

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1902

No. 5

The Origin of the State

By Alonzo T. Jones

THE first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment.

"And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

These two commandments exist in the very nature, and circumstances of existence, of any two intelligent creatures in the universe. They existed thus in the existence of the first two intelligent creatures that ever had a place in the universe.

When the first intelligence was created and there was no creature but himself; as he owed to his Creator his existence, as he owed to God all that he was or could be, heart, soul, might, mind, and strength; it devolved upon him to render to God the tribute of all this, and to love God with all his heart, and all his soul, and all his mind, and all his strength. And this is the first of all the commandments. It is first in the very nature and

existence of the first, and of every other, intelligent creature.

But the second of these would have no place if there were but one intelligent creature in the universe; for then he would have no neighbor. But when the second one was created, the first of all the commandments was *first* with him equally with the other one; and now the *second* great commandment exists in the very nature and existence of these *two* intelligent creatures, as certainly as the *first* great commandment existed in the nature and existence of the first *one*.

Each of the two created intelligences owes to the Lord all that he is or has, and all that he could ever rightly have. Neither of them has anything that is self-derived. Each owes all to God. There is between them no ground of preference. And this because of the honor which each owes to God; because to each, God is all in all. Therefore the second great commandment exists as certainly as the first; and it exists in the nature and circumstance of the very existence of intelligent creatures. Consequently, "there is none other commandment greater than these."

These two commandments, then, exist

in the nature of cherubim, seraphim, angels, and men. As soon as the man was created, the first of all the commandments was there, even though there had been no other creature in the universe. And as soon as the woman was created, these two great commandments were there. And there was none other commandment greater than these.

Now, if these two great commandments had been observed by man on the earth, that is, had man never sinned, there always would have been perfect and supreme religion; *and there never would have been a state.* God would always have been by every one recognized as the only Ruler, His law as the only law, His authority as the only authority. There would have been government, but only the government of God. There would have been society, but only the society of saints. But there would have been, and could have been, no state.

There would have been society, but no state. Because, men loving God with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength, and their neighbors as themselves, the will of God would have been done on earth even as in heaven. All would have been one united, harmonious, happy, holy family.

There is an essential distinction between society and the state.

"Society is the union which exists between men, without distinction of frontiers—without exterior restraint—and for the sole reason that they are men.

"The *civil* society or *state* is an assemblage of men subject to a common authority, to common laws,—that is to say, a society whose members may be constrained by public force to respect their reciprocal rights. Two necessary elements enter into the idea of the state: *laws* and *force*."—*Janet, Elements of Morals, p. 143.*

This distinction, however, though clear and easily evident, is seldom recognized. Indeed, it is not recognized at all by those who are anxious to secure the union of religion and the state.

But men did not observe these two "first of all the commandments." They would not love God with all their heart; they would not love their neighbors as themselves. They rejected God as their only ruler, their only sovereign, and became ambitious to rule over one another. And thus originated politics and the state.

The Scripture outlines the story of this: "When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and creeping things." "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Rom. 1: 21-25, 28.

Note that at the first men *did know God.* But they chose not to glorify Him, not to honor Him, not to give Him the first place in all their thoughts and actions. Knowing God, they did not like to retain Him in their knowledge.

The next step was that they became vain in their own imaginations. They professed themselves to be wise, *of themselves.* The consequence was that they became fools; and their foolish heart was darkened.

In their vain imaginations they made gods of their own. And then to assist themselves in their worship, they made images of the gods which they had imagined.

The image was always the outward,

tangible form of the god which they had already conceived in the imagination; imagining simply mental *image-ing*. The outward form of the god, whether it be the shining sun in the heavens or a hideously-shaped block of wood or stone, is only the outward form of the *image-ing* that has already been performed in the *imagination*.

Thus, from the knowledge of the true God, they went to the worship of false gods. From the light, they went into darkness. From righteousness, they went to wickedness.

This is the truth. And the records of the earliest nations witness to it. The earliest records—those of the plain of Shinar—witness that the people at first had a knowledge of the true God. The records of the next two of the earliest nations, Egypt and Assyria, bear witness to this same thing.

In all these places the earliest records testify that the gods were their first rulers and the real kings; while men, in the places of authority, were but the servants, the viceroys, of the gods who were held to be the real kings.

For instance, one of the earliest records from Shinar runs thus: "To [the god] Ninridu, his King, for the preservation of Idadu, *viceroys of Ridu*, the servant, the delight of Ninridu." Another: "To [the god] Ninip the King, *his King*, Gudea, *viceroys of [the god] Zirgulla*, his house built." Another: "To Nana, the lady, lady splendid, his lady, Gudea, *viceroys of Zirgulla . . . raised.*"—*Empires of the Bible, chap. 6, par. 3, 4.*

These are not only the earliest of the records that have been *found* in that land, but they themselves show that they are of the earliest records that were *made* in that land. And they clearly testify of a time when there were no kings amongst men. The gods were the kings; and the

men in authority claimed only to be the viceroys of the gods who were held to be the real kings.

And all this testifies of a time further back, when the people knew and recognized God as the only king and rightful ruler of men. They show also that this knowledge of God was so recent, and still so strong upon the minds of the people, that men who stood in places of authority had not the boldness to assume the title of king, even though they held the power.

The records of Egypt and Assyria testify precisely to these same things. And at that time, also, *there was no state*. There was society.

There came a time, however, when even this lingering knowledge of God as king and the only rightful ruler, was cut off; and the man himself assumed the full title and prerogatives of king.

The first man to do this was Nimrod. Nimrod was the first man in the world who had the boldness to take to himself the title and prerogative of king, in the face of the yet lingering idea of God as king. Nimrod was the first one to establish the might, the power, the authority, of human government, in the form of an organized state. He was the first man to assert the power and prerogatives, and assume the title, of king over men.

Consequently: "With the setting up of Nimrod's kingdom, the entire ancient world entered a new historical phase. The oriental tradition which makes that warrior *the first man who wore a kingly crown*, points to a fact more significant than the assumption of a new ornament of dress, or even the conquest of a province. His reign introduced to the world a new system of relations between the governor and the governed. The authority of former rulers rested upon the feeling of kindred; and the ascendancy of

the chief was an image of parental control. Nimrod, on the contrary, was a *sovereign of territory*, and of men *just so far as they were its inhabitants*, and *irrespective of personal ties*. Hitherto there had been tribes—enlarged families—*society*: now there was a nation, a political community—THE STATE. The political and social history of the world henceforth are distinct, if not divergent.” —*Empires of the Bible, chap. 6, par. 7.*

Such was the true origin of the state. The state was, and is, the result of the apostasy of men from God. Such only could possibly be its origin; for if all men had always observed the two “first of all the commandments,” it would have been impossible for there ever to have been any state. There could have been no human authority exercised. All would have been equally subject to God; He would have been the only sovereign.

Before Nimrod there was society. Respect of the rights of persons and of their property was maintained. It was only when the apostasy grew, and men got farther and farther from God, that the monarchical idea was established and personified in Nimrod.

Let no one misunderstand. This is not to say, nor even to imply, that there should *now* be no human government; that there should be no state, nor even that there should be no monarchy. It is simply to say that which is the truth, that if there never had been any apostasy from God, there never could have been on earth a state, nor any human government.

It is true that these things are the consequences of the apostasy from God. But men *having apostatized* from God, these things all, even to such monarchy as that of Nimrod or of Nero, became necessary, just in proportion to the degree of apostasy.

It is better that there should be a government, bad as it may be, than that there should be no government at all. Even such a government as Nimrod’s or Nero’s is better than none at all. But without apostasy there could never have been any human government at all; and without the apostasy having gone to a fearful length, there never could have been any *such* government as Nimrod’s or Nero’s.

Nimrod’s example was eagerly followed by all the tribes around, until they were all absorbed in it. Society had passed away, and only states remained; and these universally idolatrous.

Christianity was introduced to bring man back to the position, and the original relations, which he had lost. “For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph. 2: 10. And Christ hath suffered for us, “the Just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.” 1 Pet. 3: 18.

It being, then, the one great purpose of Christianity to restore man to his original condition and relation to God, its purpose is to restore him to the condition in which he can love God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength, and his neighbor as himself. It is to restore him to obedience to the first two of all the commandments. It is to restore him to perfect and supreme religion.

We have seen that such a condition maintained from the beginning would have been the absolute separation of religion and the state; because, then, there never could have been any state. And now, as the one great purpose of Christianity is to restore man completely to that condition, it follows with perfect conclusiveness that Christianity in its very essence, from the beginning to the

end, and everywhere, demands the absolute separation of religion and the state.

And it must not be forgotten that the complete separation of religion and the state in those who profess religion, can be maintained only by these persons

themselves being separated from the state. For it is so plain as to be indisputable that if the professor of religion is himself a part of the state, then *in him* there is at once a union of religion and the state.



What "Civil Sabbath" Laws Involve

By M. C. Wilcox

I WILL use neither time nor space to consider all that is involved in Sabbath legislation. But it seems well to lay before the candid readers of this journal, many of whom no doubt have sometimes favored such legislation, a few of the very obvious consequences that flow from it, some of the fruitage of Sabbath-law seed-sowing. We beg them to consider these as Christians; if not, as lovers of liberty, not for themselves, but the other man.

The claim is frequently made that all that is desired to be accomplished by Sabbath legislation is to secure to the workingman, and all those who desire it, a day of rest. But, candidly, if the Sabbath were not a religious institution would we have this demand for laws to "protect" it? Has not the demand for such laws invariably sprung from those who regard the day as a holy day? This question can be truthfully answered only in the affirmative. The law is desired to sustain or protect a religious institution. If such a law is secured and enforced, here are some of the effects sure to follow:

1. A legal Sabbath involves, in a country where there are classes which disagree, a decision by the lawmaking or judicial power as to what day is the Sabbath. This would demand a commis-

sion or court to decide the religious question. This court would, if not claiming infallibility, place itself in a position where it must assume to act as infallible, or the law would become a dead letter. Religion would be united with the state. The government would be made the arena for religious controversy and priestly intrigue, and all the sad fruits of the fourth to the eighth centuries of the Christian era would follow; and in this sad controversy good government would perish, and true religion would hide in desolate places.

2. In the decision rendered by the government, it discriminates against one part of its citizens. It involves, unless these classes will compromise on some other day of the week, the adoption by the government of a religious institution held by only a part of its citizens as sacred. It exalts, honors, and encourages that part of the Christian church and the people of the land which keep the law-adopted day, by establishing a religious tenet held by them; and correspondingly abases, dishonors, and humiliates those who may disagree.

If, for example, the government should enact a law for the establishment of the seventh day, it would unduly exalt those

who observed that day above those who observed the first day, but who were equally good citizens, and who cared equally as much for the good of their country. Thus the government would find itself arrayed against a great part of its own citizens, not from any change of attitude on their part toward the government, but because of the action of the government itself in a field entirely foreign to the purpose for which any just government is established.

3. Such action by the government involves injustice. It is said that the man whose day is not chosen is not prevented from observing any day he wishes. That may be true generally, though not always. But even though this were invariably so, the law is unjust. The first-day man has the same right to observe the first day, so far as man is concerned, as the seventh-day man has to observe the seventh day. Each conscientiously observes the day of his choice, as he believes God requires. Now the state steps in and says to the first-day man, You must keep the seventh day also. It thereby imposes a tax of $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. (one-sixth of his time) upon the first-day man that it does not impose upon the seventh-day man. Therefore the state is guilty of the injustice, and not the observer of another day, unless it can be shown that the individual has no right to choose his own religion, but must accept that adopted and enforced by the state.

This hardship, this unjust demand, this injustice, would come to the first-day observer not by virtue of his relation as a citizen, but solely because of his religion; and his religion does not come into conflict with the *rights* of his fellow-citizens, but in conflict with their religious belief enforced by civil law. No sophistry can evade this argument. A "civil Sabbath" law would be unjust.

4. "Civil-Sabbath" laws tyrannize over conscience. That those who are working for such laws do not design to touch any man's conscience, I give them credit; yet that is the effect of such a law. It seeks to compel a man to observe an institution utterly repugnant to him under the plea that it is only a "civil" law. So in the same sense was the law of Nebuchadnezzar a civil law, in harmony with the majority, for the good of the people, and necessary for the maintenance and stability of the government of Babylon! And Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego could have obeyed it as a civil ordinance, according to the same kind of logic, without compromising their faith! All that Nebuchadnezzar required was obedience to a civil decree. The Hebrews were not forbidden to worship *their* God (see Daniel 3). But the loyal servants of Jehovah thought differently. They could not be made to seem to worship that which their consciences condemned. They could defy all Babylon and go into the fiery furnace with clear consciences, rather than with compromised consciences to offend God and buy the favor of the king. They would not bow down to the great image even though certain death was before them. And God vindicated their course.

All this has been on the supposition that the government enforced the seventh day. Every first-day man will admit the force of the argument, the cogency of the reasoning. But every one of the foregoing arguments are just as true if the case were reversed. The rights of the seventh-day man are as sacred as those of the first-day man, and no more. Injustice is as much a sin in one case as in the other. Numbers have no bearing in the matter. Injustice to one man is as truly injustice as though it were exercised toward a million.

Sabbath legislation means religious legislation, religious tyranny, religious persecution. The great marvel is that Christians, professed followers of Christ, should engage in such work. Surely they must be moved by sentiment, not by calm, Christian reason and principle. The Master said: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye

even so to them." Yet in the light of this those who have named His name, seek in that name to persecute him who is a follower of Christ Jesus, but who may not believe as they do. Jesus said again: "If any man hear my words and believe *not*, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." John 12: 47.



The Papal Theory of the Relation Between Church and State

II.

[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.]

HENCE it follows that not only since the foundation of the Church, but from the very commencement of social life, two Powers were appointed to govern the world—the spiritual and the temporal, both of God, but different in the character of their institution. The civil Power, though instituted immediately by God, was not especially communicated to an individual in this or that kingdom (*Almainus de potestate eccles. et laica*, 2 i. cap. i.). This is the primary difference between the two Powers, for the Church was not only constituted directly by Christ, but the supreme authority was conferred directly upon Peter as His representative on earth. The whole constitution likewise of the Church is divine; therefore the

prince, like the individual Christian, falls under the universal obligation of submission to its authority. But, says Lactantius, in these two, the royal priesthood and secular royalty, inseparably united, the duty of man as well as all truth is contained. (*Lactant. div. Instit.* iii. c. 1: "Et in his duobus inseparabiliter connexis et officium hominis et veritas omnis inclusa est.") Christ, himself of a priestly and royal race, has allotted to each of these two powers its particular office. The priestly and royal dignity, says an eloquent modern writer, are like the two columns of bronze at the gates of the temple, or like the golden cherubim, which, stretching out their wings, cover the sides of the mercy-seat of God. Both Powers, the spiritual and

the temporal, rest upon Christ as upon a cornerstone; both serve the same Creator, and rule the same men.¹ (Philipps' *Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii.)

From this identity of purpose follows the necessity of unity between these two Powers. For, says the eminent German writer on canon law whom I have already quoted, they have a common end: the glorification of God and the well-being of the human race. Or, as an ancient writer expresses it, never so great as may be the difference between the spiritual and the temporal Powers, for the one may be likened to the soul, the other to the body, yet they nevertheless tend to one and the same end—the salvation of those subject to them. (Isid. Pelus. lib. iii. *Epist.* 247.) The two Powers are united by Christ, says Peter Damian, in a mysterious manner, and as it were sacramentally, for they both find in Him, the Priest and King, their unity.² They are taught to be of one heart and of one mind in the Lord. (Petr. Damiani *Epist.* lib. vii. Ep. 3.) He who bears the sword of civil power is bound as the servant of God to unite it with the sword of the Church. In such a sense our own king Edgar expressed himself to the bishops Dunstan, Oswald, and Ethel-

wald. "Rival, O priests," he said, "rival the ways of the Lord and the just doings of our God. It is time to rise up against them who break the law. I hold in my hand the sword of Constantine, you that of Peter; let us join our right hands and unite sword to sword and cast the evil-doers out of our homes so that the sanctuary of the Lord may be purged and the sons of Levi minister in the temple."³

Again, these two Powers are connected by the link of mutual support, kings stand in need of the Church for things divine, and the Church is protected by the laws of the State. If the warning voice of the Church fail to deter evil-doers from violence, the sword of the civil Power is drawn on their behalf. Where the power of the one fails it is supplied by the other.⁴ (Gelas. Tomus de Anathematis vinculo apud harduin.) For though indeed they are two Powers they form one Christian Kingdom.⁵ (Richard archiep. Cantuar. *epist.* ad omn. *episc.* Angliæ, inter Petr. Blis. *Epist.* 73.) "O ye servants of the Church, and ye servants of kings," exclaims Bossuet, "why are you divided? Is the ordinance of God opposed to the ordinance of God? O why do you not remember that yours is a united activity; that to serve God is to serve the State,

¹ The Christian church was not appointed to rule the world. This is the assumption of those who would make the church a carnal power. The state was not instituted immediately by God. That is the assumption of those who would make the state divine. This theory of the unity of church and state is not Christian in any sense. The church was instituted by God; the state was instituted by men. The church is composed of those whose natures are being transformed into the likeness of Christ's by the power of the Holy Spirit; the state is made up of those who desire to protect themselves from injustice and violence, and has nothing to do with the spiritual regeneration of men. Christ is the cornerstone of His church, of those who are regenerated, but He is not the cornerstone, nor any other stone, of the state. Never did he give the slightest intimation that he was the ruler of the state; on the contrary he positively declared that He had nothing to do with the state.

² Yes, this union must have been brought about in a mysterious manner, indeed, if it subsists in spite of the plain distinction made by Christ between the things of Cæsar and the things of God (Matt. 22:21), and his plain declaration to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." John 18:36.

³ This is in essence the very thing that is being declared to-day by those religious forces which are attempting through "civic clubs," politics and the civil law to "reform" society.

⁴ The power of the true church and the power of the state are totally unlike. One is the power of persuasion, of entreaty, of love, of moral conviction; the other is the power of force, of the sword. It is utterly impossible then that one can supply power for the other. The church which bears such a relation to the state is not the church of Christ: The church of Christ receives its power from on high; not from the powers of earth.

⁵ "The kingdom of God is . . . righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17), and "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3. But any man can see this "Christian Kingdom," for all are in it regardless of whether they are born again or not. This is the sort of a "Christian Kingdom" that the religious elements in this country now have in mind, and which they propose to usher in "through the gateway of politics." If such a kingdom is Christian, there is nothing that is not Christian.

and that to serve the State is to serve God?"⁶ (Bossuet, *Sermon sur l'Unité de l'Eglise.*) This, as a terse exposition of the general principle, is true, provided it be understood as applying only to a State when it is acting in all things in conformity with the precepts of the Church.

In so far, then, it is true that the Church is in possession of both swords; the one she has in her own hand, the other is wielded in her behalf. Frederick II., Emperor of Germany, recognized this principle when he described the material sword as subsidized by the spiritual.⁷ From all that has been said, it follows that the civil Power was not merely bound to provide the necessary means of divine worship, but to look upon the furtherance of the kingdom of God as its higher aim and greatest privilege.⁸ "But this was brought about," says Professor Philipps, in his great work on canon law (Philipps' *Kirchenrecht. Gegenseitige Hülfeleistung beider Gewalten.*) "by a well-ordered legislation which excluded from itself everything that might stand even in the slightest opposition to the divine law promulgated by the Church; by a legislation which with the weight of its authority helped out the ecclesiastical prescripts (Can. certum est. 12. D. 10. In this Pope Gelasius recommends to the East Gothic King Theoderic, the observance of the Roman law, not only in secular but in spiritual matters); and this was especially the case by the employment of the secular penal power where that of the Church did not suf-

fice." Hence it was that the Church from the earliest times, especially in the matter of the assembling of Councils to decide doctrinal disputes, claimed the interference and support of the civil Power; and the emperors themselves appeared in the Councils in order to see to the execution of its decrees.⁹ (Philipps' *Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii.)

Occasions were not wanting for the employment of the civil sword in defence of the Church. "Defend," says Leo the Great in a letter to the Emperor Theodosius II., "defend against the heretics the unshaken position of the Church, so that by the rights of Christ your kingdom also be protected." (Leon. M. epist. 43. c. 3. ad Theodos.) Thus the spiritual and the civil Powers were so united as to make it impossible that rebels against the one should find refuge with the other.¹⁰ Hence, argues Professor Philipps, this principle follows: that neither the Church nor the State, whensoever they are united on the true basis of divine right, have any cognizance of tolerance. (*Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii., p. 511. See also Muzzarelli, *Tolleranza*, in his *Il buon uso della logica*, tom. ii., p. 66.) "Not the Church," he says, "because neither true peace nor true charity recognizes tolerance. Not the State, because in accordance with its own principle it must not tolerate anything which does not agree with divine justice. Christ himself condemns tolerance when He says: 'Who

⁹ This is the truth, and to this fact is due the most inhuman, terrible, and abominable events of human history.

¹⁰ Well was it declared to the General Assembly of Virginia, in 1785, in that noble memorial which bears the name of Madison: "What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty have found in established clergy convenient auxiliaries." This is the secret of the union of church and state "on the true basis of divine right." It resolves itself into the "divine right" of despotism.

⁶ To serve God is to serve every just law of the state; for the service of God is the service of love, and "love worketh no ill to his neighbor." But to serve the state is not to serve God, for the state is not God.

⁷ The power which subsidizes the material sword is not spiritual; it is earthly, carnal. The power which pretends to be spiritual and which subsidizes the material sword is devilish.

⁸ This is the message that we are now hearing from many "Protestant" sources.

is not with me is against me.' " "And the peace of Christ," continues Professor Philipps, "is very easily reconciled with the sword which he has also brought, by which father is divided from son, brother from brother. The peace of Christ, and therewith that of the Church, goes hand in hand with truth and justice, not with error and immorality; it goes hand in hand with unity, but not with division. For the preservation of unity this peace calls for the sword to separate brother from brother, in order that brother might not separate brother from the unity of the Church." Moreover, the Church has the right, in virtue of her divine commission, to require of everyone to accept her doctrine; whosoever obstinately refuses, or obstinately insists upon the election out of it of what is pleasing to himself, is against her, "But were the Church," continues Professor Philipps, "to tolerate such an opponent, she must tolerate another; if she tolerate one sect, she must tolerate every sect, and thereby give herself up."¹¹

So far Professor Philipps. In the foregoing passages I have quoted from him verbatim, in order that there might be no mistake as to the meaning of so great an authority on the question as to the tolerance of errors in the matter of religion. In a succeeding paragraph, however, the writer draws a distinction between the divine law and that positive human law which has developed itself in the course of history.

According to divine law, he says, every magistrate, whether spiritual or temporal, must in every respect take his stand on the principle of religious intolerance, but

nevertheless this is not the principle of the law which has historically constituted itself. In this law many modifications are introduced by treaties which are to be held sacred, by constitutions confirmed by oath, and the like. Therefore, according to positive human law, that intimate alliance which is required by the divine law does not always exist between the two Powers destined to rule the world.¹² Unfortunately we all know too well as a fact the modifications which have taken place in the divine constitution of society; but what is so necessary to enforce, is the vast distinction between the respect for rights that have sprung up out of the compulsory modifications of a principle divine in its origin, and the entire or voluntary abandonment of that principle.

It must, however, be remembered that just now I am treating of what I have called the Catholic theory of the relations between the temporal and spiritual Powers. I shall in the course of this paper or of the next have to come across the historical modifications which have arisen in those relations and shall have to encounter, not only the modification but the partial destruction, and in some instances and for a time, the total abandonment, of that principle which divine Providence has laid down as the basis on which the government of human society rests.

Lest I should seem just now to be giving too religious a character to this discussion, or rather to be giving too theocratic a view of the constitution of society, may I be allowed to recall the fact familiar to everyone that the State is co-eval with the human race itself, that the knowledge of the divine constitution of

¹¹ The doctrine of intolerance is here presented in all its baldness. Of course the church which has substituted the power of politics and the sword for the power of Christ cannot be expected to tolerate those who differ from her. When she has no longer the power of love, of holiness, but only the power of the state, she cannot relinquish the right to perse-

cute without "giving herself up;" for she is nothing but a persecuting power, and to cease to persecute is for her to cease to be.

¹² And fortunate it is, indeed, that such is the case, for if this alliance did exist in all its intimacy all the time the ages of darkness and persecution would be perpetual.

society is found in the remotest antiquity, and that after the rise and passing away of many an empire, traces of this great truth still remained deep and clear even in the mind of the heathen. The

godless theory of the constitution of society is as shallow as it is modern.¹³ The older, the truer, the Catholic mode of treating this subject is therefore the only one that I can adopt.



Remedies for Romanism

[Viewed from no other standpoint than that of the statistician, the Catholic Church is making enormous strides in the United States. Recently published statistics show that the increase in the number of communicants of that church in the last few years has been far in excess of the combined increase of all the larger religious bodies. The condition of affairs which this reveals calls emphatically for such instruction as that contained in the following article by the noted evangelist, Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, which appeared in the London (England) *Christian* a few months ago.]

HOW shall we, as evangelical Christians, counteract the Romanizing movement in our midst? We look upon that movement as one of the greatest perils that threatens both church and state.

The Romish apostasy began with corruption of the minds of men from the simplicity and the purity that is in Christ (2 Cor. 11: 2, 2), apart from which we cannot touch the sublimities of our holy faith. Underneath the doings and the teachings of the Romish Church there is a foundation of truth, and this makes the whole thing so difficult to deal with. Yet the fact just stated indicates the line along which, by God's grace, we may successfully combat a movement which is founded in the obscuring of Christian verities and in playing upon the needs of the human heart. When divine truth is not fully declared, helpless men turn to counterfeits. We must seek to bring truth to light, that it may contradict error.

The dogma of papal infallibility is based upon human longing for authority in some final word to satisfy the questioning heart of man. But that dogma denies the office of the Holy Spirit as Administrator of the affairs of the church in the

absence of Jesus Christ, and degrades the idea of the *catholic* church by implying that one man can comprehend within himself all truth. Correction of the error will be found by practically recognizing the presence of the Holy Ghost in the midst of God's people; and realization of that truth will bring about the renunciation of worldly methods of service. Until this be done platform protests will be powerless to save the nation from the paralysis of popery.

Sacerdotalism claims that so-called priests have certain rights of access to God which are denied to other men. These pretensions are based upon the soul's desire for spiritual guidance. Here the fulness of the work of Christ is denied, as well as the administrative power of the Holy Spirit in the believer. The error confines sacramental grace to a narrow rivulet, concealing the fact that grace flows through the whole catholic church

¹³ The most godless theory of the constitution of society that has yet afflicted the world is that which is set forth in this article—that which identifies religion and government. For when this theory is put into practise they who are in power assume the place and prerogatives of God, and do everything under the sun that they can to make all men recognize them as God, and to prevent any one from worshipping God in spirit and in truth. Such a constitution of society is as godless as it is possible for society to be constituted.

of Jesus Christ. We are to correct it by returning to the doctrine of the divine immanence in every believer, and by insisting upon the duty of each to seek to know the mind of God, immediately and directly, concerning every detail of life.

Young people sometimes come and ask me, "Do you think I may go to the theater?" My answer is twofold. First, I reply, "I do not know; ask your Lord when you are alone with Him." And then, "If you ask me whether I can go, the reply is, Certainly not." I decline to decide a single question of conduct for any one. It is so easy to take the decision of others in such matters; but a strong character is never made, and the will of God is never done, in that way. You cannot realize what it is to be "a man in Christ," unless you learn to wait amid the silence of a great perplexity until the voice of God sounds in your soul. When we reach that point, the priest loses his occupation.

The confessional finds acceptance in our land with thousands of men and women, principally the latter. It recognizes sin as an act of rebellion with consequences beyond the control of the sinner, and is reared upon human craving for pardon. What is wrong about it? The confessional delegates a power which has never been given by God to man, blunting the conscience, and setting sin in a false light. One sentence only upon a grave side of the question—the practise carries an awful possibility of sinning. I need not dwell upon that last shocking and awful fact. The corrective is to be found in proclaiming the atoning value of the cross of Christ, for immediate and direct pardon of sin confessed to God alone.

There is a close connection between the sacerdotal pretension of the "priest" and that rationalistic theology which drops the cross out of its preaching; for

the latter has served the former, while professing to fight it. We must get back to the declaration, everywhere and at all times, that, without shedding of blood, there is no remission. It is quite time that we were done with the false thing called "culture," which abhors the doctrine of atonement by blood. When the doctrine, in its necessity and direct results, is faithfully preached, the confessional will have no place among us.

Take that which, called by its right name, is termed the mass. The writings of Roman mystics discover a seeking for actual contact and communion of man with God; and this doctrine of the mass, false as it is blighting, is founded upon the heart's true hunger for comradeship with Christ. The doctrine degrades eternal and spiritual things to a material and sensual level, and creates a new idolatry.

The remedy is, that we preach and live in spiritual fellowship with the Father and with His Son, as the constant habit of our life. Then should there be no room for the false idea which robs men of their true communion, and leaves them out of touch with God. While there is need for exposure and denunciation of the vileness of the Romish system, it must be ours, as evangelical Christians, to bear clear and full testimony to the positive truths which center in Christ.

[Another dangerous doctrine of Romanism, and one which has a sufficient foundation of truth to make it the equal in deceptive power of any other of these false doctrines, is that of the relation between church and state. This doctrine is by no means as simple and as easy to deal with as is commonly supposed, as may be seen by a careful reading of the instalment in this number of THE SENTINEL of "The Papal Theory of the Relation Between Church and State." There are especial reasons why the doctrine

there announced should be opposed in this country by the proclamation of the Christian truth with regard to the relation between church and state. While the power which stands for this error is rapidly growing in this country, the error itself is growing much more rapidly than is the Papacy or any of her other doctrines. It is, therefore, of great importance that the truth in this matter should be set forth, and that is what THE SENTINEL is trying to do.—EDITOR.]



More Candid Testimony on an Important Subject

[After the March SENTINEL had gone to press there came into our possession a reprint of a sermon delivered at the Church of the Messiah (Unitarian), in this city on November 24, last, on "Sunday: Its Origin, History and Authority." We regret that we did not have this earlier so that the pertinent extracts here given might have been presented in connection with other matter of the same tenor then given. We are glad however to now add to what was then presented concerning the Biblical authority and historical facts regarding Sunday observance, the testimony of so able and intelligent a man as Dr. Savage, who is himself an earnest friend of Sunday observance.—Editor.]

THE one point to which I wish to invite your attention is a consideration of the origin, history, and authority of Sunday, so that we may have the facts, at any rate, to go upon in making up our minds. For it is astonishing what gross ignorance there is on the part of the majority of the people, even those supposed to be intelligent, concerning this matter of Sunday. They have taken tradition, prejudice, all sorts of things, for facts, and have not intelligently considered the matter.

* * * * *

Because God is traditionally said to have commanded the Jews to do a certain thing or not to do a certain thing on a certain day, we are told in this twentieth century that we must do and keep from doing a thousand other things that the Fourth Commandment says nothing about, on some other day. That is the situation.

It has been quietly assumed on the part of Sabbatarians [Sunday "Sabbatarians"] that there was, somehow, an authoritative transfer of the divine com-

mand to keep the seventh day to the first day of the week, because our Sunday is not the Sabbath day of the Jews at all. Let us note the attitude of the New Testament on the subject.

What was the attitude of Jesus, in the first place? He was popularly charged with being a Sabbath-breaker; and he was, according to the standards of the people of his time. He disregarded their traditions. For example, they forbade walking through the fields of grain. Why? Because, if you happened to knock out some of the kernels as you walked, they would consider that as a kind of threshing: it was work. Jesus went through the corn-fields or grain-fields and gathered the heads and rubbed them in His hands and ate the grain; and the disciples did the same. And, when He was charged with breaking their traditional law, He admitted it and then enunciated that great principle, which ought to be a luminous guide for us—that human needs, human well-being, were superior to any tradition; "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sab-

bath." And, if human well-being and the Sabbath came in conflict, Jesus had no question as to which should give way.

* * * * *

In general, there is not a single word in the Christian Scriptures [the New Testament], from one end to the other, in regard to keeping any day at all, in any way whatsoever—not one single word. The Jewish Sabbath is distinctly and definitely abrogated; and there is not one word from the lips of Jesus or any of His apostles concerning the keeping of any other day in its place—not one single syllable.

There are only a very few references to the first day of the week anywhere. We are accustomed to talk a good deal about the "Lord's Day," but that phrase occurs only once in the Bible, in the Book of Revelation; and nobody can prove that the author had in mind our Sunday then. It is always "the first day of the week," and there is no command about it. We are not told what we ought to do on that day or ought not to do.

* * * * *

I challenge the world to contradict successfully and by facts any single utterance of mine this morning.

* * * * *

The first law ever issued on the subject by any authority whatsoever was an edict of Constantine, promulgated in the year 321; that is, three hundred years went by before there was any law issued in regard to Sunday at all. Note that Constantine had been a sun-worshipper; and, when he issued this edict, what is it? He does not say anything about the Lord's day. He says nothing about the Sabbath, about the first day of the week. He does not refer to the resurrection, or to any divine command whatsoever. He simply by this edict makes what he calls "the great and venerable day of the sun" a holiday. In

other words, he releases people from the necessity of attending courts or engaging in any public business on that day, sets them free; and he distinctly and definitely says that the farmers whose work requires constant attention may feel themselves perfectly free to look after their affairs as usual, as they did on any other day. That is the first law ever issued concerning the keeping of Sunday.

Now I wish to tell you how one or two of the great Church Fathers treated the matter. You would imagine them to know something about it. Saint Cyril, who was bishop of Jerusalem, and whose life spans the years from 315 to 386, uses these words: "Turn thou not out of the way to Samaritanism or Judaism; for Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee. Henceforth reject all observance of Sabbaths, and call not meats, which are really matters of indifference, common or unclean."

Then Jerome, the famous old Church Father, who lived from 340 to 420, says this: "On the Lord's day they went to church; and, returning from church they would apply themselves to their allotted works, and make garments for themselves and others." And again: "The day is not a day of fasting, but the day is a day of joy. The Church has always considered it a day of joy, and none but heretics have thought otherwise."

Now I imagine that the Lutherans of this city, the Dutch Reformed churches—indeed, most orthodox churches—would pay a good deal of regard to Luther's opinions. You know what Martin Luther said about Sunday. He was speaking of an attempt being made in that day to enforce it on the churches on the basis of the Fourth Commandment; and he says: "If anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake, if anywhere anyone sets up its observance on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on

it, to ride on it, to feast on it, to *do anything* to remove this encroachment on Christian liberty." That is Martin Luther.

John Calvin has been generally regarded as rather sound in the faith. Let us see what his attitude was. Calvin went so far as to advocate a change from Sunday to Thursday, making this great break as a distinct and definite assertion that one day was just as good as another. And, when the famous old John Knox went to Geneva on a certain occasion to see Calvin, he found him one Sunday afternoon out playing bowls. That is John Calvin. In other words, if Calvin and Luther were living to-day, they would be fit subjects for church discipline.

Beza, who was a coadjutor of Calvin's and his successor at Geneva, advocated distinctly working on Sunday. And Bucer, another great man, and a co-worker with Luther, took the same ground, advocating the idea that work on that day was no more harmful than on any other.

I have given you these specimens of church history and church opinion on the subject. I do not wish you to judge my opinion on the subject until I get through, because I do not feel at all bound to agree with any of these whose opinions I have thus far given you.

Where did our Puritan Sunday originate? For—get this clearly in your mind—our Puritan, American, and English ideas of Sunday were never heard of on the face of the earth until about the sixteenth century. They grew out of the Puritan reaction. What is the explanation of it?

Thackeray says, "An Englishman is not necessarily a brute; but an English brute is the worst sort of brute." He was speaking of the customs of the common people in England. They carried this

matter of pleasure, sports, on Sunday, to such an extent that it became a national scandal as to morals. It was given up to every kind of licentiousness, to cruel sports, bear-baiting, and everything that revolted the sense of the better people of that time; and it was against this sort of day that the Puritans rebelled; and, naturally, our sympathies go with them in that rebellion.

But how did they do it? If you would know anything about the temper and spirit of the Puritans, they lived a good deal more in the Old Testament than in the New. They quoted it more; and their God was a man of war. They were living in troublous times, when they wanted the backing of this conception of the Divine.

Now what did they do in regard to this Sunday? They went back, and, as they innocently supposed, revived the Jewish Sabbath. They thought that was what they were doing. They took the Fourth Commandment, and declared that it was binding to-day in regard to the first day of the week as it had been in the old Jewish times concerning the seventh day. And so they set up their kind of Sunday, backing it up by the supposed divine authority that had issued the Fourth Commandment.

But the Puritans in regard to this matter, as in a good many others, were seriously mistaken. They did not revive the Jewish Sabbath at all, for the Jewish Sabbath was never that kind of a day. * * *

The Puritans were entirely mistaken when they made this hard and uncomfortable day, that many of us can remember, and based it on a misinterpretation of the Fourth Commandment. For they said, and they made it into theocratic law, A man must go to church, and do this and that, and not do this and that,

forgetting, even if the Fourth Commandment were a matter of divine and eternal authority, that it does not command anything. It only forbids one thing; that is, labor.

These, then, are the main facts in regard to the origin, the history, and the authority of Sunday. You will note that I have kept clear in my discussion the Sabbath from the Sunday, because there is absolutely no historical connection be-

tween the two whatsoever; and the early church never made the mistake of identifying the two.

I have made it clear, I trust, that there is no ground whatever for the traditional Puritan idea of Sunday. You cannot find it in secular history. It does not exist in the Bible. You cannot find it in church history, until you come to the Puritan Revolution of the sixteenth century, and there it is manifestly based on a mistake.



Hearings at the Massachusetts Capitol

By K. C. Russell

There was another interesting Sunday-law hearing conducted at the State House in Boston, Mass., Friday, February 21. This bill was introduced by the religious element which is ever appealing to the puny arm of flesh for the support of the Sunday sabbath.

Among those present who were of influence in the interests of Sunday legislation were Mrs. Stephenson, the president of the Massachusetts W. C. T. U. organization, and Miss McEntire, the president of the Boston Association of W. C. T. Unions.

One of Boston's prominent attorneys was secured by the Sunday folks to introduce the bill before the committee. The proposed legislation is for the purpose of prohibiting theaters from conducting Sunday concerts unless they are strictly sacred, and causing all proceeds from such concerts to be used for religious and charitable purposes.

It was plain to be seen from the first, that the committee were not at all in sympathy with the proposed bill.

The point that was discussed more than any other at this hearing was how

to determine between a sacred and profane concert. A minister who spoke in favor of the bill with more zeal than knowledge, frankly admitted that the question of what was and what was not sacred was a very difficult one to decide. He further said in effect that the theater was a competitor of the church.

Opportunity was given those who desired to speak in opposition to the bill, and the time was improved by Elder G. B. Wheeler and others. Each speaker endeavored to make plain the principle of a total separation of the church and the state.

It was shown by the opposition that an immoral concert was just as bad on one day as another, and that the Lord and the person who is born again are only able to determine what is sacred, and even the converted soul can decide that for himself only.

It was clearly seen, by the attitude of those in favor of this bill, that the spirit of religious intolerance is growing.

On March 11 there was another interesting hearing on a bill that had been introduced for the purpose of restricting

all sectarian legislation. There were present a goodly number of distinguished clergymen, representing the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational and Christian denominations.

The proposition emphasized by nearly all the speakers was that no appropriation should be granted by the State to any religious body.

In the main, the speakers presented the truth regarding the proper functions of the State in this matter in a most forcible, interesting and eloquent manner. With great emphasis a number of the speakers stated that any denomination that could not support itself without the aid of the State ought to die, and other similar expressions were made.

Some of those who spoke most decidedly in support of this measure are among New England's most zealous advocates of Sunday legislation. It is a query how intelligent men can so earnestly defend the principles that underlie our Federal Government, and in

the very next breath seek the aid of the State in support of the Sunday institution, which is in flagrant contradiction of the principles of religious liberty. What is the difference whether the State shall impose a tax in money or of one's time, which represents money, as is done when, by civil enactment, the observance of a particular day in each week is required in response to the demands of a class of citizens who desire to have their religious conceptions, especially with regard to "the Sabbath," "respected"?

It was very evident that if those present who were in *deed* and in *truth* the supporters of the principle of this bill, had placed before the honorable committee what was really involved in a bill to eliminate *all religious* legislation of a sectarian character, that they would have been regarded as opposers of the bill, instead of its true supporters, by those who were so loudly and rightly, too, pleading that the State should not discriminate in favor of any religious organization.



On February 16, 1899, Secretary of the Navy Long delivered an address before the Home Market Club of Boston. In that address Mr. Long said: "It is certain cause for congratulation that the extreme imperialists who resisted the treaty have been signally overthrown. By resisting its ratification they have been insisting upon the extremest imperialism and have now out-Heroded Herod. They not only would have prolonged the war with Spain, but would have refused to take out of the hands of one man, the President, absolute authority over the Philippines, limited only to the indefinite scope of what is called the war power, wielded by a purely military arm holding a naked sword. Think of that for impe-

rialism! It is a great credit to the President that, like Julius Cæsar and George Washington, he has refused this offer of a kingly crown. On the contrary, the good old democratic plan has been adopted of putting the disposition of these islands into the hands of the American people, who will duly express their will through their representatives in Congress assembled. I have no doubt the President is delighted to have the elephant off his hands and on theirs."

Three years have gone by since this speech was delivered and yet the President appears to be wielding about as much power in the Philippines as he did in 1899. It is true that Congress is going through the form of enacting a tariff law,

but the form of government under which the Filipinos must live is that of "a naked sword." So thoroughly imperialistic is this authority that it has been charged and not denied that the President's rep-

resentatives in the Philippines prohibited the reading of the Declaration of Independence before a gathering of Filipinos on July 4, 1901. "Think of that for imperialism!"—*The Commoner*.



Dr. Savage on the Sabbath and Sunday Question

By the Editor

IN this number of THE SENTINEL we quote extensively from a sermon delivered a short time ago in this city by the well-known Unitarian minister, Dr. Minot J. Savage, with regard to the origin, history, and authority of Sunday observance. We have taken the liberty to present only those portions of the address that seem to us to be especially pertinent to the Sunday question as it is now presented to public attention, and that are substantially in accord with what we believe to be the truth regarding Sunday observance and its enforcement. But inasmuch as the extracts given present only a partial view of Dr. Savage's position regarding the observance of a weekly rest day, perhaps it will be only fair to him for us to briefly present other points in his address that his position may be clearly understood.

In the first place it may be proper to say for the information of some that Dr. Savage is one of the foremost men of a religious body that has always been noted for the intelligence and culture of its leaders. He is a prolific writer on the deeper themes which now engage the attention of the intellectual world, and is a man of great intelligence and depth of thought. However widely one may differ from some of his opinions and con-

clusions, it cannot be doubted that they are the result of earnest study and deep conviction, rather than of the superficial and supercilious intellectual daring that is so prominent a characteristic of these times.

We are glad that a man of such earnestness and intelligence has spoken unequivocally regarding the popular delusion that Sunday observance is of divine authority. He states plainly the fact that neither in the Fourth Commandment, in the New Testament Scriptures, nor in Apostolic times, is there anything sanctioning the observance as of divine authority. We are glad also that he has stated in no uncertain terms that the enforcement of Sunday observance is a flagrant violation of the principle of religious freedom, the creeping in of tyranny, a return to the old theocracy, the union of church and state. Men of prominence who dare to plainly and boldly avow this evident fact are scarce, and therefore we may be pardoned for calling special attention to this instance. However, in this age such words should not deserve especial commendation; every man should hold the position that is announced by Dr. Savage on this point. The idea that civil government has anything to do with

enforcing and regulating the observance of Sunday should be as scarce as is the idea that the earth is flat, or that it rests upon the shoulders of a man who stands upon a turtle's back.

So far as the social and political phases of the Sunday question are concerned the above points are of most importance, and on these points we are heartily in accord with Dr. Savage. But there are other ideas presented by him in this connection from which we differ, and we will briefly give them here.

Dr. Savage holds that the week sprang out of planet-worship, when men knew of only seven planets, and that the weekly rest day did not originate as described in the Bible, but "is thousands of years older than the Hebrew nation, let alone the date of the composition of the Biblical books." He says that in the Bible "there are two accounts of the setting apart of the seventh day as a day of rest"—"the traditional one, with which most people are familiar, that God created the universe in six days and rested the seventh, and so set that apart;" and the account in Deuteronomy which "says that the seventh day was set apart as a memorial of the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt." He thinks that both these accounts cannot be true, but "are two irreconcilable contradictions." But he raises no question as to the seventh day of the week, as we now have it, being the day referred to in both accounts. He raises no question whatever as to the integrity of the week itself, but speaks of it as though it were now what it always has been, which is no doubt the truth. As to how far back the week can be traced in the line of what he regards as its true and original source, that of planet-worship, he says: "At least to the Accadians—a people who occupied the valley of the Euphrates before the city of Babylon was founded."

There can be no doubt that from the very earliest times of which we have knowledge, aside from the Bible, that the week and its days have been associated with planet-worship, and that in that way the days received the names by which they are now called. In nearly all pagan nations each day of the week has been associated with the worship of some special deity. But we see nothing in this inconsistent with the account given in the Bible of the institution of the week. It may have been that a long time before the week and the Sabbath became identified with the Hebrew nation that "the Accadians—a people who occupied the valley of the Euphrates before the city of Babylon was founded"—and other people as well, possessed a knowledge of and observed the week, and that among them "on Saturn's day everything was tabooed," and "the king in those far off times was not even permitted to change his royal robes on that day." All this may have been, and yet it does not seem to us to contravene the account in Genesis. Neither Dr. Savage nor anyone else offers any information concerning the week and the weekly rest day anterior to the "traditional" account in Genesis; and inasmuch as we are plainly told that as men multiplied on the earth they departed from God and gave themselves up to idolatry, what more natural than that they should have retained the week and that they should have perverted to the uses of idolatry that which had been established by the Creator of all things as the memorial of Him beside whom there is no God? Is there anything strange or inconsistent with the Bible that in the nations of those and succeeding times a weekly holiday or festival was observed? To us this fact does not argue against the account of the divine institution of the week. On the contrary, as the universal prevalence of the idea of God, though ter-

ribly distorted and corrupted in many nations, argues that once the common ancestors of all nations had a knowledge of the true God, so the existence of the week and the setting apart of one of its days for special observance, however unlike the original it may be, argues the integrity of the Biblical account of the institution of the week and the Sabbath.

Of course, Dr. Savage holds to the theory of evolution, and believes that the earth was populated long before the time given as the beginning of human history on this planet in the Bible, and believes the account in Genesis to be a fable. We do not believe thus, and we believe that so far as authentic knowledge goes, so far as a knowledge of the past exists upon facts and not upon theory, the Biblical account of the creation and of the institution of the week and the Sabbath, is better sustained than any other view of the matter.

Neither can we see two irreconcilable contradictions in the account of the institution of the Sabbath in Genesis and the account of its re-institution when the Hebrews were brought out of the bondage of Egypt. It appears to us that the Sabbath was set apart for the whole human race; that the greater portion of the race, through the corruption of idolatry, lost its true meaning and perverted it to the purposes of idolatry, or practically abandoned it altogether for the observance of the day of the chief pagan deity—the sun. Only those people who retained a knowledge of the true God, and it is quite evident that they were very few at times, retained the true Sabbath in its integrity. This people became a nation, but in the bondage of Egypt they, too, practically lost the Sabbath. But God wrought a great deliverance for them for the express purpose “that they might observe His statutes and keep His laws.” Ps. 105: 45.

Now in the reestablishment of the observance of the Sabbath among a people to whom its original design had become dimmed and also lost, is it strange that in addition to the original reason for its observance should have been given a reason based upon some later and more vivid manifestation of God's power? The Sabbath in the first place was the sign of the Creator of all things, and on this ground its observance was incumbent alike upon all peoples. But all people had departed from God, and had lost not only the Sabbath, but the reason for its observance. But here was a people who were called out to serve God, and they were delivered from bondage by the power of the same God who had created all things. Is it strange, then, that the command to them to observe the Sabbath should include not only the fact that “in six days the Lord made the heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day,” but also that “the Lord thy God brought thee out [from Egypt] thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.” This last reason would not apply to any people but the Hebrews, but that which made the Sabbath a perpetual covenant even to them, that which was the enduring foundation of the Sabbath and upon which its perpetuity depended, was plainly stated to the Hebrews. “It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: *for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.*” Ex. 31: 17.

The special reason which the children of Israel had for observing the Sabbath was subordinate to and in perfect harmony with the original reason. It did not in any way modify, change, alter, or set aside the original and fundamental

basis of Sabbath observance. To the Hebrew who would go back of the deliverance from Egypt, back of all the idolatry, to the origin of the Sabbath, its observance would mean just what it would mean to any other person of any other nation. And he could go back to this original source without any inconsistency whatever. The Sabbath is the memorial of Him who is the Creator of the heavens and the earth—the sign of that power which creates, redeems, and sanctifies—and it is the proper memorial not only for the original manifestation of that power, but for every manifestation of it. While the Sabbath itself as an institution rests upon the fact that God created the world in six days and rested upon the seventh, there may be, and will be on the part of every individual who truly observes it, special reasons for its observance by himself. To each individual comes different experiences, different manifestations of God's power, and when he truly observes the Sabbath it will be the sign to him of the God who has thus wrought mightily for him as an individual, even as to the Hebrews the Sabbath was the sign of the God who delivered them as a nation of individuals from the bondage of Egypt.

Dr. Savage holds that the command for Sabbath observance was for the Hebrews, and that when Christianity came it was no longer in force. He thinks that the observance was plainly set aside in the New Testament, and quotes these texts which certainly seem to bear out that idea: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon or a Sabbath, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ's." Col. 2: 16, 17. "Ye observe days and months and seasons and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon

you in vain." Gal. 4: 10, 11. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike: let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom. 14: 5. This opens up a large subject, but as we have already made this article much longer than was intended, we will have to pass this point without comment.

Dr. Savage says that the Sabbath was observed by many of the early Christians because of the influence of the Jewish believers who clung to its observance, but that gradually the Christians came to observe Sunday, but as an entirely different institution and in an entirely different manner. On it they celebrated the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and made it a day of rejoicing in honor of the Resurrection, but did not attach any sacredness to the day itself, nor dream that work on that day was wrong.

In concluding his address, Dr. Savage said:

Now, lest I be misunderstood, in a word at the close let me outline my own position as to Sunday. I do not care where the day has come from nor through what processes it has come. We have inherited this rest day, one day in seven; and it is one of the most blessed inheritances from all the past. It is a gift priceless; it is a divine opportunity. I think it would be infinitely lamentable to have it blotted out, to have it become like the other six days in the week. We need it for rest. We can bury ourselves deep enough in worldliness in six days, we can weary ourselves enough, we can wear ourselves out enough in brain and heart and conscience and life. Let us have one day free, when we can remember that we are men and not mere business machines, that we are not mere money-makers, not mere pleasure-seekers, in which we can remember that we are children of God. Let us prize it and guard it as one of the divinest gifts of all the past; but let us tell the truth about it, and let us place it on its true foundation of usefulness, of unspeakable beneficence to the world.

How would I have it kept? I would do this, which I believe is all that the civil government

has any right to do. The government has no right to do anything more than make it a legal holiday; that is, to release people from the necessity of labor. I would have all religious denominations of every kind jealously guarded and protected in their meeting together, in their worship. No one has a right to interfere with them. I would have everybody else jealously guarded in using the day as they please, provided they do not interfere with the equal freedom of anybody else. That is all the law has a right to do. Set the day apart, hedge it about, guard it, protect it; and then you and I are perfectly free to get just as many people as possible to agree with us in our ideas of the day, and how it ought to be kept, and why it ought to be kept. But we are released from the temptation to use force, which has always been abomination and tyranny.

We have only one comment to make on the above, and that is that we do not think this last paragraph is strictly in accord with the principle pervading the "Sound Words" which we quote elsewhere from Dr. Savage, and which were spoken at the same time. The civil government has no right to legislate regarding Sunday observance in any way whatever. So far as this point is concerned, we, too, do not care where the day has come from nor through what processes it has come. We know that it is a religious institution; as such it has been inherited from the past, and as such it is observed and honored to-day. Every person has a right to observe it, to be undisturbed in its observance. Every religious denomination has a right to observe it, and to be protected in worshipping on that day. But it is not the business of civil government to set that day apart, to hedge it about, to guard it, or protect it, because in doing so it is setting apart, hedging about, guarding, and protecting a religious observance.

Civil government may make holidays and guard them to a degree, but it has no business to make legal holidays of *religious* days. So far as government is

concerned a person has no more right to observe Sunday than he has to observe any other day, and government has no business to give him any more protection on Sunday than on other days. Every religious denomination (not because it is a religious denomination, but because it is an association of citizens) has an undoubted right to governmental protection from disturbance in worshipping on Sunday, but it has not a shadow of a right to an iota more of protection on Sunday than it has on any other day.

People no doubt have a right to be released from toil on Sunday if they want to observe the day, but they have no more right to be released from toil on that day than they have to be released on any other day, and the only releasing that government can do for them in this direction must apply to all days alike. Government can go no farther than to see that men are not compelled to work when they do not want to. To go farther than this is to trample upon the rights of some men in order that other men may receive from government the sort of aid which manhood and true religious conviction alike should spurn.

We believe that Dr. Savage would indorse these statements, notwithstanding at the close of his excellent address he seems to have partially endorsed the idea which now has such a tenacious grip upon the minds of so many persons: that in some way Sunday must have governmental guardianship and protection, or at least that on that day people become possessed of a great many more rights than they have on other days, so that there must be special legislation for their protection. This idea is certainly a mistake, and we believe that Dr. Savage will recognize it as such when he has looked into it as carefully as he has other points in the same address.

Minnesota's Attitude Concerning Religion in Public Schools

[A short time ago it was announced that the attorney general of Minnesota had rendered an opinion to the effect that the recital of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools of that State was unconstitutional. In response to a request for a copy of this opinion, Hon. W. B. Douglas, the present attorney general, says that no new opinion has been rendered by him, but that he has simply concurred in the opinion of former Attorney General Childs. Under date of December 10, 1895, Mr. Childs, as attorney general, wrote the following letter to Hon. W. W. Pendergast, Superintendent of public instruction.—Editor.]

SIR: You inquire whether it is lawful to open a public school with a recital of the Lord's Prayer.

The question involves a construction of Section 16 of Article 1 of the constitution, wherein it is, among other things, provided: "Nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship."

In the absence of that provision, I should not hesitate in answering your question in the affirmative. Indeed, there is a strong array of well considered cases in States whose constitutions are not thus characterized, to the effect that it is a question for the school authorities to determine whether or not a public school shall be opened with prayer and the reading of the Scriptures. Wisconsin and Minnesota, so far as my examination extends, stand alone in respect to such a provision. In the first named State, the supreme court, after exhaustive argument and in a carefully considered opinion, held that the reading of the Scriptures in a public school was in violation of the constitution in that it compelled one to support a place of worship. (*State vs. School District*, 76 Wis., 177.)

No occasion has arisen for a construction by our own court of the said provision. It was held by one of my predecessors at an early day, and some time prior to the decision reached by the Wisconsin court, that the reading of the Scriptures is a matter over which the

board of education or board of trustees has complete control. (*Op. Attys. Gen.* 83.) But on a later occasion it was said that "when the use of the Scriptures in a common school is objected to by the parents or guardians of pupils on account of religious or conscientious scruples, their adoption as a text-book is improper and the pupil may decline to use them for the same reason, without being liable to be deprived of the privileges of the school." (*Op. Attys. Gen.* 229.)

No distinction can in principle be drawn between the opening of a school with prayer or the reading of the Scriptures, so far as the question pertains to the violation of the provision above named. If one is unlawful, the other is also.

It is the purpose of the law of this State to permit no intrusion into our public schools of any religious teachings whatsoever. They are to be kept purely secular in character, and as places where the children of parents of every shade of religious belief may assemble for purposes of instruction in authorized subjects and incidental moral improvement. The judicious teacher will never attempt to institute such a practise in schools against the wishes of the parents of his pupils.

In view of the decision by the Wisconsin courts you are advised that the practise, however frequently tolerated or indulged in, is violative of the constitution.

that divine command. There is the old theocracy, the union of church and state, tyranny creeping in again.

The men who believe that God has ordered all people to keep Sunday after a certain fashion have a perfect right to persuade people to agree with them so far as they can; but they have no right to enforce it by law. Why? Consider the principle involved.

The mayor of this city may be personally interested in the salvation of my soul; he ought to be. If he believes that I ought to do something in order to be saved, he ought, as a man, to do what he can to insure my salvation; but, so far as his office of mayor is concerned, it is none of his business whether my soul is saved or not.

It is the business of the governor of this State, as an individual, to do what he can to save my soul, if he thinks it is in danger; but it is none of his business as governor. It is none of the business of the Government of the United States whether anybody's soul is saved or not, whether anybody goes to heaven or somewhere else: it is the business of the civil government only to see to it that we are good citizens. It is enough for any civil government to look after this world: it has no right to attempt to GOVERN THE NEXT. Civil government stops with the consideration of civic characteristics and conduct.

So that, whatever anybody may believe to be true in regard to the divine command as to keeping Sunday in a particular way, it is his business to use his utmost persuasion to get others to agree with him; but he has no right to attempt to use force. Hands off from religious questions! The soul stands face to face with its God, and is accountable to God only for its religious opinions.

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. APRIL, 1902. No. 5

The highest form of government is self-government.

The worst things in the world are perversions of the best things.

The rights of the majority are not inconsistent with the duties of the majority. It is the duty of the majority to protect the rights of the minority.

Not to govern the world but to save individuals is the mission of the Christian church.

An act which affects but one individual may be as unjust as one that affects a million persons.

If the church and the state are identical in purpose one of them has no excuse for existence.

The state is coeval not with human society, but with human sovereignty and human subjection—with human ambition to rule and to be exalted over others.

A man has no more right to observe Sunday than he has to observe any other day, and hence he has no right to protection in this matter which does not extend to all days alike.

Religious intolerance is often manifested through *civil* legislation. The state can strike at the religion and conscience of the individual only by abridging his natural, human rights.

The divine constitution of society calls for an alliance between the soul and God, not between church and state. The one alliance means self-government; the other means outrageous despotism.

To serve God is to observe every just law of the state, for the service of God is the service of love, and "love worketh no ill to his neighbor." But to serve the state is not to serve God, for the state is not God.

In the divine constitution of society is no provision for government either by church or state. There is only self-government—the government of principle—

and this is attained only by direct communion of the soul with God. There is no place for intervening authority. In the truly Christian kingdom "they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord."



The church which wields the sword of the Spirit will never turn for power and defense to the sword of the state. "For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword." Not the sword which mutilates the body, but the sword which penetrates soul and spirit and reaches the thoughts and intents of the heart, is the weapon of the church of Christ.



We do not remember to have read anywhere, not even in the works of the most critical students of the Papacy, a more plain and direct setting forth of the Catholic theory of the relation between church and state than is presented to our readers in this number from the pen of a Catholic writer. The doctrine of intolerance, without modification or limitation, is stated as plainly as it can be put. The civil and the ecclesiastical powers must be "united on the true basis of divine right," and when thus united neither is to "have any cognizance of tolerance." It must be "impossible that rebels against the one should find refuge with the other." All who incur the displeasure of "the Church" must feel the heavy hand of the state. Notice how through it all runs the idea of the earthly sovereignty of the church and the divinity of the state. The church is to *govern* the world conjointly with the state, and the state, by obedience to the church, is to work for "the glorification of God" and "the salvation of those subject to them." And thus the two "form one Christian Kingdom." But, it is admit-

ted sorrowfully, the true, divine theory has in practise been compelled to suffer certain modifications at the hands of "positive human law," so that the ideal "Christian Kingdom" has not been perfectly realized. But we suppose that when the Inquisition was in full swing in Spain that it was almost realized. This theory whereby church and state constitute "one Christian Kingdom" is identical with the "Christian nation" theory now so prevalent in the ranks of so-called Protestantism.

It is worth while to remember that this statement of the Catholic theory of the relation between church and state was put forth by leading Catholic apologists themselves in a nominally Protestant country in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It may be taken, therefore, as not only a fair and unprejudiced representation of the position of the Catholic Church in this matter, but a representation of the position which she wishes recognized as her own in countries where she was formerly detested chiefly on account of this very thing.



A rather abstruse problem is presented by certain quotations given in this number in which it is stated that religion and government are inseparable. We think, however, that a careful study of the first article in this number will throw some light upon it. This idea that society is a unit, and that religion should permeate and control it at every point, is based upon truth. Men are religious, and a society in which religion is supreme and all-pervading is that which corresponds with what is highest and best in man. In such a society was he originally placed. In that state would he ever have remained had he not sinned. But man sinned; he ceased to be in harmony with the laws of perfect justice and rectitude,

and departed farther and farther from God. And out of the condition which ensued came politics and the state. Now the pregnant question is, Did or does God govern man notwithstanding his apostasy from Him, and does He do it through the state which has come because of man's apostasy from God? Or, can man, by means of politics and the state, get himself out of the condition from which sprang politics and the state? Can the human race, by means of social and political organization, bring itself back to its original condition, to the state of perfect rightness and harmony with God? Can man, who has fallen under the dominion of sin, organize himself free from that dominion? The philosophy of this age answers these questions in the affirmative. It assumes that perfection in human society can be attained, and that the state will be the chief instrument in this attainment and the chief instrument in its maintenance when it is attained. Therefore, it is not strange that it is held that religion and the state cannot be separated, for religion must permeate and control a perfect society, and if the state be so important an institution in that society of course it must be religious. We are persuaded, however, that this philosophy does not take account of some exceedingly important things. In a perfect society, in a society where righteousness prevails, there will be no place for the state. The conditions which generated it and which make it necessary will no longer exist. God does in a sense continue to rule the human race, notwithstanding its apostasy from Him, but He does not do it through organizations, and certainly not through the state. He does it through the influence of His Spirit operating upon the hearts and consciences of individuals. Thus many are brought back

to obedience to Him, but it is always as individuals, not as organizations. This is what He has put Christianity in the world for. And through Christianity He has made it plain that there is but one way whereby human beings can be restored to the condition which man originally enjoyed. The difficulty with this philosophy of which we have spoken is that it ignores this provision, and assumes that humanity can be saved in some other way than that appointed by God. It assumes that human society, by means of human institutions which have sprung up because of human imperfection and sin, can restore itself and its members to righteousness and rectitude—to harmony with God. However pleasing such a scheme may appear to the imagination, it is a deception and an illusion. The effort to get back to God by means of the state means only to get further away from God; it means the exaltation of the state to the place of God.



Moral, Culture and Sunday Legislation

A gentleman of some prominence, though favoring the Sunday opening of saloons, says that there must be legislation prohibiting industry on Sunday because "the cultivation of the moral nature is of the greatest importance, and people must have opportunity for such culture."

It is very true that the cultivation of the moral nature is of the greatest importance, but it does not follow that this is a work to which government should devote itself, for it must be admitted that this is a matter in which legislation will prove exceedingly crude and bunglesome.

Nowhere is the inadequacy of legisla-

tion in this direction more strikingly illustrated than in this very matter of Sunday laws. Instead of securing moral growth and cultivation among the classes for whom alone it can be claimed that such aid is needed, such laws contribute to just the opposite result. The day of enforced idleness is spent in ways that are demoralizing and degrading, compared with which honest labor throughout the day would be a moral tonic of inestimable value.

And not only is there a total failure so far as moral growth and cultivation is concerned, but the mischief into which the people fall because of this enforced idleness becomes a menace to public order, and grave social and political problems are thrust upon society.

If the purpose of Sunday laws is to afford the masses opportunity for moral culture, then the laws which existed some centuries ago were more consistent than are those now on the statute books. In England formerly, and in the early days of this country, people were not only compelled to stop labor on Sunday but were required also "to come to the public worship of God." Thus the people were given "opportunity for moral culture," and they were not allowed to defeat the purpose of the law by staying away from the places where it was supposed that moral culture was to be obtained. Now, if moral culture is the object of the Sunday laws to-day, why do they not compel people to go to church?

The truth is that the cause of moral culture does not need the aid of Sunday legislation; it is injured by such legislation. The coddling character of Sunday legislation is entirely inconsistent with the spirit of manly independence and self-direction, and, therefore, it cannot be favorable to the growth of moral and spiritual fortitude. The people who want

Sunday for moral culture will have it without the aid and intervention of the law, and they who do not want it for such purpose will only be injured by such aid and intervention.

The man who expects the moral welfare of society to be promoted by legislation legalizing open saloons and criminalizing honest labor and industry must have very peculiar ideas as to what conditions are favorable for moral growth and culture. Such legislation would be nothing more nor less than special legislation in the interests of the liquor traffic and the cause of social and moral degradation; and of course it would be detrimental to the peace and order of society.



In a recent sermon, in Brooklyn, on "The Sunday Question," Rev. Dr. John Douglas Adam, a minister of the Reformed Church, insisted that the Sunday-closing law could be enforced, and appealed to the city of Glasgow as an example, in these words: "The city of Glasgow is perhaps a more drunken city than New York, and yet not a single saloon is open on Sunday. Every one knows who has visited Glasgow what appalling sights of drunkenness are to be seen there on week days, and how free the city is from the scourge on Sundays. I consider Glasgow a clear argument for a more vigorous attempt at enforcement than has yet been tried."

This example may serve as a good argument to show that Sunday closing can be enforced, but certainly it falls very far short of showing that there is anything to be gained in the direction of temperance or the curtailment of the liquor traffic by the shortsighted and foolish policy of keeping saloons tightly closed one-seventh of the time and wide open six-sevenths of the time. According to the testimony of this minister himself the ex-

ample of Glasgow shows that a city which has absolute Sunday closing may be "a more drunken city than New York" with all its thousands of saloons and all its Sunday opening. Perfect legal "Sabbath" observance that is attended with "appalling sights of drunkenness" on week days is not a condition that is likely to excite any very great enthusiasm or admiration in the minds of people who look at the realities of things instead of being deluded by the shams and hypocrisies of formalism and legal religion.



Two "Reasons" for Sunday Enforcement

The February *American Monthly Review of Reviews* thus states its attitude with regard to the Sunday question, which fairly represents the prevailing opinion in this matter:

Sunday-keeping, from the religious standpoint, is a matter of the private conscience. From the public standpoint, Sunday-keeping has great importance for two reasons—first, because of the absolute necessity that a day of rest should be preserved for the great mass of workingmen and women; and, second, because it is right that a Christian country should carefully promote the order, quiet, and peace that belong to Sunday as a day of worship and as an essential factor in the moral progress and true civilization of the community.

The first reason given is one now quite prevalent as an excuse for Sunday legislation, but it is of comparatively recent origin, exceedingly more recent than the laws which it is claimed sprang from this "necessity." The Sunday laws themselves give no intimation whatever that they were enacted for the purpose of preserving a day of rest for workingmen and women. They contain no intimation, unless it be in amendments recently made, that they rest upon any other foundation or have any other purpose in view than that given as the second reason. It is be-

cause it has been deemed "right that a Christian country should carefully promote the order, quiet, and peace that belong to Sunday as a day of worship," etc., that Sunday laws have been enacted. That is what history says, and that is what they declare upon their face.

This second reason here given for Sunday legislation is identical with that which has been the "reason" for all church-and-state systems, which was the "reason" for all the enforcement of religion which prevailed throughout the most highly civilized portions of Europe for century after century. Christianity is "an essential factor in the moral progress and true civilization of the community," certainly of not less importance than Sunday observance is supposed to be. But, nevertheless, it has not been deemed wise until recent years to identify Christianity and government in this country, nor to make the promotion of Christianity an object of government. On the contrary, it was declared early in the history of this country, by a man who was competent to speak, that "the Government of the United States is in no sense founded upon the Christian religion." And why this attitude? Because it was clear to the founders of the American Government that true religion was a thing infinitely above government, and that the nearest approach that civil government could make to true religion was to carefully avoid all attempts to identify it with government.

But notice again these reasons for Sunday legislation. It is stated that from the religious standpoint Sunday-keeping "is a matter of the private conscience." Yet it is stated that by means of legislation, which takes no account whatever of the private conscience, except that of those who dictate the legislation, that "a Christian country should carefully promote

the order, quiet, and peace that belongs to Sunday *as a day of worship.*" These two things will not hang together. The promotion of "the order, peace, and quiet that belong to Sunday as a day of worship" is a promotion of Sunday-keeping from the religious standpoint so far as it is possible for a political power to act from that standpoint. No political power has ever gone further into religion in the most relentless of religious persecutions.

It is because these things will not hang together that recourse is now had in defense of Sunday legislation to "the absolute necessity that a day of rest should be preserved for the great mass of workmen and women." If such a necessity exists it has not as yet become very apparent, and certain it is that it would be exceedingly difficult to find any Sunday statute among the many that exist that was enacted to meet any such necessity. The interests of the great mass of the workmen and women were not the interests that were considered when the Sunday statutes now in existence were enacted. It appears to us, therefore, that the appeal to this argument at the present time is entirely unjustifiable. This alleged "absolute necessity" should be far more in evidence than it is now, or has been in the past, before it is made to carry the responsibility that it is now attempted to shoulder upon it.



Because it contains truth that is applicable to doctrines which appear in other matter in this number the article on "The Origin of the State," by Alonzo T. Jones, is published this month. In future numbers Mr. Jones will continue the line of thought begun in his article in the March SENTINEL. The thought of true self-government will be followed up, showing how the power of self-government is obtained and how it is lost.

These articles will be of great value to all who will read them. Do not fail to read them yourself and to give as many other persons as possible an opportunity to do the same.



A Subtle Doctrine

Do not fail to read carefully the installment in this number of "The Papal Theory of the Relation Between Church and State." The whole thing is virtually contained in this number. It will bear the most earnest and careful study, and let no one suppose that in studying this theory he is giving attention to something that is past and gone. The Papacy holds to this theory as firmly as ever, and she is becoming more powerful all the time. But this theory of the union of religion and the state is growing much more rapidly than is the Papacy. The present tendency of things promises to make the question of the relation between religion and government one of the most prominent and important questions of the future. Although in this nation the doctrine of the complete separation of religion and government has been avowed as a fundamental principle of government, the opinion is rapidly gaining ground that there can be no separation of religion and government. And this opinion, though it differs slightly with the different classes among which it is growing, is substantially the doctrine set forth in the article to which we have referred—the Papal theory.

At this very time when the Papacy is making rapid strides in this country, those who should be the chief defenders of the principle of separation of religion and government are not only weakening in its defense, but are actually proclaiming the opposite principle themselves. The great Protestant religious bodies are

actually becoming protesters *against* this principle which lies at the very foundation of Protestantism. And even more than this, the "liberal" and "advanced" theology, so strikingly prominent at this time, and which professes to be much farther removed from the errors of Romanism than Protestantism itself, advances a theory that is scarcely distinguishable from the doctrine that has for so long been held by the Papacy. And even still farther, this idea, varying slightly with the different viewpoint, prevails in the newer social and political philosophy which now predicts great changes and developments for society in the not distant future. According to this latter-day philosophy the social and political movement of which it speaks is the manifestation and the very essence and substance of true religion itself.

To illustrate what has been said we will give one or two quotations. First we quote from a letter recently published in the *Christian Advocate* of this city, and which we suppose was written by a Methodist minister. It is fairly representative of the view that the large evangelical bodies are coming to take of this matter. A writer in the *Advocate* had declared with reference to the holding of the next Methodist General Conference that "God's business should be done in God's house." Here is something that that statement called forth:

When did God retire from civic, material, and economic business? Has He no business in the state? Has He withdrawn from the Congress and other legislative halls? Has He taken Himself out of international questions? Is He no longer in commerce and in agriculture? Has He ceased to take sides in wars? Are His teachings to be ruled out of political economy and of political platforms? Where shall we draw the line that separates "God's business" from other businesses?

The apostle Paul called the rulers of nations "God's ministers of state" (Rom. 13: 6, Roth-

erham's translation). If civil rulers are still "God's ministers of state," then politics, in its highest and broadest sense, is still His business; and, of course, the business of the church, and the sooner His ministers of the church and His ministers of the state come to recognize themselves as brothers working in these two grand departments of His administration, separate in functions, but allied in interests, neither to dominate the other, but both to be dominated by the Supreme Mind, to the accomplishment of the one sublime purpose, the better it will be for all concerned in both fields. Both classes of ministers are under the same moral law, and will be held equally to an account finally. Purity of action is enjoined upon both alike.

In my opinion one of the most alarming signs of the times is this effort to separate religion and civics from each other. What God has joined together let no man put asunder. To separate them is death to both. All compromises with sin in church or state damage both. If religion and politics will not mix, it is evident that both did not come from above, for harmony is the order of things in that country. The ministers of the church have no more moral right to keep aloof from civic affairs than the ministers of the state have to ignore religion. As the tactics of West Point and Annapolis differ, but are, nevertheless, dominated by the same commander-in-chief for one grand, patriotic purpose, so the functions of the church and the state differ; but, nevertheless, they are grandly correlated forces or agencies under the all-dominating Mind for the accomplishment of the sublimest purposes of God. Let each master its own tactics, but be helpful to the other.

Now the above is essentially identical with the Papal theory. The positions are the same. The intimation that both religion and politics came "from above," and are therefore joined together in their relation to God and constitute the two "grandly correlated forces or agencies under the all-dominating Mind for the accomplishment of the sublimest purposes of God," is identical with the Catholic position that both the church and the state were instituted in the beginning by God and appointed by Him to

govern the world and to work together "for the glorification of God and the salvation of men." The Catholic writer tells us that the church and the state, indeed, have different functions and departments of work, but that they are to be "of one mind in the Lord." So we are told here by this Methodist minister that they are the "two grand departments of His administration, separate in functions, but allied in interests, neither to dominate the other, but both to be dominated by the Supreme Mind." The only difference between the two positions is that while the Catholic holds that the state is to be subservient to the church, the Methodist holds that neither is to dominate the other. But this, we are assured, is a difference only in degree. The Methodist has not pursued his logic quite as far as the Catholic. The logic of his position of course leads directly to the domination of the state by the church.

As representative of the position of the more "liberal" and "advanced" theology of the times may be taken these two paragraphs which we find in a recent editorial on "The Social Conscience," in the *Christian Register* of Boston:

Religion, as the Puritan fathers looked at it, was not a something by itself. It had its affiliations with the state and with the school. In our struggle to establish the independence of one or the other, we have destroyed their correlation. At one time we remember that it became a civic shame to "preach politics." The school was so far divorced from the church that religious training was carefully debarred from the curriculum. Just now it is once more beginning to be felt that no social equilibrium can be produced where the church and the school and the state are not in correlation and coalition. There is a common basis to religion, education, and politics; that is, to the whole social structure. Society is a unit: it is a vital error to overlook this fact. Politics must be preached, and it must be taught. Religion must be found in the school-house and in the state-house. Religion that has no intimate correla-

tion with affairs of the household, of the street, of the counting-room, of the common school, lacks its ethical basis. Teaching should therefore be as solemnly truthful as the pulpit discourse; and preacher and teacher should in the same sense be pious—that is, devoutly obedient to duty.

Statesmanship cannot be divorced from religion, nor the church severed in its aims from the state. To preach politics is to preach honest citizenship; it is to assert the great doctrine of compensation for well-doing and for ill-doing. Partisanship does not belong in the pulpit, neither does partisanship find a wholesome place in politics. The preacher's duty is not, under any just definition, to expound scriptures, ancient or modern, but to create a sentiment for righteousness, which is only right-doing. And this sentiment should take hold of every phase of doing. Political life has had this fatal defect, that it rarely has developed conscience—that social conscience that refuses to do evil for party's sake, that can be defeated rather than buy votes with character. The cultivation of a social conscience is a religious duty—the most important religious duty now before Americans. The temptation to sell out manhood for honor or position, the lack of power to stand alone, is the chief social ill. A sale of independence, and a failure to stand by convictions, may bring small but not abiding honor. To modestly and yet firmly stand by what we have decided to be right will in the end bring to us advantage and respect. This whole business of seeking preferment at a sacrifice of conscience is, in the long run, a dead loss. Does it pay to be in a continual struggle to be popular? What, at the milestones of life, can give us satisfaction? These are questions for both the statesman and the preacher as well as the teacher. They are fundamental questions concerning the social conscience. The statesman can preach with votes: the preacher is concerned with affairs of state. The teacher has the sublime duty of making honest statesmen and honest preachers. In all directions we come upon the obligation to work together for good, because God works in us, individually and collectively, to will his Golden Rule. The catechism of the twentieth century is a social catechism. We are henceforth not bid to save ourselves, but to save the world.

We heard a few weeks ago, at Cooper Union in this city, substantially the same

doctrine advanced by a lecturer on sociology. In the course of a series of lectures on "The Prophets of Democracy," George William Curtis and Thomas Hill Green, especially the latter, were set forth as the representatives and exponents of the politics of the future, and the idea of the union of politics and religion was declared to be the dominant one in their lives and philosophy. The lecturer declared that politics and religion were absolutely inseparable, and that the teaching and inculcation of the doctrine of their separation had been injurious to society. It had resulted in a low moral standard in politics and the consequent corruption of government. He held that the very highest idea of right, and therefore of religion, should be the law of society in all its relations and departments, and that the statesman could be as much the servant and exponent of religion as the preacher. It is of some significance that in the same connection the lecturer declared the doctrine of individual, natural rights to be an utter absurdity, which no man who understood the philosophy of history could believe for a moment. He declared that the individual was the product of society, and that apart from society he had no rights whatever. In a primitive state the individual had no rights; he had no rights until he was made the subject of rights by society; the individual was constantly coming into the possession of more and more rights by virtue of the progress of society. However, at the conclusion of the lecture, a few inquiries from the audience drew from the lecturer the admission that this point was an exceedingly difficult one and that he could not hope to make it perfectly clear. And certainly it was not made clear to some members of the audience.

But the point to which we desire to di-

rect attention here is that with regard to the union of religion and politics. We see that from three different viewpoints it is to-day held that politics and religion are inseparable. Now we do not deny that there is an element of truth in the position avowed from these three sources. But there is in it no more truth than there is in the position of the Papacy set forth elsewhere. The position of the Papacy is just as reasonable and just as logical. The Papacy agrees with the Methodist that politics is God's business, "and, of course, the business of the church." She agrees with the "liberal" theologian that "society is a unit," and that there is a common basis to the whole social structure. She agrees with the Socialist and the prophet of democracy that politics and religion are by right absolutely inseparable.

Now, however reasonable and logical this theory of the relation of religion and government may seem, we are convinced that it is a subtle error. We cannot enter into a consideration of it here, as this article is already too long, but what we have given is very suggestive and the reader can think for himself. In conclusion we make these two observations: First, that persecution and the Inquisition itself was the outgrowth of this theory in the past, as history abundantly confirms. Second, that the most godless theory of the constitution of society is that which makes society or any of its organized forces, whether known as "the Church," the state, the social conscience, or whatnot, God; which interposes any human thing between the individual and his Creator. It seems to us that on this point the democratic philosophy of to-day is at one with the Papacy of the Middle Ages, and between these two extreme schools of thought are found others which agree with both on this point.

Dr. Kneeland and the Sabbatharians

A meeting "in favor of the better observance of the Sabbath" was held at the city hall in New Bedford, Mass., on the evening of March 7. Twenty-five persons were in attendance. Mr. Robert F. Raymond began the meeting in this fashion: "Not merely those who believe in religion, but patriots and lovers of mankind stand for the sacredness of the Sabbath. The Christian Sabbath is one of the pillars of Christianity." He was followed by Dr. Martin D. Kneeland of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, who was the speaker of the occasion. Dr. Kneeland "began his address by describing a storm which he had once seen in the Alps, his attention having first been called by the guide to the storm centre, a black spot of cloud which appeared against one of the distant hills, and gradually spread out until the whole landscape within vision was involved. The storm centre to-day, Dr. Kneeland said, is the warfare raging around the Christian Sabbath. There is a constant combat, unseen by some, neglected by many, waging about us. There is no question which will have more to do with the settlement of the great moral issues of the future than this."

Mr. Kneeland declared that "the enemies of the Lord's day are many." As he named them over they were "the open, outspoken, blasphemous, anarchic Sabbath destroying elements," the "indifferentists," the "greedy worldlings, who want to make money out of Sunday," and the "devotees of pleasure." He said he did not regard the first class as the most dangerous, "because we know where they stand." "But," said he, "there is another element which you have in this community: the Sabbatarian

friends who tell us they do not desire any guard about Sunday. They take the ground that Saturday is the seventh day, and they are determined to overthrow Sunday. Many of these men are honest, but narrow. They have a smaller pin point on which to base their reasoning than any other sect that I know of." In view of the following very sound point made by Dr. Kneeland in the same address, we should like to know where the point is, even the pin point, on which he, an advocate of *Sunday* observance and enforcement, bases his reasoning:

There was a little boy once who was asked by his father, when he had returned from Sunday school, what the lesson had been about. The boy told his father that the lesson was on the Fourth Commandment, whereupon the father, who was not a believer in the Sabbath, argued to the boy that while the Sabbath might have been all right for the Jews and the olden times, the idea was played out. "What about the commandment, 'Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother?'" asked the boy, "Is that played out, too?" When God put that commandment into the heart of the ten He made it the storm centre of the whole, and when you take that out, I don't see how you can maintain the other nine.

There is a point in this, but it is one that is very fatal to Dr. Kneeland's contention. This commandment which is "the storm centre of the whole," and which cannot be taken out without destroying the other nine, is taken out and destroyed so far as Dr. Kneeland's position goes, for it says nothing about Sunday and has no relation to Sunday observance whatever. Of course Dr. Kneeland will say that he interprets the commandment on the "broad" ground of "one day in seven," and in that way he takes the liberty to apply it to a day about which it says nothing. But the commandment does not say anything about "one day in seven." It says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six

days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

Now here is Dr. Kneeland, not only perfectly willing that the day here commanded to be kept holy shall be utterly disregarded and made the busiest day of the week, but he is scouring the country in the attempt to work up a sentiment that will endorse the enactment and enforcement of legislation that will prohibit as a crime labor on one of the days on which this commandment declares "shalt thou labor." Yet he declares that that commandment is the storm center of the whole and cannot be disregarded without impairing and destroying the other nine! And in the same connection he expresses his astonishment at the narrowness of the people who observe this commandment and oppose his attempts to nullify their right under it to work on Sunday! "They have a smaller pin point on which to base their reasoning than any sect" that he knows of! Well, where is the point, even the pin point, on which he bases his position and reasoning in this matter?



A correspondent of the *Christian Work* thinks that "a proposition to open saloons on the Sabbath in a Christian community is astonishing." If he will seriously and candidly consider this matter he will arrive at the conclusion that no such proposition has been made in a Christian community. A community which supports upwards of 13,000 saloons and all their adjuncts, not to speak of a thousand and one other things, and whose "best citizens" are concerned about the open saloon only for one day of the week and are apparently perfectly content that it should flourish the other six days, is scarcely a Christian community. If Greater New York were a Christian

community it would not be confronted with a great liquor problem, and neither would any of its inhabitants be demanding the employment of the policeman's club to prevent "the desecration of the Sabbath."



A prominent journal says: "It is one of the curious developments of the times that in the present discussion of the Sunday laws some of the strongest advocates of a liberal Sunday, even to the point of open saloons, are representatives of Puritanism, while some of the strongest advocates of strict Sabbath observance are representatives of the Catholic Church which might naturally be supposed to be in sympathy with conditions which exist in most of the countries of Europe."

It is true that the Puritan Sunday is not very prevalent in countries where Catholicism is strongest. We read of priests attending cock-fights and lottery drawings on Sundays in South American countries, and, according to a writer in a recent number of the *Christian Register*, much the same condition of affairs exists among the Catholics of Italy. An old priest of Pisa, Italy, on being asked as to the religious condition of the people of that community, replied: "They no longer love their Lord. They no longer associate the Lord's day with a sense of joyousness. We are told to worship the Lord with joy, and now they reserve their festivities for another day than the festival of their risen Lord. Would you believe it, sir? They have actually held the historical horse-trot on Monday instead of on the Lord's day!"

But because the Catholic Church does not object to such Sunday observance in Catholic countries, it by no means follows that she would favor laxity in this respect in other countries. She knows well enough that Sunday observance

rests simply upon her own authority, and where her authority is amply and sufficiently recognized she need not be particular in regard to this observance. But in such a country as the United States, where she is seeking every opportunity to extend her prestige, it is the most natural thing in the world that she should be in favor of strict Sunday enforcement. But we will venture to say that when once she gains the prestige and power that she desires in this country that she will no longer see anything very harmful about Sunday saloons, for the Catholic Church is not opposed to the liquor traffic, and she is not opposed to Sunday drinking and Sunday sports when they are carried on with due regard to her authority. She may be opposed to indulgence in this direction by the state, but when once she has complete control of the matter no doubt she will regard indulgence on her own authority in a different light.



Monarchical Tendencies Manifested

"Ye see, a prince is a gr-great man in th' ol' counthry, but he niver is as gr-great over there as he is here. Whativer riv-prince we may feel tow'rd George Wash-nton, it don't prejudice us again' live princes. Th' princes we hate is thim that are dead an' harmless." Thus observes "Mr. Dooley" with regard to the recent visit of the brother of the German Emperor to this country, and as usual there is something more than humor in his observations. Here is the way the matter appears to Dr. C. H. Parkhurst:

When we are in the process of reading the Declaration of Independence, we believe in the nobility, and even in the royalty, inherent in man as such. In such a moment of high American enthusiasm we see in every man a prince and even a king. That is an interpretation, however, of which we are capable only in our

best moments, and at present, however it may have been a hundred years ago, there is not in our passion of democracy sufficient staying power to prevent our admiring more effusively and idolatrously one single foreign prince of the blood than we do a hundred American princes that are such by ordination of God and nature.

This betrayal of the original American principle, this sly hankering after nobility, evinces itself not only in the members of our own sex, but in the subtle methods by which women unconsciously advertise their predilections. Women dote on princes. Nine young women out of ten would rather dance with the Prince of Wales than with half a score of the sons of Presidents of the American Republic. And the same proportion of apostatizing young females would rather have been presented to Queen Victoria than to have been received by the whole line of American Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt. We are not in this exactly criticizing the poor things, but only seizing upon the fact as evidencing the tendencies that are clandestinely at work in people's hearts.

Still further evidence of the tendency of things in this direction is brought to light in these dryly humorous remarks of *Harper's Weekly*:

Again it is rumored that President Kruger of the Transvaal Republic, is coming to pay us a visit; and we really wish he would think better of it. Our present arrangements are such that we can send a special embassy to represent us at the coronation of a king, and that we can receive an imperial prince in a manner befitting his rank; but we have no facilities for the entertainment of a plain old man representing a perishing people whose struggle for freedom and independence is one of the most heroic in history. We are sorry for him, and anything in the nature of offering him a cold potato and letting him go, we would gladly do. But beyond this we do not see our way. He had better not come, and if our advice can prevail, he will not come. There is such a thing as embarrassing people by confiding too fondly in their past for a welcome which they cannot give to guests not in their present station in life. When we were young and poor, we should have received Mr. Kruger with municipal, State, and national ceremonies; but if he will reflect he must see that this would be im-

possible now. We could, officially, take no notice of his visit, and it is doubtful if the President could accord him such personal recognition even as he gave Mr. Booker Washington.

Evidently Mr. Dooley might have truthfully added to his observation that "th' princes we hate is thim that are dead and harmless," also that "th' prsidents we love is thim that are dead and harmless."

In his recent rapid tour in this country Prince Henry did not stop to rest on Sundays. This fact, as might have been expected, is regarded as a serious affront "to American ideals" by the friends of what they choose to regard as the "national Sabbath." "We are well aware," says the *Congregationalist* of Boston, "that Continental opinions as to Sunday are different from American; that New York is a comsopolitan, and not a Puritan New England city; that the Prince's stay in this country was limited, etc. The fact remains that, the officials of the United States consenting, his tour in this country was adjusted to non-American ideals, and not to American ideals. As a prince, as a man set upon a hill to serve as an ensample for other men, as a Lutheran, as a guest desirous of accommodating himself to the customs of his host, Prince Henry should have spent Sundays when in this country in a way to indicate that God and worship were factors in civilization; and if his own sense of propriety or that of the German ambassador did not teach this, then the Department of State should have intimated it courteously but forcibly."

The zeal for religion which manifests itself in this way will never accomplish anything worth accomplishing. The Prince and the Government might have done exactly what is desired here, and yet nothing would have been accomplished for the cause of true religion, for

piety is not an attribute of princes and state departments, but of individuals; and if the Prince as a man had desired to observe Sunday he could have done so, and have had his program arranged accordingly. But evidently he did not desire to do so; and that being the case any pretended observance of the day in the manner set forth above would only have been a hollow mockery.

The King and the "Englishman's Sunday"

The eccentric Dr. Joseph Parker, of the City Temple, London, created somewhat of a stir recently by criticising King Edward for his laxness in regard to Sunday observance. "If the King goes to a Sunday concert," said Dr. Parker, "as he did recently, he deals a deadly blow to the Englishman's Sunday. If the King, who is the head of the Church and the defender of the faith, can violate the English Sunday, what can the people do but follow in his steps? I do not want to be disloyal, but I cannot be disloyal to Christ."

The minister of Christ who rates a king as "the head of the Church and the defender of the faith," may think that he "cannot be disloyal to Christ," but he needs to give the matter more serious consideration. What, indeed, can the people do but follow in the steps of the King, when ministers of the gospel are found rating him as "the head of the Church?" Is it not time that ministers, since the people have already largely done so, were ridding themselves of such shams?

And when they have gotten rid of this notion, they will have taken a long step toward getting rid of the equally great sham which in England is found in the term "Englishman's Sunday," and in this

country in the term "American Sabbath." For the notion that the Sunday institution is to be regarded as a political, national one, and as such to be given official, legal care and protection, is as repugnant to common sense and the principles of true religion as is the notion that the King of England, or any other potentate or man whatsoever, is "the head of the Church and the defender of the faith." The ideas are virtually one; the one is the complement of the other. They who in this country loudly complain at the Government, and at civil officials, whenever they are not strictly circumspect with regard to Sunday observance, virtually declare that from that source people are to look for religious guidance—that, in fact, the Government is the head of the church.

The mixing of Sunday observance, or any other religious observance, with civil, political affairs, is paganish, and it will very naturally lead to the paganish conception that the state, the government, the king is supreme in religion. And religion of course will become just what the state, the government, the king make it. God, through His Son, is the Head of all true religion, and they who look elsewhere, and teach the people to look elsewhere, are dealing deadly blows to something far more vital to the religious interests of the people than is the "Englishman's Sunday" or the "American Sabbath," either.



The sort of Sabbath or Sunday-keeping that can be secured by legislation is very similar to that suggested in this little incident:

Mamma—You mustn't bowl your hoop in the front on Sunday. You must go into the back garden.

Tommy—Isn't it Sunday in the back garden, mamma?

The law may transfer people on Sunday from the front yard to the back yard, but it cannot make them really observe the day. They are likely to get into far more mischief in the back yard than if they were left in plain view in front.



Church and State in the Philippines and Elsewhere

In a communication to the *Christian Advocate* of this city, Mr. Homer C. Stuntz, D.D., writes from Manila, P. I., of the position taken by the Civil Commission in the matter of the relation between church and state, and of the enmity and antagonism toward the Commission engendered thereby among the Catholic friars. The incident related took place last summer, but it is not too old for present consideration. It seems that in the town of Tarlac the Filipino municipal council had undertaken to regulate the fees that should be charged by the Catholic priest in that place for performing his priestly functions. The priest objected, and appeal was made to Governor Taft, who seized the opportunity afforded by the incident to set forth in the following proclamation the clear distinction and separation that should be maintained between church and state:

OFFICE OF THE CIVIL COMMISSION,
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, MANILA, P. I.

July 31, 1901.

CAPTAIN WALLIS O. CLARK, GOVERNOR OF TARLAC, TARLAC, P. I.—SIR: On July 24 I received a call from Father Eusebio Nativdad, a Filipino Roman Catholic priest in the town of Tarlac. He came to complain against the municipal council of the town, that the town was attempting by ordinance or resolution to regulate the fees which he was charging for religious functions performed by him as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church in the church at Tarlac. Similar complaints have come to me from other parts of the archipelago, and I deem it wise, therefore, in a public

letter to the governor of the province where there has been such an abuse of civil authority, to call attention to it and to point out the fundamental error committed by the municipal council.

The President of the United States in his instructions to the Commission used the following words: "Upon every division and branch of the government of the Philippines, therefore, must be imposed these inviolable rules: . . . That no law shall be made respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed." And again: "That no form of religion and no minister of religion shall be forced upon any community or upon any citizen of the islands; that upon the other hand no minister of religion shall be interfered with or molested in following his calling; and that the separation between state and church shall be real, entire, and absolute."

What fees or compensation shall be charged by a minister of religion for religious services performed by him is a matter wholly within the control of the church authorities, and is one in which the civil government, whether municipal, provincial, or insular, can have no voice whatever. No one is obliged by civil law to partake of the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church; no one is required by law to solicit from the priest the marriage ceremony or the funeral ceremony of the Catholic Church. If he does so, under the government as it now exists in these islands, he does it voluntarily. If, however, his religious conscience requires of him that he should secure the performance of any such ceremony by a priest of the Catholic Church, and deems the fee exacted excessive, he can have no recourse to the civil government, but must apply for relief to the superior ecclesiastical authority in the Catholic Church. Under the government instituted here by the United States, neither priest nor bishop has any power, as such, to control the course of the civil authorities, nor can he, as such, take any part in the government, nor exert any influence upon its course. He may only appeal to the civil authorities, as any other citizen or resident may appeal, for protection to his life, liberty, or property, or that of the religious corporation which he represents. With this entire separa-

tion of ecclesiastical influence from civil government must follow, on the other hand, complete abstinence from interference in clerical and ecclesiastical matters by civil officers as such. The right of each councilor or each *presidente* as an individual, if he be a member of the Catholic Church, to take such action within the church as its rules and discipline may prescribe, to prevent the exaction of excessive fees by priests, is, of course, fully conceded; but when the councilors meet in a town council and take official action by municipal ordinance or resolution, they are not acting as individual members of the Catholic Church, they are acting as the agents of civil government, and as such they have nothing whatever to do with the government of the church, or with any act of its priest which concerns the administering of religious sacraments or the performance of religious functions, unless those services are carried on and those functions are performed in such a way as to affect injuriously the property rights or the civil rights of the general public, whether Catholic or non-Catholic.

Whatever satisfaction may have been afforded the friars by the fact that in this instance a decision was rendered in favor of the priest, and the municipal councils were forbidden to interfere with the priests in any way in the administration of church affairs, was completely swallowed up in their detestation of the principle upon which this decision was made. A tract in Spanish and the vernaculars was at once published and circulated by the "Catholic Center," an organization which stands for the preservation of the "rights" of the "Holy Church." The character of this document may be gathered from the following extracts:

Not many days since a miserable paper rabidly impious saw light in this capital, a monstrous abortion of perversity, a banneret of enrollment in the interests of apostasy, in which freely and unmasked the cry is raised, War against God!

To arms, then, warriors of Jesus Christ! The challenge is thrown down! To the strife, Catholic soldiers! Not with a resort to worldly arms, but to the powers of prayer, of faith,

of a union of all true Catholics, of public manifestation of our religious sentiments, to defend them by all the means that are within our power.

Yes! War against God is the infamous motto of this infernal proclamation. They say that they "cannot and do not desire to intervene in religious questions;" then, lying with hateful cynicism, they excite the people to make in all parts manifestations of distrust against the Catholic priests. . . . And all under the guise of a pernicious liberty! Buffoons! Pusillanimous and false politicians! . . . You desire to eclipse the sun of the moral world, which is the Catholic faith. We shall walk in darkness. The Philippines will be a Babylon. . . .

Enough of hypocrisies. Enough has our country been deceived. Enough tears and blood have we shed. Shake off the lethargy that overpowers you. Turn your gaze upon your unfortunate country, and have compassion upon it. Will you impassively allow the treasury of your faith to be torn from you by violence? Will you consent that it disappear from the Philippines because it so pleases four rickety brawlers? . . . The Centro Catholico protests in your name against the low, miserable paper and its reprobate propositions, desiring that this solemn protest be heard the circumference of this archipelago around as a genuine expression of your Christian sentiments. We despise the talkative pigmies. . . . To-day impiety reigns, and it is a time of ruin, of fury, of indignation. Be zealous, therefore, for the law to-day, and give your lives in defense of your parents. Be resolved by the valor of your ancestors, and you shall acquire imperishable fame and eternal renown. . . .

Mr. Stuntz is of the opinion that the Catholic priests have been very foolish to grossly misinterpret and twist the fair and plain statements of Governor Taft into a declaration of "war against God and Holy Church." "If the supporters of Rome had been wise," he observes, "they would have seen in this statesman-like deliverance the surest guarantee of protection in the exercise of all their rights of property and all the rites of their ecclesiasticism."

But evidently these priests, as are the

adherents of other religious organizations of which we know, are not satisfied with protection in the exercise of their rights; they want more than their rights, they want special favors from government. When the evident ignorance and fanaticism of these priests is left out of the consideration we see no difference between their attitude and the attitude of the Methodists and other denominations in this country who insist that Sunday observance shall be enforced by the state. We see not a particle of difference in principle between this document issued by the "Catholic Center," protesting against the adoption of a policy which deprives "the Church" of special favors which she has been accustomed to receive from the civil government for hundreds of years, and the editorials which have been frequent in the *Christian Advocate* during the last few months protesting with equally as much emphasis against any repeal in the statutes whereby the church day, Sunday, is given special protection by the State because of its religious character.

Of course the *Advocate* has not indulged in such language as that used by the Philippine priests; its editor is too wise and too scholarly. But nevertheless it has not hesitated to do in a more civilized manner exactly what these priests did. The proposition to modify the Sunday law in its application to saloons has been declared to be a "preposterous idea," and "a pernicious scheme," fraught with "universal demoralization." Bishop Potter, Mayor Low, District Attorney Jerome, and, to quote from the *Advocate*, "a few clergymen, a few credulous idealists, and—'heaven save the mark'—leading reformers," have been arraigned quite severely. They have not been called "rickety brawlers" and "talkative pigmies," but

something which bears some resemblance to such language has been said. Bishop Potter has been spoken of as having no rival in the affections of saloon-keepers but the District-Attorney, and has been characterized as "a rhetorician of high grade," "a follower of tendencies." The Mayor has been represented as trying "to undermine public respect for the existing law," as proposing "a quack remedy," a "pernicious scheme" that "would be morally disastrous," and as having "a huge fly" in his "pot of ointment for the sores of the city." The District Attorney has been dealt with at greater length and with even less respect. Here is the last "compliment" that has been paid him by the *Advocate* because of his attitude toward the Sunday-closing law: "Before the campaign was over it was obvious to every intelligent person that, though his vociferations might make votes, his judgment was in inverse proportion to his volubility." This may be more scholarly than the language of the Filipino priests, but otherwise it is not materially different. It is to be noted that the *Advocate* has carefully refrained from making known what "was obvious to every intelligent person" some time ago until it found that Mr. Jerome did not propose to spend his time as District Attorney in enforcing the Sunday law. What was known in November is published in March in connection with comment on what took place in January and February!

Of course there is mixed up in this matter the question of the liquor traffic, but so far as Sunday enforcement is concerned, the attitude of the *Advocate*, the Methodists, and other religious bodies in this country, is just as much opposed to the principle of the separation of church and state as is the attitude of the Catholic priests of the Philippines. And in our opinion the Catholic priests have a much

better excuse for their contention. They are not making any pretensions of standing for the principle of separation of church and state, and the government of the country in which they live has for hundreds of years been operated with reference to religion just as they insist that the new government shall be. Yet those religious people, who in this country insist that "the Sabbath" shall be maintained by the civil authorities, are very much amused that the Philippine Catholics should raise such a stir over the announcement and application of the principle of church and state separation, and should see in it "a declaration of 'war against God and Holy Church.'" If we remember correctly there have been seen and heard from a great many non-Catholic religious sources in this country declarations to the effect that if the state withdrew its legal support from the "Christian Sabbath" that it would be equivalent to something very much like "a declaration of war against God and the church." We are not disposed to believe the statement recently made in the Senate of the United States to the effect that if the religious people of the Philippines were Protestants instead of Catholics they would be dealt with in a much different manner by the American authorities, "as no member of Congress would be able to withstand the wrath of the Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians of this country." But certainly this matter of Sunday enforcement does not argue that the statement is incorrect. Many adherents of the large religious denominations in this country seem perfectly content to have one standard with regard to the separation of church and state enforced upon the Catholics of the Philippines and quite another standard practised by themselves in the United States.

Is Human Perfection at Hand?

While the learned men of the times continue to expatiate upon the progress of the human race, upon the great superiority of the human nature at the present time over all that it has ever been heretofore, and predict for it in the not distant future a blossoming that will be as much superior to what it has been in the past as the piano is superior to the bowstring of the savage or the ocean liner to the dugout canoe, crimes of every description continue as of old, and appear to be even more prevalent than ever before.

Just now in this city the crime which is regarded as the greatest of all human crimes—murder—with the causative and attendant circumstances, is engaging universal attention. There are four prominent cases now before the public, and it is safe to say that before interest in these cases has subsided there will be others to take their place in public attention. For crimes, instead of being absent in these times, are so numerous and follow so rapidly upon one another that people cannot be shocked if they would. The thing becomes commonplace, and while the setting and coloring of an occasional scene rivets all eyes upon it, it is but for a moment, for the panorama of crime moves on, and public attention must ever be shifting from the views that are disappearing to the new ones that are ever presenting themselves.

And these four cases to which we have referred are not mere murders, but are attended by other circumstances which are as inconsistent with the teaching that we live in a time when human nature is on the verge of shedding and discarding its weaknesses and its crimes as are the murders themselves. In briefly referring to these cases we speak of them in

the light in which they now appear to the public. The courts have yet to pass upon the evidence and to determine the guilt or innocence of those accused.

Covetousness, so far as it relates to the love of money, to the desire to become rich by seizing the property of another, appears to have been the cause of one of these murders. A man of education and ability, a lawyer, is accused of coldly murdering an old man, his client, in order to secure possession of his enormous fortune. Behind another murder appears the effort to escape the clutches of the law on the part of representatives of the law. A man had given evidence which convicted a certain police official of criminal negligence of duty; he was to appear in court against others charged with the same offense, and upon his testimony conviction was expected. Early one morning he was found upon the street almost dead, with bruises upon his body from which he died in a few hours. At this very hour the name of the man who was dying was entered upon the record of the police court in that section of the city, as though he had been present there instead of being where he was found. It is thought that in this the police have identified themselves with the murder, and by means of this maneuver hoped to baffle investigation and to prevent the apprehension of the perpetrators of the crime. This is the theory, and if failure to discover the murderers sustains the theory, it has so far been confirmed. "This crime," says a prominent journal, "brings us back to the primitive days when men were beaten to death because that was the simplest, easiest and most natural way to get rid of them when they promised to be inconvenient." The third case is the murder of a middle-aged woman, evidently done in the most cold-blooded

and brutal manner. If the accusation now made be true, this is the most horrible of all these crimes—that of matricide; for the woman lived with her son, and so far suspicion has fastened upon him.

But the case which engages the greatest attention, so great that the others are almost forgotten, is that of a beautiful young woman who is accused of the murder of a young man. This case contains the element that enlists always the widest human interest—the relationship between men and women. What began in parental negligence and seeming youthful affection ends in murder. The intervening folly and its bitter accompaniments leading to the final desperate deed can only be gathered from what now appears. It is said that the young woman, who is now on trial, will soon be a mother, and it is alleged that the man whom she is accused of murdering is the father of her child.

This case is naturally turning attention to present social conditions, for it is predicted that the testimony which will be adduced in the course of this trial will affect other young people of good social standing, and that the reputations of some will be ruined. Among those who have not hesitated to speak plainly of present conditions in this respect are Mrs. John A. Logan and Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D. In a communication to the *New York Journal* of March 10, Mrs. Logan says she does not wish to be considered a "croaker," but that she "cannot refrain from calling attention to the evidences daily witnessed of the almost criminal carelessness of parents of the present day in the matter of constant vigilance in the care of their children." She says that "girls and boys, especially of wealthy and well-to-do families, are allowed to grow up with almost a total

disregard of parental authority." Dr. Hillis says that "according to the American nowadays the revised version of the Bible seems to be, 'Obey your children,'" We quote further from Mrs. Logan:

To one brought up under the stricter observances of the rules of propriety and womanly modesty, purity of mind and heart, under the old régime, the rooms of many of the young men and girls, in their homes and the boarding-schools of to-day, furnish material for reflection and alarm at the moral degeneracy of the present generation. Pictures of actors and actresses in all the rôles outside the legitimate drama; all the instruments necessary for the various games and amusements now in vogue, adorn the walls and the places of their instalment, displacing in the young ladies' rooms all of the old-time accessories of work table, writing desk, musical instruments, artists' materials and easels, and other feminine requirements. Too many young men allow their minds to be filled with the knowledge of sports, instead of that of the useful and practical so necessary for success and the attainment of high place in the world.

Mrs. Logan then describes the sports of the present day to which so many young men and young women are devoted, and says that this indiscriminate association of the sexes, the careless style of dress adopted for these games, and the consequent carelessness of maners, engenders "a disregard for the delicate instincts of modesty in women and less respect for womanhood in men," producing a condition that "is appalling to every thoughtful, refined person." She says further:

Men think nothing of saluting their female acquaintances in the most familiar way—joining them in the street, promenading and loitering about the parks and places of resort as if they were members of the same household. Numerous young women bedeck themselves in all their gorgeousness and walk up and down the streets and avenues of the towns and cities, knowing they will pass places frequented by young men, purposely designing to attract their attention, and, if possible, inveigle them into joining them, many expecting that the young

men will invite them into some place for refreshments over which they spend hours in silly twaddle over nothings, ignoring the fact that they have forfeited their claims to respectability. In this way women, sometimes of very mature years, become irretrievably entangled with young men who sooner or later become disenchanted and throw them aside, while the young men are so demoralized themselves by the association of such women that they are ruined, and must pay the penalty of wrong-doing by the loss of confidence in their integrity and devotion to their business or profession, the insatiable revenge of their victims demanding in some cases life itself, as exemplified a short time ago within the shadow of the dome of the National Capitol, and more recently in the case of —, who, if reports are true, was the victim of the wiles of a wayward girl.

And to this may be added these words spoken by Dr. Hillis at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, on the evening of March 2:

There never was an age when cities held more temptations and the necessity for safeguards was greater. There never was an era when there were so many forces gilding sin. We have come to a time when all the places where vice reigns and men appeal to the lower passions are made beautiful. It is a popular saying among the thousands of young men who come to this city from the country, "When in Rome do as the Romans do." But that sentence should be interpreted to mean, "When in hell do as the devils do." It is an age when beautiful paintings and stained glass windows adorn saloons and hotels; when men are hired to write alluring plays; when tunes are made catchy to convey suggestive words; a time when gardens such as those on the road to Coney Island abound, where young men and girls stop, first for a chop or a roll, and then for worse.

In other words it is an age in many respects the counterpart of that of the later Roman civilization. And yet we are told that the blossoming of human nature and the perfection of human society is at hand. We do not wish to doubt it. We agree that great things cannot be accomplished by individuals and the race without optimism and hope.

We know that no great social advance or moral uplift of society can be accomplished unless it is deeply believed to be possible. But at the same time we cannot attach much weight to that faith and optimism which strengthens itself with regard to the future by ignoring and denying some of the most salient conditions of the present. They who are blind to the present cannot be the prophets of the future. They who refuse to recognize human nature and human society as they are to-day are not competent to say what they will be to-morrow.

A popular journal which teaches the doctrine of the ascent and constant progress of the human race, and which holds that crime is a lingering relic of the bloodthirsty instincts of the primitive ancestors of man, among whom it includes not only savages but a certain species of animals, declares that the four crimes to which we have referred "are certainly without precedent in the criminal field which they cover," and adds this significant comment:

To the curious and the morbid these crimes of love, money, revenge and moral distortion mean exciting reading for many days to come. The crimes have a sadder meaning for others. Since the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, our civilization, in which such crimes occur, has need of much reforging and tempering before the race of men shall have earned the right of the title, "humanity."

Human beings are not totally depraved nor are they on the verge of perfection; they have not ascended from animals nor are they blossoming into angels. They are simply intelligences whose misfortune, or better, whose fortune it is, to be upon the theatre of the great battle between good and evil, and to be themselves the agents and objects of the conflict. Some are given up almost entirely to evil; others are devoted almost entirely to that which is good; the greater

number are divided in themselves, and are first upon one side and then upon the other. But in each and all the conflict between good and evil continues. And no social or political change, however radical, no material or intellectual development, however great, will ever end this conflict; and so long as it continues moral heroism and moral baseness, virtue and vice, justice and crime, sin and righteousness will be manifested in society to its glory or its shame, and in a greater and deeper sense, to the glory or the shame of the individuals directly concerned.



Before some two hundred people typically representative of wealthy society Dr. William S. Rainsford, of St. George's Episcopal Church, this city, recently took occasion to vigorously emphasize what he called "the strange and unfair partiality that favors the rich" in the matter of Sunday enforcement. "I can go to the University Club on Sunday," he said, "and meet my friends and get all the liquor I want, while others' clubs are shut up, and the poor man can't do this—I tell you that this is the sort of thing that cuts and rubs." "We are trying to do Christ's work with the sword, instead of the Cross," he exclaimed. He said the churches were gaining the dislike of the masses, and that it was their own fault. "Who was it opposed the opening of the museums on Sunday? Who opposed the opening of libraries on Sunday? Who tried to prevent the running of cars on Sunday to give people a whiff of fresh air? Who opposes the games of boys and girls on Sunday? The churches. A couple of boys get into a vacant lot on a Sunday afternoon, but the cops soon find them out, and the boys have to hide their ball and bat or run off. Whether right

or wrong, the boys think the churches are responsible. Is it reasonable to expect that boys will grow up for a love of Sunday school when the churches say to them, 'You shall not do this and you shall not do that; you shall not do anything on Sunday but go to church?'" He declared that "the man who damns the church is not necessarily a bad or a hardened man." With these words he paid his respects to the wealthy in this matter of Sunday observance:

I say most emphatically that the chief sinners against God's rest day are to be found in the growing class in our city which goes to dinners, musicals, the theatre and opera six days in the week, and on Sunday must have extra elaborate dinners, more people to be entertained at its houses, more extravagance in music and any costly diversion its whims can invent. These people do these things aimlessly, selfishly, unpatriotically, and they are debauching and upsetting the whole country. In denunciation of them I have no fear of using adjectives too fierce.

Dr. Rainsford is somewhat sensational, but there was an unmistakable element of fairness and justice in what he had to say on this occasion.



The Outlook is of the opinion that "the excesses of protectionism" now threaten the overthrow of the party which rose to triumph in this country forty years ago because of "the excesses of slavocracy." The opinion seems to be rapidly gaining ground that "protection," whatever it may have been once, is now merely a means of the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. The spread of this idea is accelerated just at present by the spectacle of the giant steel trust posing before Congress as a "helpless industry" in need of continued "protection," and the selfish attitude of the sugar and tobacco interests with refer-

ence to the needs of Cuba. The "protection" of industries works very much as does the "protection" of religion and its institutions, notably "the Sunday." The more legislative protection it has, and the more evident it becomes that it is fully competent to take care of itself, the louder arises the cry for its "protection" by law. It is coming to be the opinion of political economists who have not hitherto taken that view of the matter, that an industry that must forever be "protected" is one that should never have been protected at all, and that the sooner it is left to perish the better it will be for the economic health of the country. And this is a doctrine that applies with even greater force to such "protected" religious institutions as Sunday observance. If it is never to be able to walk alone without legislative support, the quicker it is deprived of that support the better it will be for all concerned.



An "original hymn on Sunday saving, by Father Walworth, one of the founders of the Paulist Fathers," appeared, set to music, in the *New York Journal* of March 2. "Father" A. P. Doyle, of the Paulist Fathers, furnished a copy of the hymn for publication, and made this statement in his communication to the *Journal*: "Surely the American Sunday is one of our most sacred institutions, and to save it from the inroads of the saloon is akin to the highest patriotism." We give the words of the hymn below, although aside from what it may suggest to those who would be informed regarding the Sunday enforcement movement, we see nothing about it to make it worthy of republication:

What sounds are these like thunder peal
 'Mid might of men and clash of steel?
 The line, the line, the Christian line!
 On Brothers, on to guard the line.

The shopman closes till and store,
 The workman's tool is heard no more;
 Sweet bells with music fill the air,
 They call the land to praise and prayer.

What malcontents are these we meet,
 Low discord growling thro' the street?
 Freedom they ask with beer and wine,
 To desecrate the Day Divine.

Look up! look up! a spirit band,
 Our Fathers sentinel the land;
 This day of rest is their bequest,
 Its shield shall be the Christian's breast.



Says the *Christian Register*, of Boston, an exponent of the doctrine of evolution: "The mystery of evolution is greatly increased by the discoveries which extend our knowledge of the history of civilization by several thousand years. For, no matter how far back we go, we find some race in which human nature was substantially what it is now. As we go back through the ages once supposed to be wholly miraculous in the history of the ancient world, we find that business was transacted almost exactly as it is now, excepting modern conveniences, and that even the labor question is much older than the Egyptian Pyramids." Yes, human nature, no matter how far back we go, was substantially what it is now. There are not many new things under the sun, and even the theory upon which rests such ideas as that human nature is now much different from what it once was, is not as new as is generally supposed. And the "mystery" of it will become greater and greater, not only with the extension of a knowledge of the past, but with the development of a genuine knowledge of the present.

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.

Among other things the grand jury of Cole County, Mo., was instructed by Circuit Judge Hazell at Jefferson City, on March 3, "to investigate playing of cards on Sunday for amusement."

On a recent Sunday a Congregational minister of Yankton, S. Dak., accompanied by an alderman and a policeman, made the rounds of that city in search of open saloons. One place was found open, and the case was placed before the State's attorney for action.

At a joint meeting of the retail meat dealers of St. Paul and Minneapolis on March 8 "it was decided that the meat markets in the two cities will not sell meat on Sunday." The next thing, no doubt, will be the prosecution of those dealers who do not agree with the organization on this point.

The clothing and gentlemen's furnishing firms of Tiffin, Ohio, "have entered into an iron-clad agreement to keep their stores closed on Sundays." "Every dealer in the city has signed the agreement, and has pledged himself to pay a forfeit for infraction thereof." The agreement went into effect on March 8.

According to the Brockton (Mass.) *Times*, Marshal Leach of that city "has issued orders to the proprietors of drug stores, news stands, candy stores, etc., who keep open on Sunday, that more care must be taken in keeping within the bounds of the Sunday law, in regard to

the goods which are sold. Failure to comply with the law will be followed by prosecution."

According to the Marietta (Ohio) *Register* "the Sunday laws are to be observed with Puritanical strictness" in that city. "No labor of any kind is to be performed on the Sabbath day within the city limits," and barbers, saloon-keepers, and dealers "who sell anything except medicine" are to be made to close on that day.

On February 24 the city council of Winnipeg, Manitoba, by a vote of nine to three, passed a resolution asking the legislature of Manitoba to repeal the present law prohibiting the running of street-cars in the province on Sundays, and to give the city of Winnipeg power to pass a by-law allowing street-cars to be operated in that city on Sundays.

The mayor of Indianapolis, Ind., has announced that he will not allow baseball games in that city on Sundays "because it would be in violation of the State law." Baseball managers reply that this will mean that Indianapolis will be stricken from the baseball league's schedule, as they cannot include a city which does not permit Sunday playing.

The report comes from Bethlehem, Pa., that "the Sabbath observance movement has been given a great impetus" in that place. "Twoscore clergymen preached from as many pulpits on the Sunday

question" in one day recently, and a few days later a general public meeting was addressed by Bishop Talbot, who "spoke in advocacy of cessation from all unnecessary labor on the Sabbath day."



Saloons in New York are acknowledged to be quite generally open for customers on Sundays, notwithstanding the prediction that has been made from week to week that the "driest Sunday" in years was at hand. About thirty or forty of New York's thousands of saloon-keepers are arrested each Sunday, and this is about the extent of the effort that is being made by the authorities to enforce the Sunday closing law.



The Meadville (Pa.) *Republican* says that at a recent meeting "the Ministerial Association of Youngstown decided to abolish Sunday funerals, but didn't decide how this was to be accomplished." Surely they will not hesitate to call on the legislature to make Sunday funerals an offense "against the peace and dignity of the State!" This is the "how" now-a-days with regard to almost everything that the ministers desire to stop on Sundays.



The Richmond (Va.) *Times* of February 28 contained this item: "Commonwealth Attorney John W. Stephenson, of Bath County, had Joe Kampson, a contractor on the Homestead Hotel at the Hot Springs, arrested for working five carpenters on Sundays on that building. The contractor agreed with the Virginia Hot Springs Company to rebuild the Homestead Hotel by March 1st, and was behind on the work. No indictment was made against the carpenters, only the contractor. He was fined to the full extent in each case and costs."

The barbers of Pine Bluff, Ark., have been prohibited from pursuing "their avocation on the Sabbath day" by an order recently issued by the prosecuting attorney. The *Commercial* of that place says that the barbers' association has somewhat reluctantly decided to submit and obey the letter and spirit of the law," and have signed an agreement "that they will have arrested any barber who shaves any man on Sunday, no matter what the cause may be."



A dispatch to the Galveston (Texas) *News* from Navasota, Texas, under date of March 2, read: "Constable Fanister gave the drug store proprietors notice that they must refrain from selling anything but drugs, and the saloon men must keep their doors closed on Sundays, so to-day these places of business are abiding by the law and closed tighter than known in the history of the town. Even the boot-blacks were prevented from doing business, and made to take their boot-black stands off of the sidewalks."



The barbers of Worcester, Mass., are manifesting considerable opposition to two bills that have been introduced in the Massachusetts legislature. One of these bills provides that it shall be lawful for barber shops on the premises of licensed innkeepers to keep open on Sundays until noon. The other simply provides that barbers and boot-blacks may carry on their business on Sundays until one o'clock. Barbers elsewhere throughout the State are said to be opposed to the bills, claiming that they "are entitled to one day of rest in the week."



In announcing a "Sabbath observance meeting" for March 6 the New Bedford (Mass.) *Standard* said: "A general

meeting in favor of Sabbath observance will be held in the city hall on Thursday evening. The committee in charge is aiming to make the meeting entirely undenominational, and among those who will be invited to participate are the Catholics as well as Protestants. Both Protestant and Catholic clergy will be represented among the speakers. Rev. Dr. M. D. Kneeland will be the chief speaker. It is expected that Hon. H. M. Knowlton will preside."



The Funeral Coach Driver's Union of Trenton, N. J., has served this notice on local undertakers: "On and after March 2 we positively refuse to drive to Sunday funerals, except where the death is caused by contagious diseases." It is stated that the union is determined "to put a stop to Sunday funerals," and is confident that they will be "supported by the clergymen, several of whom have expressed themselves already as opposed to Sunday funerals." The members of the union "say it is too great a strain on their nerves to attend their duties seven days in the week, besides interfering with their religious duties."



The Minneapolis *Times* of March 1 contained this item: "About a week ago John Anderson, a deaf barber, was fined \$5 or five days for keeping his barber shop open on Sunday. Anderson, however, felt it would be money in his pocket to keep open and pay a fine, and recently appeared before the city authorities and asked if he could not arrange to pay a regular fine by the day, month or year. He expected that in this way it would be less expensive. When informed, however, that it would cost him \$10 or ten days for each and every shave, he went his way to conjure up some other and

safer plan." Sunday barbering must be regarded as more of a crime in Minneapolis than is fighting.



Archbishop Keane and the parish priests of Dubuque, Iowa, have presented to the city council a petition "urging the adoption of an ordinance providing for the closing of saloons on Sunday and at 10 p. m. on secular days, and prohibiting wine rooms and the sale of liquor to minors or drunkards." That phrase, "on *secular* days," has a significance that should not be overlooked in this connection. It shows that the closing of saloons on Sunday is desired because Sunday is regarded as something different from a secular day. However laudable may be efforts and ordinances restricting and curtailing the liquor traffic and its attendant evils, they should not be based upon any such distinction as that between sacred and secular days.



The Terre Haute (Ind.) Merchants' Association has taken its first step to enforce the Sunday closing of all the retail stores of that city. The following notice has been sent out to the clothiers, butchers, and grocers who are known to have been keeping their places of business open on Sunday:

Dear Sir—It has been reported to this association that you keep open your place of business on Sunday. Kindly refrain from doing so in the future.

Very respectfully,

TERRE HAUTE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION.

"Prosecution will follow where the merchant refuses to notice the request of the association. The association, which was in a dormant state before the State convention, has become thoroughly aroused, and will make things hot for the violators of the law."

Druggists and other dealers in refreshments, of Springfield, Mass., have begun an agitation for legislative action to permit the sale of ice-cream, soda water, and confectionery at retail on Sundays. A bill to this effect has been introduced into the Massachusetts house of representatives. The sale of cigars and tobacco is now permitted, and it is thought that these other things are just as proper for Sunday traffic. Of course there are a thousand other things that are just as proper for Sunday traffic, but it seems that legal regulation of Sunday traffic is not made from that standpoint. The law seems to regard as proper for Sunday traffic that which people will not do without, and these are in many cases things that are not proper for traffic on any day.



At the request of the master and journeymen barbers of the city a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, city council is making an effort to secure the passage of an ordinance "tending to secure a more strict enforcement of the Sunday barber closing law." The ordinance will require "that barbers keep all curtains down from their windows on Sunday, so that the public may have a clear view of the interior." Mayor Johnson is said to be opposed to the ordinance, and expressed himself in these words when it was brought to his attention by Councilman Sulzmann and a delegation of barbers: "Let the people do what they please on Sunday or any other day. Individuals have the right to do what they please when the matter of personal liberty is concerned."



A press dispatch from Columbus, Ohio, under date of March 8, read: "The executive committee of the Ohio Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which closed its midwinter session here to-day,

ordered that a crusade against Sunday baseball be immediately inaugurated by the state organization and by every affiliated society in Ohio. The organization will give their attention to defeating a bill to legalize the playing of baseball on Sunday which is now pending in the general assembly. When this is accomplished the local organization in the several cities in which the game is permitted to be played on that day will insist that the city officers enforce the law. There is now on the statute books a law prohibiting baseball on Sunday, but it has never been enforced."



Speaking of the Massachusetts Sunday law, the Brockton (Mass.) *Times* says: "How far it fails of general enforcement will be realized when it is understood that it is against the law to sell candy, soda, soft drinks, etc., which are commonly sold throughout the commonwealth, to say nothing of the entertainments and innumerable forms of work which are in active operation on Sunday, especially in the summer time. Every effort to enforce the law to the letter has resulted in ridicule and failure." It would be to the interest of the State and the cause of law and order in general, if this law were abolished. When only ridicule and failure attend every effort to enforce a law to the letter it is pretty good evidence that it does not properly belong on the statute books, and that its tendency while there is to cause the laws in general to be more lightly regarded.



An "open Sunday bill" was introduced in the lower house of the Maryland legislature on March 4: "The bill recites that the present law is a relic of a stationary past, and was enacted as a politico-ecclesiastical regulation in contravention of the common law, and that it is neither

practical nor capable of being enforced. The new bill amends the law so as to allow the sale and delivery of groceries, meats, provisions, milk, ice, bread, cake and other household necessities before the hour of 10 a. m. Sundays. It further provides that all orderly and healthful diversions, pastimes, and recreations shall be permissible on Sundays as freely as at the common law before the passage of the act of 1625 of Charles I., chapter I. This section, it is claimed, will permit baseball matches, bicycle races and almost every sort of game or contest to be held on Sundays. The bill was referred to the city delegation."



At a largely attended public meeting in the interests of union labor, held recently in the Grand Opera House at Muscatine, Ia., Sunday observance and enforcement was urged in the interests of laborers. The subject was introduced by Rev. H. D. Herr, who addressed the meeting on "The Relation of the Sabbath to Toilers." Sunday was set forth as "a truce day to the toiler," "an emancipation day, a university day, the speaker here pointing out that if a man studies one-seventh of his time, in twenty-eight years he will have used four years for study, which is equivalent to a collegiate course." It was declared that "the Sabbath means commercial justice," and "rightly kept brings greater vitality." "The speaker urged particularly Sunday closing in all businesses, proving that no business was injured by Sunday observance." Mr. Arthur E. Holder, of Des Moines, the president of the State Federation of Labor, also addressed the meeting, and in the course of his remarks "urged a shorter working day, and was very emphatic in his advocacy of a Sunday rest day, and the closing up of all kinds of business on that day."

In a sermon at the Erskine Presbyterian Church, in Montreal, on February 23, Rev. J. G. Shearer, of the "Lord's Day" Alliance of Canada, declared that "nearly 90 per cent. of the adult population of Canada were quietly but powerfully aiding in an effort to create a stronger public opinion in favor of the better observance of the Lord's day." "The organized labor forces of the country," declared Mr. Shearer, as reported in the *Montreal Star*, "are actively co-operating with us in opposition, not only to Sunday labor and business, but to Sunday holiday features, recognizing that the Sunday holiday for the many means the Sunday work-day for a considerable number. Mr. Ralph Smith, M.P., president of the Trades and Labor Congress, is a vice-president of the Lord's Day Alliance, and does all in his power to promote this co-operation between the labor orders and the Alliance."



On February 24 a deputation representing the "Lord's Day" Alliance of Canada waited upon the mayor of Montreal "in regard to the enforcement of the by-law against Sunday selling." A new mayor has recently come into office, and the deputation desired to secure from him a renewal of the promise made by the former mayor that on May 1 stringent enforcement of the Sunday-closing law would begin. The new mayor was not quite so ready to promise absolute Sunday closing, holding that "there would be a great deal of difficulty in enforcing a by-law which would shut up a small shop where a few oranges, apples, etc., were sold." However he "was sure that a way could be devised whereby big stores could be closed." The deputation was asked "to furnish a list containing the names of those who are doing a big trade on Sunday," and was given to understand that

as soon as this list was received the chief of police would issue orders to the police "to take action against all those who are summoned to close up and who refuse to do so."



The "act to amend the Penal Code relative to the sale of prepared meats, salads, and cheese on Sundays," introduced in the New York legislature by Representative Adams, will amend section 267 of the Penal Code so that it will read as follows:

All manner of selling or offering for sale or delivery of any property on Sunday, is prohibited, except that meals may be sold to be eaten on the premises where sold or delivered elsewhere by caterers; and prepared tobacco, fresh milk, ice, and soda water may be sold in places other than where groceries, vegetables, spirituous or malt liquors or wines are kept or offered for sale, and except, also, that between the hours of 5 and 8 in the evening, prepared meats and fish, salads and cheese may be sold. Fruit, flowers, confections, newspapers, drugs, medicines, and surgical appliances may be sold in a quiet and orderly manner at any time of the day.

The bill has been reported upon favorably by the Committee on Codes, and it is expected that the amended section will go into effect as law on May 1. What is gained is the privilege of selling meat, fish, salads and cheese for three hours on Sunday evenings. It is to be hoped that some time the essential absurdity of such a statute as the above, with its reasonless distinctions and differentiations, will become apparent to legislators and the people alike.



The Albuquerque (N. Mex.) *Citizen* recently published the following: "A Santa Fe committee, consisting of Hon. Arthur Seligman, Samuel G. Cartwright and J. W. Akers, accompanied by Attorney A. B. Renehan, presented to Governor Otero a numerously signed

petition, calling attention to the fact that the Sunday closing law is enforced in the First judicial district, while common report has it that it is not enforced in the other judicial districts, much to the detriment of Santa Fe in particular and to the business interests of the First judicial district in general. The petitioners ask that Governor Otero exercise his power over the peace officers of the territory to urge them to enforce the Sunday law as strictly in one part of the territory as in the other. Governor Otero promised to take the petition under advisement and to act in strict accordance with the powers that the law confers upon him in matters of this kind." We suppose this refers to general Sunday closing, though it may be that it has reference only to the liquor traffic, although there is no intimation that such is the case in the above statement.



The Portland (Me.) *Argus* predicts "a spasm of rigid Sunday observance before long" in that city. It calls attention to "the extreme laxness which is shown by the city government and the police, as well as the sheriffs and various other kinds of officials, in the Sunday closing of places of business, or rather in their not being closed on Sundays," and continues: "It is said that it is now possible to buy almost everything in Portland on Sunday except dry goods, and it might be possible to buy those on a pinch. There is a lot of alleged restaurants which take out victualers' licenses every year for the mere purpose of covering the sale of candy, cigars, fruit, and fancy groceries on Sunday. There are a number of other lines of business in which there is coming to be a disregard of the limit between Saturday night and Sunday morning." The *Argus* says that

"some of the people who still believe in the old New England Sunday" are preparing to enter upon a crusade against this state of affairs. "A man said yesterday that it was the same old story of giving a man an inch and he would take an ell. If the sale of medicine and Sunday newspapers is permitted it will gradually be abused until things are wide open again. The only way to do is to stop it all and make storekeepers realize that they must obey the laws in letter and spirit also."



On February 24 over one hundred ministers from all parts of the State appeared before a committee of the New Jersey legislature, at Trenton, in opposition to a bill which provided that in incorporated cities violations of the Sunday liquor laws shall be disposed of before the local police magistrates instead of being subject to grand jury indictment as at present. The bill was generally regarded as a measure for the special benefit of Atlantic City, which desires to be free from the restrictions upon Sunday liquor selling. A number of the ministers made vigorous speeches in opposition to the bill, declaring that they did not want the saloons "to have more privileges than they now have." This contention is of course perfectly proper, but along with it came the inevitable Sunday-enforcement plea. Dr. J. W. Marshall, pastor of the Broadway Methodist Church, of Camden, who made the principal speech of the occasion, according to the newspaper report, declared that the legislators "should build up rather than tear down the barriers around the observance of Sunday." The Christian Endeavor Societies and the Baptist Young People's Union of the State were represented before the committee in opposition to the bill, as was also the Law and Or-

der League of New Jersey, the secretary of which, Rev. S. H. Hann, was reported as saying that "the Sabbath day shall be respected and shall not be turned over to the liquor hordes."



A union meeting "for the better observance of the Sabbath day" was held in the First Methodist church in Fall River, Mass., on the evening of March 2, under the auspices of the Fall River Ministerial Association. The meeting was quite well attended by clergymen, and Rev. M. D. Kneeland, of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, made the principal address of the occasion. From the report given by the Fall River *News* we take the following:

He talked at some length on the necessity of the proper observance of the Sabbath, both from a moral and a hygienic standpoint, and stated that the greatest nations in the world were those which observed the Sabbath day as a day of rest. * * * He said that the man who took from another this one day in seven was an enemy to humanity, an enemy to civilization, and an enemy to God. * * * He told of the work of the league before the legislature, and complimented Senator Morrison and his committee for their adverse report on the bill to permit Sunday gunning and fishing. They had also defeated the bill to allow Sunday golf and baseball. There are now only two places in New England where baseball is allowed to be played, one near at hand, at Crescent Park. This should be stopped. Last year they had made it so hot for the proprietor that he had sold out to a syndicate. Now the Providence papers state that an industrial exposition will be held there this year and will be opened Sundays. This should be stopped.

At the conclusion of the address the local ministers proposed the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That we hereby express our disapproval of the practise of holding secular entertainments on the Lord's day, and respectfully request the proper authorities to take the necessary steps to enforce the law.

NOTE AND COMMENT

On Sunday, March 9, the French Chamber of Deputies held two lengthy sittings, which is said to have been an unusual proceeding.

The physicians who attended President McKinley during the week preceding his death have presented a bill to Congress approximating \$50,000.

The Empress Dowager of China has issued an edict forbidding hereafter the cruel practise of footbinding, which custom has so long been inflicted upon the girls of China.

The Patrick-Rice murder trial which has been in progress in this city for nine weeks will cost the State, it is said, for expert testimony, photographs, printing, witnesses and court expenses, about \$250,000.

Two reconcentrado camps are maintained in Batangas province, Philippine Islands. There are 6,000 Filipinos in one camp and 19,000 in the other. The camps are said to be kept in excellent sanitary condition, and the inmates are reported to be "healthy and contented."

The War Secretary of England has submitted to the House of Commons what is said to be "one of the boldest and most comprehensive schemes of army reform ever presented to Parliament." One leading feature is an increase of the rate of pay for English soldiers, and it is expected that in this way a resort to conscription will be avoided. The temporary remedy means an additional annual ex-

pense for the support of the army of about \$10,000,000.

Referring to "the dreams of Cecil Rhodes of an occupation of the whole of Africa by the English, the entering wedge to be the railway from Cairo to the Cape," the *New York Times* says: "Had it not been for this ambition, it is safe to say there would have been no South African war in our time." The *Times* is not a Boer sympathizer.

Russia and France have issued a joint declaration to the effect that the Anglo-Japanese agreement is in accord with their own policy in the far East. Russia especially declares that she has invariably had in view the maintenance of peace in that part of the world, and that she desires the maintenance of the independence and integrity of both China and Korea.

Three Vatican officials were on trial in Rome on March 20 on the charge of stealing \$80,000 of the Pope's personal funds. This is said to be the first time in the history of the Papacy that a Pope has turned to a secular tribunal for justice. The Pope keeps large sums of money in his private apartments, and has suffered from the cupidity of attendants at other times in recent years.

"The incentives, inspiration, and force which the Word of God supplies to personal action" were dwelt upon by Capt. Alfred T. Mahan in an address before the graduating class at the West Point Military Academy on March 14. "The

essential character of the good Christian and the good soldier," he said, "have much in common. They are more closely allied than those of any other calling." In endurance, hardship, conflict, yes, but in weapons, object, and manner of warfare as different as heaven is different from earth.



From Berlin it is reported that recruits for "Christian Science" and Spiritism "come exclusively from the educated, and especially from what is known as 'society,' and that those who are most skeptical in matters of religion are most apt to embrace 'Christian Science.'" This is pronounced "a strange feature" of the growth of these cults. The people who are indifferent to or skeptical with regard to true religion are the very ones who are prepared to be deceived by these cults. True religion and not skepticism is the genuine protection against these delusions.



England, too, is enlisting the school teacher in the work of conquest. The principal of a leading normal college in England has gone to South Africa on a three-years' engagement as principal of the Normal College at Pretoria, and at the request of Mr. Chamberlain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are supplying 100 teachers for work in the former Boer republics. Education, when sought after, is an excellent thing; it remains to be seen what success will attend those anomalous educational ventures which are thrust upon a people from without and which will undoubtedly be regarded both by the Boer and the Filipino as but a continuation of the conquest in which grim-visaged war was the first and chief reliance.



The three Boer delegates who came to

this country a few weeks ago left for Europe on March 20. While here they visited Secretary of State Hay and President Roosevelt, but before doing so were given to understand that their calls must be in no sense official. Mr. Hay informed them that no rule of neutrality was being violated by the shipment of horses, mules, and provisions from the United States to the British army in South Africa. The President "informed them decisively that this Government could not interfere in the progress of the war." Evidently these visits amounted to the same thing as they would have had they been official.



An incident in some respects similar to the Tillman-McLaurin affair which recently occurred in the United States Senate took place in the English House of Commons on March 20. During an exciting debate on the war in South Africa a tilt occurred between Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, and John Dillon, Irish Nationalist. Incensed at some remark of the former the latter flung at Mr. Chamberlain a very unparliamentary epithet, for which he was immediately suspended from his privileges as a member for one week. These two incidents will add nothing to the glory of the Philippine and Boer wars, with which they have a certain connection.



It is worthy of note that two such events as the extinguishment of the "torch of liberty" on the Bartholdi statue and the sending of an embassy to take part in the ceremonies attending the crowning of a monarch should take place almost simultaneously. Both of these events may be unimportant and insignificant, but certainly whatever importance and significance attaches to them is on the side of the idea that republicanism and

not monarchism is on the wane in the world to-day. It is said that the amount which the Government will save in twelve months by extinguishing the light on the Statue of Liberty will amount to just one-fourth the sum it is paying to send representatives to the coronation of Edward VII.



Rudyard Kipling, "the poet of imperialism," thinks that what the United States is doing in the Philippines "is precisely what we are doing in South Africa." He says: "What a new country wants is a high-toned despot of unlimited powers and absolute integrity. But, as America and England are both free peoples, we must just muddle along in the expensive, wasteful, butchery fashion that attends our methods." Mr. Kipling is by no means the first man to discover that a free people are unfitted to govern subject peoples. When they attempt it, and persist in the attempt, they usually "muddle along" in an "expensive, wasteful, butchery fashion" until they "muddle" themselves into accepting "a despot of unlimited powers," who is sometimes "high-toned," but never possessed of "absolute integrity."



On the afternoon of March 11, amid the noise of booming guns, the blowing of whistles on land and water, the playing of bands, and the shouting of assembled crowds at every point of vantage on the water-front, Prince Henry of Prussia took his departure for Germany on the *Deutschland* of the Hamburg-American line. Felicitous messages were exchanged between President Roosevelt and the Prince on the eve of his departure, and immediately after he had sailed messages were exchanged between the German Emperor and the President.

The cruiser-yacht *Hohenzollern* departed at the same time. The honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon the Prince by Harvard University on March 6. This was more an act of international courtesy than anything else, for it is not pretended that the Prince was given this degree by virtue of his own attainments as a man.



It is said that during the recent stormy times at Barcelona, Spain, anarchists and militant socialists flocked thither from all parts of Europe, and even from America, for the purpose of fomenting trouble and of aggravating it when it occurred. This statement may be slightly exaggerated, but there is no doubt that there is considerable truth underlying it. The significance of the fact here brought out is that in times of industrial depression and popular commotion there are to-day throughout the world many discontented spirits who will flock hither, and under cover of a strike or some other form of industrial disturbance, will commit acts of violence and terror. There is no reason to believe that industrial disturbances of a violent character will be discontinued, and it is quite certain that the violent characters who stand ready to take advantage of such opportunities are increasing rather than decreasing.



The Russianization of Finland proceeds in the same despotic way in which from time immemorial strong nations have been accustomed to extend their sovereignty over weaker ones that they desired to rule. But some sturdy opposition is being met with. The Finnish clergy in many parishes have refused to read out in their pulpits the military service edict, and press censors who have trespassed in private houses in search of unauthorized prints have been prose-

cuted. On the other hand many communes have been fined for refusing to elect conscription boards for carrying out the military service edict, and the chairman of the Helsingfors school board has been compelled to resign. The Medical Board of Finland has resigned rather than have anything to do with the carrying out of the military levy. Such a condition of affairs points to serious trouble if the Russian government persists, which it is very apt to do.



The little dependency of Guam is calling for some measure of self-government. A petition signed by thirty-two persons who describe themselves as "citizens of the island of Guam, a dependency of the United States of America," has been forwarded to Congress. It states that military government is radically unsuited for the island and is distasteful and repugnant to fundamental principles, and says that the petitioners are anxious to "mold our institutions to the American standard, and prepare ourselves and our children for the obligations and the enjoyments of the rights to which, as loyal subjects of the United States, we feel ourselves rightfully entitled." The petition is indorsed by Commander Schroeder, governor of the island, and prominent journals which ridicule and oppose all suggestions of any such thing with regard to the Filipinos, declare that "the petition should receive prompt attention." But then Guam is not the Philippines.



Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, professor of constitutional law at Yale University, in a recent lecture to workingmen at Hartford, created somewhat of a sensation by declaring that "American workmen eat too much, especially too much meat." His statement has been rein-

forced by Dr. Cyrus Edson, who says that "all Americans eat too much meat." He says that men who do physical labor should eat meat but once a day, and that after the hardest work of the day is over. He recommends fruit and starchy foods for the morning and midday meals. Judge Baldwin also made these significant statements in the same lecture: "Despite the fact that the nation is growing richer, the people generally are not saving as much in proportion as did their ancestors half a century ago. Everyone strives to live as well as his neighbor. Display, extravagance, and dash are ever in evidence." This means that luxury is succeeding frugality; that the acquired and cultivated wants and desires of the people are more than keeping pace with the marvelous increase of wealth.



On March 13 District Attorney Jerome sent to the New York legislature a brief concerning the Sunday saloon question. He gave fourteen reasons why the bill modifying the present Sunday closing law should become a law. The brief began as follows:

Under democratic forms of government a law is not permanently enforceable by elected authorities where a large number of persons in the locality do not consider the act forbidden as immoral in itself, and are unwilling to accord obedience to the law.

In Greater New York there are a large number of people who do not consider it immoral to enter a saloon and take a drink on Sunday.

New York is a cosmopolitan city and its inhabitants, being citizens and voters, have a right to have their wishes respected and their tastes and habits considered, whether they be foreign-born or native-born.

It was pointed out that the greater number of the saloon-keepers were violating the law anyhow, and would continue to do so; that the alleged hotels kept in existence in order to enable liquor

to be sold on Sunday are centres of vice which saloon-men have not willingly established, and which would disappear if the saloons were given the liberty to open without such an adjunct; and that the present law is fruitful of blackmail, and thereby works the corruption of the police, and because of this use made of it, disrespect for law in general.



The Chicago *Tribune* thinks that the sending of a special embassy by the United States Government to see the King of England crowned "should be the last affair of the kind," and adds: "The attitude of the United States concerning future coronations should be one of dignified aloofness. It should not descend from the heights of its republican simplicity to take part in the childish entertainments of Europe in which crowns, scepters, and holy oil are of so much importance."

This seems like a sound view of the matter, but it should not be forgotten that it is now held by quite high authorities in this country that the instrument by which this nation repudiated monarchy and kingship, and upon which its republicanism was based, especially that portion of it expressly declaring the political equality of all men and asserting that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, is "fit only for the aloofness of the astral intelligence." Perhaps it follows then that monarchy and its "childish" accompaniments are most eminently fit for the people of this planet, and even that those who have once been vain enough to imagine otherwise will have to settle back into the belief that kingship is the "dignified aloofness" proper for the contemplation, acclamation and aspiration of mundane intelligences.

On March 8, 1802, the *Evening Post* of this city published a translated copy of a proclamation made a short time before to the inhabitants of St. Domingo by the military representatives of the French government. It read as follows:

LIBERTY. EQUALITY.
PROCLAMATION.

On board of the Ocean, off the Cape, the 15th of Pluviose, 10th year of French Republic, (6th Feb. 1802.)

LE CLERC, General in Chief of the Army of St. Domingo, Captain General of the Colony.

To the Inhabitants of St. Domingo.

INHABITANTS OF ST. DOMINGO!

READ the Proclamation of the first Consul of the Republic. It assures to the BLACKS, that liberty for which they have so long fought—to commerce and to agriculture, that prosperity, without which there can be no colonies. His promises will be faithfully fulfilled—to doubt it *would be a crime.*

The General in Chief,

Captain General LE CLERC.

By order of the General in Chief,

Captain General LENOIR.

This proclamation, especially its last words, has a striking similarity to things of much more recent times. The methods by which Napoleon extended his sway have been commonly regarded as strictly imperial, but nevertheless the method of the above proclamation is still in vogue. Nations are still, yes, and even republics, on the strength of their own unsolicited promises assuming sovereignty over distant people in the name of liberty and equality, and pronouncing it "a crime" to doubt their magnanimity!



At Joliet, Ill., on the evening of March 11, just at the close of a stirring speech in behalf of the cause of the Boers, Ex-Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, was stricken with paralysis, and died early the following morning. Mr. Altgeld was a man of wide reputation, chiefly because

of the virulence with which he attacked, as a public speaker, what he regarded as unjust and abusive in public affairs, and those who opposed him on such points, and because of two things connected with his governorship of Illinois from 1892 to 1896: His pardoning of the anarchists who had been sentenced to imprisonment for life because of alleged complicity in the Haymarket dynamite explosion and riot of 1886, and his conduct with regard to the great railroad strike of 1894, when he declined to call out the State militia and protested against the presence of Federal troops. Because of these things he has been regarded by most people as a very dangerous man. But the *Times*, of this city, which is not prejudiced in his favor, says that he "was not quite so black as he was painted or as the American people imagined him to be. He was not consciously the enemy of mankind or a foe to public order. He sincerely desired to see mankind happier. He felt that a great part of his fellow-beings were wronged, oppressed, and cheated of their rights. According to his understanding and his lights he tried to restore the equilibrium by exalting the humble and pressing down the mighty." Mr. Altgeld was fifty-five years of age. He was born in Germany, and was brought to this country by his parents when three months old.



On March 10 news came from South Africa of one of the most severe defeats experienced by the English since the beginning of the war. General Methuen, who a short time ago predicted that the war would be over in a few months, with 900 mounted troops and 300 infantry and quite a train of baggage wagons, was on his way to join another detachment. His force was suddenly attacked and stam-

ped just after dawn by a much smaller force of Boers under General De La Rey. Three officers and thirty-eight men were killed, and nearly 100 wounded, including General Methuen, who with over 500 of the British force and the baggage, fell into the hands of the Boers. The news was received with dismay and astonishment in England. The depression, however, was somewhat relieved by the news which came later that General De La Rey had magnanimously released General Methuen, sending him over to his comrades where he could have treatment for his severe wound. This act reverts attention to the act of the British in putting the Boer leader, Scheepers, to death a short time ago, and it is wondered what they will now do with General Kruitzing, who was captured wounded and is now held a prisoner. The reports of Lord Kitchener since May, 1901, have accounted for 15,374 Boers killed, wounded, made prisoners, and surrendered, which is more than the estimate made by the British War Department of the number of Boers remaining in the field in June, 1901. This late Boer victory, therefore, creates some astonishment in England, and indicates that the Boers are not as nearly conquered as has been supposed.



After months of delay Congress at last gives some promise of heeding "the weighty reasons of morality and national interest" which the President in December declared called for the enactment of some measure in the interest of Cuba's material well-being. But the "benevolence" and "generosity" of her big benefactor is not likely to melt Cuba's heart. A 20 per cent. reduction of the tariff duties in favor of Cuba is proposed, which is said to be "but half of what General Wood regarded as desirable, and

about two-thirds of what he regarded as absolutely necessary" to avert industrial ruin on the island. More than this the reduction is to be limited to but one crop, extending only to December of next year, and with this "concession" go some more "Platt amendments" to the effect that Cuba shall enact in return "immigration and exclusion laws as fully restrictive of immigration as the laws of the United States," and shall grant "reciprocal and equivalent concessions in favor of the products and manufactures of the United States which shall be, less by an amount equivalent to at least 20 per cent. than the rate imposed upon like articles when imported into Cuba from the most favored of other countries." *The Outlook*, which has so constantly seen the hand of Providence in all that the United States has done in its colonial ventures, revolts at this treatment of Cuba, and observes that "it would be base, having made free, to rob of the fruits of freedom." "This," says *The Outlook*, "is a new version of the parable of the Good Samaritan: drive off the robbers, and then leave the wounded traveler to die of starvation." It is strange that with this matter before it *The Outlook* does not see that Cuba has not been made free; she has been made a dependency of this country, and it is that relation of hers to this country which moves *The Outlook*, evidently unconsciously, however, to make such strenuous pleas "for the redemption of the public pledges and the saving of the national honor." We shall give more attention to this and related matters in our next number.



On March 2 Giacchino Pecci reached the age of ninety-three years. The next day was the twenty-fourth anniversary of his coronation as Pope, the fiftieth anniversary of his installation as cardinal,

and the sixtieth anniversary of his assignment as nuncio at Brussels. This was made the occasion of a great celebration in Rome, called the *jubilee* celebration of the anniversary of his coronation as Pope, though why, we do not understand. The principal ceremony was held in the Basilica of St. Peter's, which had not been used on such an occasion since 1870. We are assured that it was attended with "extraordinary pomp." "Thirty cardinals, numerous archbishops and bishops, the members of the Pontifical Court, the special foreign missions sent by most countries, the members of the diplomatic corps, and the Roman nobility, all in magnificent vestments or uniforms, participated in the ceremony and formed a striking spectacle. The Pontifical Guards, wearing their gala uniforms, were on duty on all sides." We are told also that this was the first time the "Pontifical Guards" have worn their full-dress uniforms since 1870. It was not stated whether they were the same uniforms worn the last time, nor what sort of uniforms have been worn in the meantime. It is said that the ceremony was witnessed by an assemblage of 50,000 persons, 27,000 of whom were Americans, or at least that many tickets had been allotted to Americans. "Costly gifts and autograph letters from the heads of the states they represented" were presented to the Pope by the special representatives of many governments. Emperor William of Germany sent a special envoy with a present and congratulations, and King Edward VII. sent his congratulations by Earl Denbigh. *The Outlook* says "he is the only Pope in recent centuries who, during his lifetime, has been honored by Christians of every name." And *The Outlook* pays its respects by the use of the term, "His Holiness."

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.

TOO GOOD TO KEEP.

Letters are daily being received at our office that are too good to keep. We wish our subscribers to enjoy them with us. Here are a few of them, all of which bear recent post-marks:

MUCH IMPROVED.

I enclose \$1 for the renewal of my subscription. I think THE SENTINEL much improved.
ELDER R. A. UNDERWOOD.

THIS HAS THE RIGHT RING.

Enclosed find \$1 for THE SENTINEL for 1902. We appreciate THE SENTINEL and always expect to take it. WM. BUTCHER.

ADMIRE THE LAST CHANGE.

I very much admire the last change made

in THE SENTINEL, and do not want to miss a single number while it is published.

T. S. MOORE.

A NECESSITY.

Please find enclosed \$1 for which you will renew THE SENTINEL to me for another year, as I do not know how to get along without it.

D. H. MCKEAN.

RATHER HAVE THE SENTINEL THAN COMFORTS.

THE SENTINEL is so valuable to me that I cannot do without it. In order to obtain it, things to add to my comfort have to be left out.

MARTHA B. TRIPP.

PLEASED WITH PRESENT IMPROVED CONDITION.

I have just received your letter of the 11th and will enclose the amount for the next year. I am very well pleased with the present improved condition of THE SENTINEL. We don't think we can get along without it.

S. BOOTH.



A LARGE NUMBER

of persons have sent us five or more names, taking advantage of our offer to wrap and mail THE SENTINEL to each individual separately, at the rate of 20 cents each for three months. One such club now running contains 297 names. These are all going to influential men in one city.

Are all the leading men of your city, town, or county receiving THE SENTINEL? If they are not, why not send us a club? If you cannot afford to do this yourself, perhaps you can get some friend or friends of THE SENTINEL in your vicinity to join you. Talk the matter over and let us know the result.



WHAT HAVE YOU DONE

with those coupons recently sent you? If you have not already handed them out, please do so at once. Remember it costs you nothing, and you stand a good chance of being enabled to renew your subscription at a reduced rate, for if we receive even one of the coupons back, you have that privilege. If any of our subscribers can use additional coupons we will be glad to mail them. This is an easy way for you to help increase the circulation of THE SENTINEL, and we hope that all of our friends will help. Ten thousand new subscriptions before May 1 is what we ought to get.

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. 20, 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 MALLETT,

710 East 171st St., New York.





Rome's Great Triumph

If current reports be correct an unheard of thing in the annals of the United States of America is at hand—the Government is to send a commission to the Vatican to discuss governmental business with the "Sovereign Pontiff." The Papacy is rejoicing, as well she may, for this is a striking evidence that the nation which once stood before the world as sponsor for principles that are in eternal antagonism with those of popery is gradually succumbing to her subtle and malign influence. See article, "The Government and the Vatican Again."