforcement of the Sunday laws of the State, "according to the letter and the spirit thereof," or in any other manner. They doubtless consider that under the circumstances their interests will be best advanced by an agreement of this sort. And in fact the interests of liquor dealers are not disturbed much by Sunday legislation after all. If they cannot set it at defiance they can profess to be its staunchest supporters, and can thus gain for themselves and their business increased "respectability."



Judging from the following, which emanates from Saratoga, Iowa, and is published in the Riceville (Iowa) *Recorder* under the heading, "Resolutions," a Sunday-enforcement campaign is brewing in that community:

*Whereas:* There has been and is in our vicinity constant and gross violation of law, both of the State and Bible, in buying and selling, dancing, visiting, hunting, ball playing, and other games on Sunday, and profane talking in public, and

*Whereas:* We desire to see our children grow up righteous, taking that course in life, and to come into possession of character which will make them good citizens and fit them for heaven, and as we desire to work together with our legislative bodies and with God for the overthrow of evil and the establishment of righteousness;

We recommend that several committees be formed, a committee to confer with the proprietor of each of our stores concerning the illegal selling of goods on Sunday, and a committee to request and advise the pastors of the Bohemian, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Free

Methodist, and Congregational churches to preach to and instruct their congregations concerning proper and illegal observance of Sunday; and

We request our citizens of Saratoga township, who own real estate, to prohibit all persons from engaging in ball playing, hunting, shooting, fruit gathering and all games or employments on the same on Sunday, which would be a violation of proper Sabbath observance.

We call the attention of our constable and justices of the peace to the above points mentioned, which are clear violations of State law, and request them to act according to their official power; and

If our citizens will have dances and parties evenings for the good of our young people who are attending school, we recommend as far as possible they be held Friday evening. There is no school on Saturday, and by no means have them on Saturday evening, as the next day is Sunday; and

We recommend that a copy of these requests be presented to the Woodman Lodge for their action and as a request for their co-operation in bringing about better regard for physical, moral and State laws, and hence better people.

Of course the good people who have put forth these resolutions are perfectly sincere in the belief that they are taking a step that will count for "the overthrow of evil and the establishment of righteousness." They do not realize that legislative bodies cannot fit people for heaven, and that many things, though excellent if done voluntarily, are of no benefit or worth if performed under compulsion.



Orthodox Jews who keep butcher shops, and their patrons, were all interested yesterday in the decision of Magistrate Olmsted, who, while sitting in the Essex Market Court on Sunday, discharged a Jew butcher who had been arrested on complaint of Charles Willi, a member of the Benchmen's Union, for selling meat on Sunday. The law which Wolf Goldberg, the defendant in the

case, was accused of violating was enacted last year, at the request of the Benchmen's Union. It was in the form of an amendment to section 267, having to do with public traffic, which, as amended, reads as follows:

SECTION 267.—Public traffic. All manner of public selling or offering for sale of any property upon Sunday is prohibited, except that articles of food may be sold and supplied at any time before 10 o'clock in the morning, and except, also, that meals may be sold at any time to be eaten on the premises where sold or served elsewhere by caterers, and prepared tobacco, milk, ice and soda water, in places other than where spirituous or malt liquors or wines are kept or offered for sale, and fruit, confectionery, newspapers, drugs, medicines, and surgical appliances may be sold in a quiet and orderly manner at any time of the day. The provisions of this section, however, shall not be construed to allow or permit the public sale or exposing for sale or delivery of uncooked flesh foods or meats, fresh or salt, at any hour or time of the day.

The last sentence was added at the request of the union. Its members declared that some such restriction was necessary if they were to have a day off in the week. It affected but little the butchers whose dealings were with Christians. The orthodox Jews maintained, however, that it hurt not only those engaged in supplying meat, but those to whom it was supplied, on account of the fact that the Jewish shops were all closed on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, in addition to Sundays. The result has been that the butchers who have this trade have most of them continued to sell meat on Sundays, but in shops with the curtains drawn and the fronts so closed that no one passing by would think that business was being carried on.

Goldberg conducted his business in this way. It was brought out at the examination before Magistrate Olmsted

that when the arrest was made the butcher was in his shop, with the shades drawn so that the interior was not visible from the street. He had no wares on exhibition outside the shop, and so far as was apparent to the casual observer no business was being transacted within. Willi, who arrested him, testified that he "just sneaked in" and found Goldberg cutting a slice off a joint. Willi called a policeman and had the man arrested. It was testified that several persons were in the shop, and these, Willi said, he took to be customers waiting to be served.

In deciding the case Magistrate Olmsted took into consideration the wording of the whole chapter in which appears the section under which the prosecution was brought, and the wording of the sentence itself which was used specifically to make the complaint. Section 259 of the Code, which is in chapter I. of title X., declares that "the first day of the week being by general consent set apart for rest and religious uses, the law prohibits the doing on that day of certain acts hereinafter specified, which are serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community." Section 264 of the code is as follows:

Section 264.—Persons observing another day as a Sabbath. It is a sufficient defense to a prosecution for work or labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a holy time, and does not on that day labor, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week as holy time.

The magistrate held that this section made it appear that Goldberg, an orthodox Jew, who observed Saturday as a holy day, was entitled to plead that fact

as a defense. In the code several cases are cited in support of this.

The magistrate also took into consideration the question whether the work was one of necessity. Understanding that the Mosaic law required that no orthodox Jew should eat meat more than twenty-four hours butchered, it appeared that a hardship would be wrought if the butcher was not allowed to sell to his patrons, who otherwise might be obliged to abstain from meat for a considerable period. All of these considerations, and the fact that the law prohibits the "public sale," led him to the decision which he rendered.

In Rapalje and Lawrence's Law Dictionary the first definition of "public" is "open; notorious." Webster gives as the definition of the word: "Open to the knowledge or view of all; general; common; notorious; as, *public* report; *public* scandal."

Magistrate Olmsted took into consideration also the population of the section of the city in which the alleged offense was committed. The residents of the district in which Goldberg's trade is are practically all Jews. It was not contended that the peace and quiet of the day were disturbed by his sale of meat behind closed doors and drawn curtains, or that any persons going on their business of observing a holy time were interrupted in so doing by the acts complained of. In fact, the vast majority of the denizens of the vicinity do not regard the first day as a holy day. The truth of this may be judged from the fact that it is common report that a public school in that vicinity has 1,600 pupils on its rolls, and that of them only two are of the Christian religion.—*New York Sun*, Feb. 11.

## NOTE AND COMMENT

It is announced from Rome that Martinelli, who has for some years "represented" the Papacy at the capital of this country, has been made a cardinal, and will be succeeded soon by Mgr. Falconio, of Canada, "as Papal delegate at Washington." This "delegate" business will no doubt be continued until it bears the fruit that the Papacy designs it shall; and then we shall have the papal "nuncio" or ambassador at Washington.

In response to the friendly advances of the government of Holland for the purpose of initiating peace negotiations between England and the Boers, the British Government has announced that it will enter into such negotiations only with the leaders of the Boer forces in the field, and cannot accept the intervention of any intermediate agencies whatever, not even the Boer representatives now in Europe. This means the indefinite continuation of the war.

As we close the forms for this number reports come from Spain to the effect that a condition bordering on civil war is raging at Barcelona and vicinity. A battle between rioters and troops was fought in the suburbs of Barcelona on February 20, and it is reported that several hundred persons were killed. It is expected that martial law will be shortly proclaimed in the State of Catalonia, if not throughout Spain. The rioting grew out of strikes that were in progress, and it is thought that anarchists are at the bottom of the matter. Workmen who have tried to resume

work have been murdered by the strikers, and ships in the harbor have been obliged to leave without discharging their cargoes.

The Emperor of Germany has shown that he has no sympathy with "Christian Science" and kindred cults, and that he is quite ready to make his influence felt in preventing their propagation in Germany. He has recently given instructions that all disciples of these cults be rigidly excluded from the royal court. It is thought that this course on the part of the emperor will be more effective in retarding the progress of these theories than would legislation, inasmuch as it will not now be "fashionable" to be identified with "Christian Science," etc.

Notwithstanding Catholics are now proclaiming Holland to be a Catholic country, and are rejoicing over the elections of last fall which placed Catholics in a number of high offices in that country, it is said that the Pope refuses to send a representative to The Hague. The reason is given that the Papacy has not forgotten how she was ignored by those who had the Peace Conference in charge, and that she "blames the Netherlands government for being excluded from the Peace Conference." Perhaps the government of Holland is not worrying much over the matter, and feels that a papal representative is not absolutely indispensable in the running of a government, the holding of a conference, or the doing of anything else.

A correspondent of the *Catholic Standard and Times*, writing to that paper from Havana regarding "the ecclesiastical property question," says that "the United States Government has approached this important question with a sense of fairness and adjusted it to the satisfaction of the Church and in the interests of justice." Although a column of solid type is devoted to this topic no information as to the particulars of this adjustment is given, except that "the equitable settlement was arranged between the military governor and Bishop Sbarretti shortly before the withdrawal of the latter from Havana to his apostolic mission in the Philippines."



On February 17 the Senate, at Washington, ratified the treaty with Denmark whereby the three islands composing the Danish West Indies are ceded to the United States. Senator Bacon moved to amend the treaty by striking out the paragraph in which it is stated that "the civil rights and the political status of the inhabitants of the islands shall be determined by Congress." The proposed amendment was rejected. Although there is a strong sentiment in the islands and in Denmark for the taking of a vote of the inhabitants of the islands themselves on the matter of the transfer of sovereignty, there seems to be no disposition on the part of this country to concern itself with the wishes of the people most concerned.



Senator Platt, of Connecticut, he who declared some time ago that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of *some* of the governed," recently declared in a speech in the Senate: "I am tired of hearing this threadbare talk about the consent of the governed." The man who wrote the Platt amend-

ment and who is one of the leading sponsors for the policy of subjugation in the Philippines might be expected to tire very quickly of "talk about the consent of the governed." There is something, however, more threadbare than talk about the consent of the governed, and that is talk about "the consent of *some* of the governed." The "*some* of the governed" theory has been the prevailing one in political history from the earliest times, but it was thought when the American Republic began its career that a new order of things in this respect had begun.



The people of Switzerland seem to be more jealous of republican simplicity and more tenacious for the observance of their constitutional provisions than are the people of some other republics. The president of the Swiss National Council, M. G. Ador, one of Switzerland's greatest statesmen, has been compelled to resign because of his refusal to return to the president of France the decoration of the Legion of Honor which had been conferred on him for services in connection with the Paris Exposition. Article 12 of the Swiss federal constitution forbids officers, subordinate officers and soldiers of the Swiss army from receiving decorations, titles or pensions from any foreign state. And as military service is obligatory and universal, that prohibition applies to every citizen of Switzerland. An investigation has begun with the object of compelling all persons who may have received foreign decorations within the last twenty-five years to return them from whence they were received.



While the Catholic Church claims to stand to-day as "the custodian of revealed religion," and boasts that she is the great defender of the inspiration of

the Scriptures in these days of "higher criticism," she does not rest her authority upon that "supernatural and divine revelation of the will of God." In answer to a recent inquiry, Rev. Raphael O'Connell, S.J., of Philadelphia, declared that "the Church could exist independent of the Bible," because she "rested on the authority of Christ himself." The fact is that between the position of Rome and that of the "higher critics" with regard to the authority of the Bible there is no essential difference. It is not a final authority to either. To the higher critic reason is a greater authority; to the Catholic "the Church" is a greater authority. Both authorities are human and fallible. It would seem, therefore, that the one which makes the least pretensions to infallibility and lays the least stress upon the finality of its own authority would be the safer of the two to which to hearken.



A bill is pending in Congress, with prospect of early passage, which reduces the "war taxes" imposed at the opening of the Spanish-American war by about \$77,000,000 per year. Some criticism is occasioned by the fact that the taxes abolished were levied upon luxuries, while the taxes upon many of the common necessities are retained. The tax on tea, tobacco, and beer is abolished, while the tax is continued on clothing, farm implements, and household necessities. The removal of the tax on tea is commended as the one reduction of the right sort; but really tea is no more of a necessity than beer, and if drunk in the same quantities is certainly not less injurious. Tea is not a food; it is a stimulant, and therefore a luxury. The Committee on Ways and Means turned away from the consideration of Cuba's desperate condition for the framing of

this tax-reduction bill, and *The Outlook* says "that there is good ground for the suspicion that this method of tax-reduction is hurried forward in order to forestall and prevent any relief for imperiled Cuba."



Prince Henry of Prussia arrived in New York harbor on February 23, a day later than had been planned. He was saluted by the firing of guns from forts and war vessels, and was escorted by a detachment of the navy under command of Admiral Evans to the pier of the North German Lloyd line. The next day was spent in Washington. On Tuesday, in company with President Roosevelt, the Prince attended the launching of Emperor William's yacht at Shooter's Island, New York harbor, and in the afternoon was received by the mayor and other officials at the New York City Hall, where he was "presented with the freedom of the city." The Prince will be the guest of the nation until March 11, and will visit Mount Vernon, Cincinnati, Chattanooga, St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Niagara Falls, and Boston. It is declared in some quarters that the enthusiasm with which he is greeted is not due to the fact that he is a prince and the representative of an emperor, but that the welcome he receives is the sort the American people always accord to distinguished visitors. However, there are those who do not believe that the enthusiasm of the present time is the sort that marked the visits of Lafayette and Kossuth.



Catholic papers are much exercised over the "senseless canards," the "reckless and malicious misinformation," about the Pope and the Catholic Church which they claim constantly appear in American newspapers. They an-

nounce "the annihilation of Mr. William E. Curtis by Mgr. Chapelle" because of a recent offense of this sort with regard to "the Philippine ecclesiastical question." There can be no doubt that there is entirely too much "wondering after" the Papacy. The Pope and his doings receive entirely too much attention in the public press, and the world would perhaps be as well off if the space were given to something of more consequence. However, the Pope and the Papacy will continue to be subjects of newspaper gossip and discussion. And the responsibility for this lies chiefly with the Papacy herself. If she did not assume the rôle of a political power, and did not devote so much of her energy to the work of insinuating herself into the affairs of political governments, she would not be the victim of so many "senseless canards" by newspaper writers. As long as the Papacy persists in this course of mixing up with governmental affairs, it is well that information regarding her is freely disseminated, even if it does inflict upon the public much very insipid and senseless gossip. But we have no idea that the greater part of that which it is most important that the public should know about the Papacy finds its way into print.



A discussion of considerable interest in the realm of international politics took place during the past month. It centered around the question as to which of the European governments prevented a European coalition against the United States at the opening of the Spanish-American war. England and Germany have occupied the foreground in the discussion, each claiming to have been the special friend of the United States at the critical period when the other great powers were on the point of serving no-

tice on the Government at Washington that intervention in Cuba did not appear to them to be justified. Austria is recognized as having been the power most anxious for such a step, because of sympathy for the Spanish royal family. Although the discussion was begun by England, with the declaration that she was the one power that befriended the United States at this critical time, Germany seems to have come out best in the discussion by producing proofs that she, and not England, is entitled to this honor. It is thought that England was led to make this declaration because of the then approaching visit of Prince Henry to this country. The incident has served to show that the friendship of the United States is now courted by the nations, and that none of them cares to be known as unfriendly toward her. It is suggested in some quarters that not one of the powers was the friend of the United States when it was thought she was going to war purely in the interests of freedom, but since they have learned that this is not the case they are willing and anxious to be friends.



"What the Catholic Church Is Doing for the World To-day," was the subject of an address recently delivered by Bishop Montgomery of that church before the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, Cal. The bishop dwelt upon three things for which he declared the Catholic Church stood to-day "as does no other institution," but in regard to which he thought that all other churches should be one with the Catholic Church, inasmuch as they were "fundamental to social well-being." These three things were: the inspiration of the Bible, the sacredness and indissolubility of the marriage tie, and the combination of religious and secular instruction. He de-

clared that "whilst Protestant sanctuaries resound with the clamor of the new thought" the Catholic Church, in the presence of the "higher criticism" of today, stood unmoved on the truth that God has made "a supernatural and divine revelation of His will, and inspired men to write it." With regard to religion and education he thought that the present system of popular education had demonstrated that the two could not be separated. He was convinced that "if the great non-Catholic bodies of this country which have pronounced their dissatisfaction at a purely secular system of instruction, would unite with Catholics and German Lutherans in asking for a modification of the present system that the sense of fairness that there is in the American people, when appealed to, would grant it." He desires a system in which the state will pay religious schools for the instruction of children in secular branches, "according to contract and according to results." No doubt something of this kind will be brought about sooner or later, and it will mean a great deal more for the churches, and especially for the Catholic Church, than did the Indian schools' appropriations.



The event of the month in international affairs was the announcement of a practical alliance between England and Japan for the purpose of "maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of the empire of China and the empire of Korea." On February 11 the terms of an agreement between England and Japan, signed in London on January 23, were made public. The first article declares that they have mutually recognized the independence of China and Korea, but are entirely uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies in either

country. They propose to take such measures as may be indispensable to safeguard the interests of Great Britain, which relate principally to China, and of Japan, which possesses interests in China, but is in a peculiar degree politically, commercially, and industrially interested in Korea. The second article provides that if either Great Britain or Japan, in defense of their interests, should become involved with another power, the other contracting party will maintain strict neutrality and use its best efforts to prevent other powers from joining in the hostilities against its ally. The third article stipulates that if any other power or powers should join in hostilities against that ally, the other contracting party will come to its assistance and conduct war in company, and make peace in mutual agreement. In the next article each contracting party agrees that neither of them, without consulting the other, will enter into separate arrangements with any other powers to prejudice the interests of the other. In the fifth each promises to communicate frankly and fully with the other when its interests appear to be jeopardized. The last of the contracts is that the agreement goes into effect at once, remains in effect for five years, and will be binding for a year after either party renounces it; but if the date fixed for expiration arrives when either party is actually engaged in war, the alliance shall continue unchanged until peace is concluded.

It is generally understood that the treaty is made with reference to the aggressions of Russia on the Chinese frontier, notably in Manchuria, and is intended to call a halt upon these encroachments and to prevent the formation of any treaty between China and Russia whereby Russia will gain additional territorial advantages. Because



of the well-known attitude of the United States in this matter the new British-Japanese treaty is looked upon as being in reality a triple instead of a dual alliance.



The rapid succession of very destructive conflagrations during the past few weeks is a matter of serious remark on all sides. Fire insurance companies have in some instances raised the rates of insurance, and a general advance of rates is suggested. Early in the evening of February 2 a gas explosion started a conflagration in Waterbury, Conn., which practically destroyed the business center of the city, burning over an area of seven blocks before it was gotten under control. The loss was estimated at between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000. On February 9 an even more destructive conflagration swept the business portion of the city of Paterson, N. J. Several public buildings were destroyed, and in addition to the destruction of many business blocks, hundreds of people were left homeless. The loss was estimated at between \$8,000,000 and \$10,000,000. The city was placed under military control, as was also the burned district in Waterbury, immediately following the fire. On the same day a large lodging house was destroyed by fire in St. Louis, and eleven of its inmates lost their lives. On the next day, February 10, the city of Springfield, Ohio, was visited by a conflagration which destroyed property valued at \$1,400,000. Early in the morning of February 18 the famous Battle Creek Sanitarium, at Battle Creek, Mich., with the adjoining hospital and several outlying buildings, was entirely destroyed by fire. Although there were some 400 patients in the sanitarium and hospital at the time, nearly all of whom were in bed, only one life was lost and

two or three persons injured. It is thought that the fire originated in the laboratory and was due to the action of chemicals. The value of the property destroyed is estimated at a half million dollars. Between one and two o'clock, on the morning of February 22, a fire broke out in the Seventy-first Regiment Armory, at Park Avenue and Thirty-fourth Street, New York, which in fatal results exceeded all that had preceded it during the month. The armory was destroyed, and while it was burning the fire was communicated to the upper stories of the Park Avenue Hotel, diagonally across the street. The guests were in bed, and many in the upper stories were cut off from escape. Heart-rending scenes followed as people crowded to the windows and hung upon the ledges to escape the flames and suffocating smoke within. Some jumped to the pavement beneath with fatal results. The fire was soon gotten under control, but not before fifteen persons had lost their lives and fifty were injured. Four of the injured died shortly after being taken to the hospitals. This is the third of the frightful catastrophes on a stretch of scarcely more than a mile of Park Avenue which make for it a terrible record since the opening of the new year. First, came the collision in the railway tunnel, at Fifty-sixth Street, on January 8, in which seventeen were killed and more than two score injured. Then, on January 27, the explosion occurred in the rapid-transit tunnel at Forty-first Street, where five were killed, fifty or more injured, and a good deal of property destroyed. In many of the churches of the city on February 23 reference was made in the prayers and sermons to "the incoming tide of great calamities which seems to have set in against our great and imperial city."

# The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 WEST 20TH ST., NEW YORK CITY.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Single copy, per year.....	\$1.00
" " six months.....	.50
" " three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year..	1.25

## CLUBBING RATE.

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

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

## TO OUR PATRONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

## SPECIAL NOTICE

We would call special attention to the fact that it is not safe to send money through the mails. Twice within the past week it has been brought to our notice that subscribers sent one dollar bills to us for renewal of their subscriptions which never reached us. When remitting do so by post-office money order, express order or bank draft on New York. *If you do send money through the mails register the letter.*

Capt. J. L. Johnson, 162 Reid Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., who is engaged in the work of distributing good reading matter among the sailors who arrive in New York harbor, can use clean copies of THE SENTINEL to good advantage. Anyone wishing to aid him by sending back numbers of THE SENTINEL to him at

the above address, will please see that the postage is fully prepaid.

## BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.

The Midwinter *Good Health*, just published, is one of the best numbers ever issued. A new cover design worked out in pleasing colors adds greatly to its attractiveness. It is filled with valuable matter pertaining to the science of health, and is profusely illustrated. Price two cents. Address, *Good Health*, Battle Creek, Mich.

No 169 of the "Bible Students' Library," just issued, is entitled "The Fall of Babylon." The author, R. C. Porter, in a brief study, examines in the light of history and prophecy the eighth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation. 24 pages; price, 1½ cents. Address this office, or Pacific Press Publishing Co., Oakland, Cal.

"Rome in Prophecy," by Elder Wolcott H. Littlejohn, is a study of pagan and papal Rome in the light of Bible prophecy. Some of these prophecies are yet to be fulfilled, and this study is made with especial reference to present developments and others that may be expected in the immediate future. 64 pages. Cloth binding, postpaid, 25 cents; paper cover, 10 cents each. Direct all orders to the author at Hume, Calhoun Co., Mich.

In these days of so much agitation for enforced "Sabbath" observance it is important that the truth with regard to the Sabbath should be sought out and presented to the people. The American Sabbath Tract Society, Plainfield, N. J., has just begun the publication of a small monthly entitled *The Sabbath of Christ*, which has for its purpose "the restoration of the Sabbath according to the standard set by Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath." It should be widely read, for it sets forth truths on this subject that are much needed at this time. Price, 25 cents per year.

How true it is that "the pleasantest things in the world are pleasant thoughts; and the greatest art in life is to have as many of them as possible." With the aim of contributing in some degree to the development of this art Mr. Henry B. Damon, of South Lancaster, Mass., has gathered from a wide range of the

very best literature nearly one hundred choice quotations, consisting in most instances of merely a sentence or verse. The little booklet of twenty pages is nice for gift purposes. It is neatly printed, and has an embossed cover that is very beautiful. Sent prepaid, in a neat box, for 25 cents each, or six for \$1. Address Henry B. Damon, South Lancaster, Mass.



The *Pacific Health Journal* enters upon its seventeenth year in a bright new dress which adds much to its attractiveness. Among the valuable articles on health topics in the February number were: "Warfare Against Tuberculosis," by G. H. Heald, M.D.; "Hygiene of Digestion," by W. R. Simmons, M.D.; "The Influence of Light Upon Disease," by J. R. Leadsworth, B.S., M.D. "Hope for the Broken-Down Dyspeptic," by David Paulson, M.D., Superintendent Chicago Branch Battle Creek Sanitarium, was announced for the March number. Valuable matter will also be found in the departments headed "Woman's Realm," "Editorial," and "Healthful Cookery." The price of the magazine is 5 cents a copy, or 50 cents a year. Address, 1059 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.



From the house of D. Appleton & Company, New York, there has just been issued a new and revised edition of Dr. A. H. Lewis's excellent work on "Sunday Legislation." Such a work is timely at any time, but it is especially so just now when so much attention is being given to the matter of Sunday observance and legislation. Much of the popular agitation and discussion at this time is to very little purpose, because there is no intelligent grasp of the subject by many of those who speak concerning it. The most important features are ignored. As Dr. Lewis says, much that is said concerning Sunday laws "is superficial and impertinent, because men do not understand their origin or their history." Those who will carefully peruse this work will no longer be in a condition where they can be imposed upon by the many shallow and fallacious theories and ideas concerning Sunday and its enforcement that are now afloat. Dr. Lewis recognizes that "facts are stubborn because they are eternal; and the theory which attempts to ignore them insures its early destruction." It has been his object in this work, not to propound theories, but to bring out the indisputable facts of history on the subject,

and thereby to reveal the true philosophy of Sunday legislation. The work is a complete compendium of such legislation for a period of 1,680 years. By personal correspondence with the governors of the various States, and by examination of all the statutes, the status of the Sunday laws of each State at the beginning of the present year is shown. The Rochester (N. Y.) *Times* says that "no recent publication is entitled to greater study or seems to so lucidly expound a vexatious sociological problem."

12mo. Cloth, \$1.00 net; postage added.



From the author, Prof. M. E. Cady, President of Healdsburg College, Healdsburg, Cal., we have received a copy of the revised edition of "Bible Nature Studies," a book that should be of great value and interest to all who would study the works of God in nature in the light of the Scriptures—who would see the harmony between creation and revelation. In all there are 260 lessons covering the different phases of the creation as mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis. In announcing the work the author says:

"To the Christian, nature's voice declares continually that there is but one God; that He is thrice holy; and that the whole earth is full of His glory. This work will be especially valuable to parents and teachers in training the children and youth to grasp and appreciate the wonderful truths in nature all about them. When the search-light of God's Word is turned upon the things of nature, there is an interest aroused, and not only is the mind enlightened, but the heart is impressed with the goodness and the love of God as revealed in His handiworks. The constant aim of the author is to exalt the Creator through His creation."

This edition of the book contains over 500 pages, and is issued in a much more convenient form than was the first edition. At the end of each lesson are notes and suggestions as to how the studies should be conducted. The book will serve as an excellent text-book in the hands of pupils in the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth grades, and should be in the hands of teachers who are teaching below the sixth grade. The book is neatly and substantially bound in cloth, and is sold at \$1 per copy. Address the author.



The March number of *The Ladies' Home*

*Journal* is replete with fiction and interesting articles. The number opens with the unique story of "The Sexton Who Ruled New York Society," by William Perrine. Neltje Blanchan begins a series of unusual articles about birds and their "personalities," and "The Dominic" tells an amusing story of his journeyings in Europe with two companions. Then there is the second installment of Miss Portor's "Those Days in Old Virginia," and a page of pictures of "Pretty Country Homes from \$400 to \$3,200." "His Mother" is a touching story by Kate Whiting Patch, and the fourth part of "The Russells in Chicago" shows more of the odd customs and characteristics of the "Windy City." Mr. Bok's editorial is written under the title "She Dasn't," and deals fearlessly with the woman who is afraid to come out and do things as she thinks they should be done. The special feature of the editorial section is Mr. Hamilton W. Mabie's first "Literary Talk." These talks will appear monthly hereafter. Other valuable articles in the magazine, outside of the regular departments, are: "How to Have a Home Wedding," "Animated Silhouettes and other Games," and "The Literary Beginner," a column of advice to young writers by Franklin B. Wiley. By the Curtis Publishing Company, Philadelphia. One dollar a year; ten cents a copy.

The publishers of the *Life Boat*, 28 Thirty-third Place, Chicago, will issue the April number as the special prisoners' number that is annually sent forth for the special benefit of the inmates of the more than one hundred State prisons and reformatories of the country. The publishers expect to place a copy in the hands of every person in these penal institutions, and that even more than this may be accomplished, they make this suggestion and appeal to all who may read it:

"This number will be just as helpful to those who are confined in the local jails. Would you not like a number of copies for use in your county, city, and village jails? We will supply the April *Life Boat* for this purpose at a cent a copy. Send us your address at once that we may know how many copies we are warranted in printing. If there is any hesitancy on the part of the jail officials in permitting their distribution, assure them that the *Life Boat* goes to nearly all the State prisons and has the endorsement of all the leading prison officials in the land. Distribute these *Life Boats* yourself, if you can obtain permis-

sion to do so; if not, let the jail officials do it, and the Lord will take care of the results."

Address, *The Life Boat*, 28 Thirty-third Place, Chicago.

Every individual in this world influences some one person, and the greater we make ourselves the greater we make some one else.—*March Ladies' Home Journal*.

Go at things that must be done with the feeling of an athlete, delighted at the chance of being able to try your strength.—*March Ladies' Home Journal*.

Our days are comparatively few, and we live through each day only once. Therefore, it behooves us to make each day worth while.—*March Ladies' Home Journal*.

## "ROME IN PROPHECY,"

By Elder W. H. Littlejohn.

"Complete power to be restored to the Papacy in the near future. The true church about to be subjected to another terrible persecution. Italy the sixth head of the prophetic beast of Rev. 17."

Illustrated by several diagrams and the subjoined engraving, which are fully explained.



Cloth binding, postpaid, to any address in the Postal Union, 25 cents each; paper covers, 10 cents each. Direct all orders to the author at HUME, CALHOUN CO., MICH., U. S. A.

**AGENTS WANTED.**

\* **\$6.00** FOR **\$3.00.** \*

Herewith we present a combination offer which we believe will be attractive to a goodly number of our readers. A beautiful large-type Teachers' Bible, and a book of nearly 500 pages describing the world famous Yo Semite Valley both for \$3 00.

Read the particulars of the offer.

### Clear-Type Teachers' Bible

Has large, clear, Long Primer type, is well printed, and bound in French Morocco, divinity circuit style, leather lined, with round corners, red under gold edges, contains 300 pages of Teachers' Helps, Concordance, etc., and sells for \$2.25.

### All About the Yo Semite Valley

This book is entitled "In the Heart of the Sierras," and is by far the best and most reliable description of one of Nature's masterpieces. Its author is a pioneer, long a resident of the Valley, and one who having lived so near to Nature's heart speaks of these marvellous scenes with fervor and love, aided by a facile pen. Interesting and authentic information is given also in regard to the famous Big Tree Groves. Contains 150 illustrations of which 28 are full page artotype reproductions from photographs. As one writer said, the reading of this book is "the next thing to a trip to the valley." The book is 7½ x 9½ inches, is finely printed on super calendered paper, beautifully bound in cloth and weighs almost four pounds. Originally published at \$3.75.

*Clear-Type Teachers' Bible, - Price, - \$2.25 } Both for*  
*All About the Yo Semite Valley, " - - 3.75 } \$3.00.*

☛ Sent postpaid to one or separate addresses for \$3.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
 11 WEST TWENTIETH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

# THOUSANDS

More would use the **SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER** if they knew, like those who are now using it, the benefit received in the treatment of

**Catarrh, Colds, Sore Throat, Head  
Ache, Deafness, Consumption,  
Coughs, Bronchitis, etc.**

Let those who are using it speak for themselves.  
Thousand of others will give the same testimonials.



**Price \$1.50**

A lady in Tacoma, Wash., says she would not take \$20 for hers if she could not get another.

Fowler, Cal. Jan. 29, 1902.

I received the Vaporizer all right, and am well pleased with it. I showed it to a lady who has chronic catarrh and she liked it so well that she wished me to send for one for her. Enclosed find \$1.50 for same.

Mrs. E. R. RHYMES.

De Leon Springs, Fla.

I have been using your Vaporizer this winter, and have derived much benefit from it. I enclose \$1 for more medicine.

E. B. WILLICOMBE.

St. Helena Sanitarium, Cal.

Dear Sir: I have used one of your Vaporizers for several months and find it excellent. As I have re-

marked many times of late,—it has done me many dollars' worth of good. I highly recommend to all suffering from catarrhal troubles. Two parties have asked me to send for one for them. Enclosed find postal order.

Mrs. HATTIE BREMNER.

Martinsville, Ind.

I received the Vaporizer and can say it is the best remedy I ever used.

W. R. ENNIS.

New York City.

I have been troubled with deafness caused by catarrh for several years, and have tried many remedies, among them expensive specialists, but I can positively say that your Vaporizer has done more good than all the rest combined, with very small expense.

J. SOLOMON.

## The Simplicity Vaporizer

Converts fluids into a vapor so light that it floats in the air. This medicated vapor fills every crevice of the nasal cavity and lungs, leaving after a few minutes' application a coating of the healing fluids contained in the Vaporizer as effectually as if it had been applied with a brush. Thus the germs are destroyed and the disease cured.

**SPECIAL OFFER.** On receipt of the price of the **SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER** alone, \$1.50, I will send **postpaid**:

**ONE SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER, with medicine**

**ONE VEST-POCKET CATARRH INHALER, with medicine**

**ALL FOR \$1.50.**

**AGENTS WANTED.** Write for prices.

Address,

**ALFRED MALLET,**  
710 East 171st St., New York.



## Sound Words

From a sermon delivered by Minot J. Savage, D.D., at the Church of the Messiah (Unitarian),  
New York, November 24, 1901.

*E*VEN if we had absolute divine authority for keeping Sunday, then we would have no right to incorporate this command into civil laws. The world has been fighting for thousands of years for religious liberty; and we say we have attained it. We have, to a certain extent, and within certain limits. If you go back, not a great while, you will find that the Catholic Church, having the power to do it, was ready to use the secular arm even to the extent of imprisonment, torture, and death, to enforce what it believed to be God's commands. We have broken down that. The Catholic Church still believes that these are God's commands; but it has reluctantly relinquished the exercise of the civil arm in enforcing these commands.

The Baptist Church believes that God has definitely commanded a particular form of the ordinance of baptism. Does the Baptist Church ask us to enforce that by civil law? No, the Baptist Church is in favor of freedom. It claims that this is true; but it claims that its only right is to persuade people that it is true, and get them to agree with it as the result of argument and persuasion. It does not claim the right to force people to be immersed by the civil power.

Why not? Why should not one of God's commands be enforced by the civil arm just as well as any other? Here is the point I wish to make perfectly clear: Suppose, granted for the moment, that God has commanded everybody everywhere to keep the first day of the week after a particular method. Still, I deny that the state has any authority whatever to enforce