

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1902

No. 7

The Only Hope of Self-Government

By Alonzo T. Jones

THROUGH world-power, wealth, and intemperance the ancient empires went to ruin, and the empire-republic of Rome not only to ruin, but to annihilation.

In studying these notable instances of "philosophy teaching by example," particularly the item of intemperance—loss of self-government—it is worth thinking of that as to strong drink they knew only the fermented juice of the grape. Though the principle of distillation was known from most ancient times, there was very little, if indeed there was any, manufacture or actual use of distilled liquors.

The problem to be studied to-day is: When, with one sort of intoxicant added to the indulgence of the other appetites and the passions self-government could be so destroyed that all the mighty empires of ancient times, and especially the mightiest of all—the empire-republic of Rome—could be carried to ruin and annihilation, what must be the result to the mighty empire-republic of the United States when to the indulgence of the other appetites and passions there is added the inevitable effect of the many sorts of intoxicants now indulged every-

where that work only the destruction of self-government?

Anything that is used, the effect of which is to intoxicate, to stimulate or to narcotize, tends inevitably to the destruction of self-government in all who use it. For this reason the whole range of stimulants, narcotics, and intoxicants is included, is of peculiar importance, and must be considered in any study of the true principle and practise of self-government.

What then is this range? Let us have the answer in the words of the highest literary and scientific authority in our language. In the Encyclopedia Britannica, article "Drunkenness," it is stated as follows:

From tea to hasheesh we have, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, a sort of graduated scale of *intoxicants* which stimulate in small doses and narcotize in larger. The physiological action of all these agents gradually shades into each other: all producing or being capable of producing consecutive paralysis of the various parts of the nervous system.

This places in the list of intoxicants two things of almost universal use, which are not generally recognized as intoxi-

cants; tea and coffee. And of these the same high authority further says:

Even the cup so often said to "cheer, but not inebriate," [tea] cannot be regarded as altogether free from the last-named effect. . . . Tea-sots are well known to be affected with palpitation and irregularity of the heart, as well as more or less sleeplessness, mental irritability, and muscular tremors, which in some culminate in paralysis; while positive intoxication has been known to be the result of the excessive use of strong tea.—*Art. Drunkenness.*

Coffee belongs to the medicinal or auxiliary class of food substances, being solely valuable for its stimulant effect upon the nervous and vascular systems. It produces a feeling of buoyancy and exhilaration.—*Art. Coffee.*

Theine of tea is an alkaloid identical with the caffeine that is obtained from coffee.—*Art. Tea.*

And the empyreumatic oil of coffee is identical with one of the essential poisons of tobacco smoke. It is thus that "from tea to hasheesh we have, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, a sort of graduated scale of intoxicants."

Of tea and coffee as intoxicants another unquestionable authority says:

To a certain extent tea produces intoxication. It enters into the circulation, and gradually impairs the energy of body and mind. It stimulates, excites, and quickens the motion of the living machinery, forcing it to unnatural action, and thus gives the tea-drinker the impression that it is doing great service in imparting to him strength. This is a mistake. Tea draws upon the strength of the nerves, and leaves them greatly weakened. When its influence is gone and the increased action caused by its use is abated, then what is the result?—Langor and debility corresponding to the artificial vivacity the tea imparted. When the system is already overtaxed and needs rest, the use of tea spurs up nature, by stimulation, to perform unwonted, unnatural action, and thereby lessens her power to perform, and her ability to endure, long before Heaven designed they should. Tea is poisonous to the system.

The second effect of tea-drinking is headache, wakefulness, palpitation of the heart, in-

digestion, trembling of the nerves, with many other evils.

The influence of coffee is in a degree the same as tea, but the effect upon the system is still worse. Its influence is exciting, and in the degree that it elevates above par, it will exhaust and bring prostration below par. Tea and coffee drinkers carry the marks upon their faces. The skin becomes sallow, and assumes a lifeless appearance. The glow of health is not seen upon the countenance.

Tea and coffee do not nourish the system. The relief obtained from them is sudden, before the stomach has time to digest them. This shows that what the users of these stimulants call strength is only received by exciting the nerves of the stomach, which convey the irritation to the brain, and this in turn is aroused to impart increased action to the heart and short-lived energy to the entire system. All this is false strength that we are the worse for having. Tea and coffee do not give a particle of natural strength.

Another eminent scientific, physiological and medicinal authority says:

Tea and coffee are merely stimulants that seem to replace appetite for food, and serve as transient substitutes, but they are not nourishing, and in excess they are likely to cause indigestion, loss of appetite, headaches, peevishness, nervousness, muscular tremors, sleeplessness, and irregular heart action, loss of flesh and general debility. They belong among drugs rather than foods, and have uses at times for those who have not become habituated to them.

The nerves are subject to two directly opposite influences or effects resulting from the use of so-called stimulants. *The first* is truly a stimulating, goading, or irritating effect, which, carried to the extreme, results in spasms, or convulsive explosions in the nerve centers, and such is the effect of the active principles of tea and coffee; and to apply this sort of influence day after day is to tire out or exhaust the nervous system, by keeping it keyed up too high, and though tea and coffee do not inebriate, they do intoxicate to some extent.

The second influence the nerves are subject to is of precisely the opposite kind—an anæsthetic, depressing, deadening or paralyzing effect, such as is provided by alcohol in greater or less degree, as it is used much or little in wines, beers, or liquors.

When such things seem to *brace* one up, it is merely because they benumb the normal sense of being tired, which is nature's indicator that the nerves need rest. The same sort of effect is got from tobacco, whether chewed, snuffed, or smoked, and from opiates and other narcotics.

Now, when these stimulants, narcotics, and intoxicants are fed daily to the children throughout the whole nation as regularly as they go to the table, the inevitable result of this persistent perversion of normal appetite and function is that at the earliest possible moment they will indulge in beer and tobacco, because these only the better satisfy the already perverted taste; and from these the graduation is just as easy to the stronger and more enslaving intoxicants, opiates, and narcotics; and so the overthrow of individual self-government is complete. And when individual self-government is so destroyed throughout the whole nation, then national self-government is gone, and is supplanted by a government of some other form, though the name and profession of being a republic may still be maintained.

This is as certain as effect follows cause. For when there is such an overthrow of individual self-government in the mass of the nation, then the masses will commit such excesses that the only way in which government can be maintained will have to be by the exercise of governmental power in a way that will

be the total abandonment of every principle of a republic, of every principle of government of the people *by the people*.

And when that time comes there will be attempts to reach and to control by governmental power the causes of the lack of self-government in the life of the individual. But all such attempts will only the more fully demonstrate the total overthrow, in the individual and in the nation, of the principle of self-government; and will also only the more fully demonstrate the urgent necessity and the timeliness of that divine message, the everlasting gospel, to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, as before and always reasoning of "righteousness, self-government, and judgment to come." Nothing else, no other power, can truly reach the cause of the ruinous evils abounding.

That gospel, preached to the individual, persuading the individual, accepted by the individual, converting the individual, restoring the integrity of the individual, planting in the individual the divine principle and power by which he can completely govern himself—that gospel, thus preached in the divine integrity of the very power of God, is even now the only hope of the individual, and through that the only preservative of the state, as pertains to the original, fundamental, and characteristic American and Christian principle, but now only the abiding Christian principle, of self-government.



The usual results which have appeared for many years whenever definite efforts have been made to suppress liquor-selling on Sunday in large cities have appeared in the city of New York. Since the general Sunday laws include other forms of business, a definite effort was made during the month of April—

backed undoubtedly by the liquor interests—to enforce the Sunday laws against the small dealers, especially among the Jews who sell food and other articles of minor value, according to their constitutional right under their exemption as Sabbath-keepers. This was carried so far that Mayor Low came out with a

public statement declaring that these in-offensive Jews should not be persecuted in this way.

It seems strange to the thoughtful student of the situation that law-makers should continue such inconsistent and self-destructive legislation. The worst forms of evil, liquor-selling, gambling and social vice, thrive most when men are most at leisure. Present legislation concerning Sunday entrenches the liquor traffic and its associate evils, because under existing laws it is able to secure the persecution of the Jews and others whom

the law treats unjustly. It goes without saying that such legislation would not continue were it not for certain conservative religious and political influences which combine to keep it in existence, and so to perpetuate evil results which might be avoided, in a large degree, if liquor-selling, gambling and social evil were legislated against upon their own merits—or rather demerits—and if the unscriptural and self-destructive legislation which compels all men to idleness on Sunday was set aside.—*Sabbath Recorder*.



Perverting Right Ways

By W. N. Glenn

THE people of the United States set out to demonstrate the practicability of a government without a king and a church without a pope. This consummation could be attained only by a complete separation of church and state. The theory was that civil government could do its legitimate work better without the interference of the church, and the church (that is, the Christian church) could do its God-designed work better without any dependence upon the state. This is Protestantism; anything else is the Papacy in principle, whatever it may be called. The Christian church was set in motion under the direction of the Holy Spirit; it ignored the support of any power but the power of God.

The Apostle Paul stood up for the faith on this ground: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. The Gospel being itself the power of God, could not be supplemented by any further power;

for in Christ was vested *all power* "in heaven and in earth." Mat. 28:18. Therefore to attempt to add any further power to the work would be to depreciate the power of God; for to attempt to do the work of the Gospel by any other means than that authorized by the Word of God would be to assume that the Word of itself was not sufficient. The Spirit of God could not work with a spirit of such a character—a spirit lacking full confidence in the Word—and consequently the work would be marred and weakened.

So whatever attempt might be made to inject the civil government or any other merely human auxiliary into the Gospel work would be logically a scheme of the adversary. And history has demonstrated that wherever the civil government has undertaken to direct the Christian religion there has been persecution—the practise of the very opposite of Christian principles; and wherever the church has had the power to dominate the gov-

ernment there has been even worse persecution.

Civil government exists in the providence of God. Its very corruption, under whatever form, is evidence that He does not administer it. Its purpose is to preserve order, and thus protect rights; not to give or enforce rights, but to protect men in the rights God has given them, among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These rights being protected, men will have liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; and men who do not want to worship God at all will not be made hypocrites by being forced into some formality falsely called Christianity.

Previous to the birth of the United States Government the idea prevailed that civil government was an institution erected for the benefit of those who could muster sufficient power to get control of it. That is the spirit of monarchy, whether it be exercised by an actual monarchical government or by a nominal republic. It is the doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils." This doctrine has two extremes—a monarchical form and a republican form. The monarchical extreme is that the benefits accrue to a restricted class, while in the republican form the benefits are supposed to belong to the majority. In either case the results of the doctrine are that the spoils fall to the official class and its friends and financial supporters.

The work of the adversary of souls is to pervert those things which are designed for the good of mankind. Civil government was instituted for the benefit of all, but it was perverted to mean the subjugation of the masses to the service of the few. Then when reformation set in motion the idea of government by the voice of the people, that was perverted to the idea that the *rights* of the ma-

jority were paramount to those of the minority. And for some years certain "reformers" have been construing this idea to mean that the majority have a right to rule in the realm of religion. This, in turn, has led back to the scheme of furthering religious interests through civil law—a reaction from the true republican idea of government.

Those whose religion conformed to this perverted theory of government must needs seek to turn the government in this direction. On the theory that republican government means majority rule in all things, they seek by every possible means to make a show of majority power in favor of this doctrine. Then comes the plea of majority *rights* in the matter of religion, the logic of which is that the minority have *no rights*; that whatever is accorded to them in this respect by the majority is merely toleration—and that the minority should be under everlasting obligation to the majority for whatever of toleration is granted. The logic of majority rule in religion is that the rights of the majority can be protected only by compelling the minority to conform to the doctrine of the majority, without respect to conscience.

This has been clearly illustrated in the Sunday-law agitations. Leading agitators have maintained that "the right to rest demands a law of rest." But this plea is founded on the idea that the majority of professed Christians observe Sunday as a weekly rest day, and that many other people do so because of the custom. So the proposition that "the right to rest demands a law of rest," when interpreted by the Sunday laws, means that the right of Sunday observers to rest on that day is abridged unless there be a law compelling every one to rest.

But the inconsistency of this manner of protecting rights is shown in the fact that a portion of the people are deliberately

deprived of their rights of conscience because they have not sufficient influence to control the government. This is in direct opposition to republican principle, which demands "equal and exact justice to all men." It is inimical to the Christian religion, which is briefly comprehended in the command: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12.

Thus we see that the increasing demand, the ever-swelling clamor, the infectious mania for religious legislation, for government influence as an auxiliary of church influence, tends to develop principles that are neither republican nor Christian. The individual or the association or the bureau that seeks through specious "reforms" to so pervert the primary principles and purposes of the Republic is not a friend of civil or religious liberty. Where religious liberty is curtailed, or reduced to the rank of mere toleration on the part of those who enjoy

any special consideration of the government over their fellow-men, civil liberty never can be the boon of the great mass of the people.

Questionable indeed is any so-called reform that is sought in the name of religion through the agency of the civil government. And dangerous indeed is the policy that leads government officials to yield to the beguilement of the agents of such "reforms." They may present measures that appear innocent in the beginning, for the end of their efforts is not apparent to any superficial view. Only a study of the history of the past and of the prophecy of the future, in connection with the signs of our times, can give a true idea of the meaning of "national reform" through the medium of national religion. And we have enough before us in this line now to call for vigilance on the part of all. Beware of "national reform" through religious dictation; beware of religious reform through political channels.



The "Rapprochement" with Rome

By the Editor

WHILE from Austria and other parts come occasional reports of a "Los von Rom" movement, reports of a very different tenor might be sent out from this country to the world. While the movement here does not take the form of the open forsaking of one form of religion for the other, it is no less a transformation, and is far more significant and important. The present status of things in this country, and the same is true elsewhere, as regards Protestantism and Catholicism is well shown by the manner in which the leading Protestant

journals handled the Pope's jubilee celebration and the observations made in connection therewith. The *Christian Work*, one of the leading Presbyterian papers of the country, in its consideration of the recent papal celebration dwelt upon "the ameliorating influence of Pope Leo's reign." Here is an extract from its editorial:

Interesting as the occasion is to Catholics and Protestants, it is less the naked historical fact that concerns us than what that fact stands for, as exhibited in the changes witnessed in that time in this country, especially

in the relations existing between two of the three great branches of Christendom—the Catholic and Protestant. And we may say that while the fundamental differences between Catholic and Protestant are no less fundamental than ever, there is yet to be seen a "rapprochement" between the two great branches which was not observable under Pope Leo's predecessors; that is to say, on the part of the Protestants themselves. Not only has much of the old-time bitterness entertained by them toward Catholics vanished, but Catholics and Protestants are often now seen coöperating in the work of promoting various benevolent enterprises, such as temperance work, relief of the poor, and other departments of benevolent activity, while such men as Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland and others have infused the American spirit in their church, as they are often seen on the same platform with Protestant ministers. And here it is pertinent to note that the Presbyterian Church, as it will formally declare a little later, no longer assumes to identify the Roman Catholic Church with the "Scarlet Woman" of the Apocalypse.

Further on the same journal pointed out that social intercourse and intermarriage between Protestants and Catholics is far more common than formerly. It attributed this partly to the influence of the public schools, and also to the sending by Catholic parents of their children to the universities, which the *Christian Work* speaks of as the "large Protestant educational institutions."

Still more significant of the trend of affairs in this respect was an editorial in *The Independent* of April 3. The text of *The Independent's* editorial was the Pope's encyclical, and it was thoroughly imbued with that "charity" with which Protestantism has come to regard the Papacy in recent years. While acknowledging that it was not five years ago that the Pope solemnly pronounced the orders of the Anglican Church invalid, thus unchurching and consigning to schism its adherents, and "that there is not the slightest hope that this decision will be reversed, or that any action or utterance

will offer to rehabilitate Anglican Protestants, Greeks or Armenians on the ecclesiastical side," *The Independent* rejoices over the Pope's expression of a desire for "the union of Christian bodies" against the attacks of anarchism and atheism, and sees in that an outstretched hand toward "those Christian bodies which are not in communion with the Roman Church," toward "those who are often called courteously, 'our separated brethren.'" "For brethren," observes *The Independent* with evident complacency, "in a sense, the Roman Church holds the rest of us Christians to be. We have been baptized, and are therefore Christians. Yet it is a remarkable thing that there should be this recognition of Protestant and Greek Christians. . . .

It is no bad service that the general enemy, the atheists, have done, if they force the mutual kindly recognition of Christian bodies so widely separated."

The "right attitude toward such an outstretched hand" is what *The Independent* regards as of importance, and it was probably with the desire to get thoroughly into this attitude that the following was written, which is the most significant portion of the editorial:

While we have been growing kindlier toward Catholics, and have been making more of the festivals of the Catholic Church, it seems as if Catholics were becoming more like us in preaching and practise. Of course, then, the Presbyterian Church is compelled to repeal the article of its Confession of Faith which declares that the Pope of Rome is Anti-Christ.

And Protestants have no right to deny that the Church of Rome is a true Church. It worships the same one God as the rest of us, and it holds to the same Saviour. It declares that its worship of the Virgin and the Saints is of a different kind from its worship of the Triune God. We see the danger of such worship, but we see that they make less of saints than they used to, and that they make more of the distinction. To our view it is very foolish to ask a saint to intercede with God, when we can go directly to Him, and there is danger

of idolatry; but it is not unchristian any more than it is for a Protestant inquirer to ask his living friends to pray for him. The doctrine of Purgatory seems to us unscriptural, but it is certainly not unchristian. Even we are beginning to think that we have taught more about the future world than we know. The practise of confession seems to us to be required when it should be only permitted; but it cannot be unchristian, and it has its good side. The supremacy of the Pope seems to us a dangerous doctrine, but one can certainly be a good Christian and be a Pope or a believer in Popes. Our chief complaint of the Catholic Church is that it makes so much of rites and machinery that it is liable to forget that God is a spirit, and that spiritual worship is what He wants.

So we are grateful to the Pope if he has asked our aid in the warfare against all vice and wrong. His purpose to bring peace to the world, to reduce armaments and war, is ours also. We would have Catholics and Protestants brought into closer relations. It is a delight to us to see their crowded churches, which are doing God's work, if not quite in our way.

Certainly it needs nothing more than this to confirm what was said by an earnest writer on this subject years ago. "The opinion is gaining ground that, after all, we do not differ so widely upon vital points as has been supposed, and that a little concession on our part will bring us into a better understanding with Rome. . . . Instead of standing in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, the Protestant churches are, as it were, apologizing to Rome for their uncharitable opinion of her, begging pardon for their bigotry. . . . The false science which undermines faith in the Bible will prove as successful in preparing the way for the acceptance of the Papacy . . . as did the withholding of knowledge in opening the way for its aggrandizement in the Dark Ages." If "Protestants have no right to deny that the Church of Rome is a true church;" if it be true that it is not un-Christian "to ask a saint to intercede with God;" if the

doctrine of Purgatory "is certainly not un-Christian;" if the practise of confession "cannot be un-Christian," and should be permitted; and if "one can certainly be a good Christian and be a Pope or a believer in Popes,"—then it is difficult to see why there should ever have been any such thing as Protestantism.

The Independent notes that "we . . . have been making more of the festivals of the Catholic Church," and this suggests a very significant phase of the drift Romeward. *The Christian Work* notes a "marked increase of the observance of Holy Week by non-episcopal Christians," and *The Presbyterian* having remarked that "the Presbyterian Church has never been a Lent-observing church," and that "there is nothing of the kind in our calendar, nor liable to be soon," the *Christian Work* replies:

The Presbyterian Church once was not a Christmas-observing church or an Easter-observing church. Now there are lots of Christmases and Easters in the church which you cannot get out. And Lent has got its head under the Presbyterian tent as well.

As to how this phase of the matter appears to "others" may be gathered from this somewhat blunt but perspicacious note by an editorial writer on the *Chicago Israelite*:

Altho Easter is nowadays very much in evidence among the various Protestant denominations, it is not so long since all of them, except the Episcopalians, looked upon it as a popish feast day, which, in common with Christmas, was no better than a rite in honor of that improper female of Babylon, whom they regarded with horror and loathing. But a change has come over the spirit of their dream, and now the dissenting churches are almost, if not quite, as strict in their observance of the season as are either Catholics or Episcopalians. If the Pilgrim Fathers are cognizant of how far their descendants have departed from the principles for which Puritanism fought, bled and died, those sturdy old haters of papistical mummery must be literally

groaning in spirit. Considering how recent the sanctity is that surrounds Easter in the esteem of Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians and other of the dissenting sects, it is rather amusing to note the fervor of the piety which makes of it as holy an occasion as if it were based upon canonical authority. The next thing will be the observance of saints' days by our Hard-shell Baptist brethren, and the Primitive Methodists will be having pictures of the Madonna and Child in their meeting-houses.

It is none of the Jews' funeral, but it is sad to witness the decadence of the stern simplicity that characterized the religion of the original Puritans. . . . I am rather inclined to think that if Cromwell and his associates could come back, they would feel more at home with the Jews than among the Romanized Protestant dissenters.

Now in all this we do not mean to oppose the spirit of true charity, nor the disposition to forget grudges and to shake off prejudices due to religious differences. We believe that a Catholic should be treated as charitably and as considerately as anybody else, and that prejudices and grudges against him are no more excusable than against anyone else. And we believe that the person is not a true Protestant who bears grudges and holds prejudices against another because of his religion, never mind how different it may be from his own. But this is not to endorse the tendency to which we have called attention. This is not to say that Protestants should desert their religion and go over to Romanism, and neither is it to say that they should now recant all that they have said in the past about Romanism and should begin to shout that they "have no right to deny that the Church of Rome is a true Church." Every man has a right to judge the Church of Rome by her record and her principles, and in the light of what he believes to be the truth. And we do not see how he who accepts the Bible as true, and is acquainted with the record and principles of the Roman Church, can

come to any other conclusion than that she is the "Scarlet Woman" of the Apocalypse," notwithstanding that those who formerly were so sure of this are now taking it all back. The Church of Rome has a very long record, and her character is not to be judged by the aspect which she has presented in the last ten, twenty or thirty years. If the papal system, which destroyed upwards of fifty millions of persons because of their religious convictions during the Dark Ages, is not the anti-Christ of prophecy then no such thing has yet appeared in the world. But whether the Papacy be the anti-Christ of the Scriptures or not, it is certain that it is an anti-Christ, for no system can set up a man as infallible and invest him with the blasphemous prerogatives which are claimed for the Pope in the titles given him and in the alleged right to "pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction to the right of nations, to the law of God and man," without becoming distinctly and unmistakably anti-Christ.

The trouble with this "rapprochement" between Rome and Protestantism is that Protestantism is going all the way and Rome is simply remaining where she always has been. She encourages the "rapprochement," of course, but she does not give up an iota of what she has ever claimed nor repudiate a single thing that she has ever done. She simply meets the oncoming "Protestants" with the declaration that they have been entirely mistaken about her, and that she has always been the opposite of what they have been taught that she was and what history says she has been. She is not granting anything to Protestantism; she is simply waiting for Protestantism to repudiate itself and return to the "maternal bosom of the Church"—the *only* church in her settled and unchanging estimation. We may be mistaken, may be narrow, big-

oted, and controlled entirely by prejudice, but according to our humble lights all this means that Protestants are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism. They are making compromises and concessions that are even an astonishment to papists themselves.

A change has indeed come, and there is now little difference between Protestantism and Catholicism, but the change has been wrought in the former and not in the latter. And this is something to which all who care for liberty and pure religion should be aroused.



America's Foolish and Wicked Course

[The words of manly feeling and indignation below are a portion of an article on "The Philippines Again," by Dr. Jacob G. Schurman, President of Cornell University, and President of the First Philippine Commission, published in *The Independent* of May 3.]

LET us now dismiss the Moham-medans and their heathen neighbors in the southern islands and turn to the island of Samar, in the Visayan group, and to the province of Batangas in the island of Luzon. These people, remember, are not savages, or "injuns," or barbarians. They are civilized Christians, and in the province of Batangas, which lies just south of Manila, the people, who are quite prosperous, are above the average of Filipinos in education and refinement. Samar and Batangas were the last active centers of the insurrection, which is now completely quelled according to our official reports. It is here, if we may believe official dispatches as well as telegraphic news, that some of our military authorities have practised Weyler's system of reconcentration, resorted to Oriental methods of torture, turned happy homes into a howling wilderness, and not only killed non-combatants, but murdered boys over ten years of age.

I state the alleged facts without either exaggeration or palliation! Would to Heaven they were only a tissue of devilish inventions! But too much has already been admitted to leave any hope of appreciable abatement of the horror and the anguish which have wrung the hearts

of the American people. War is hell indeed, and in a sense we had scarcely dreamt of. I remember (alas, the pity of it!) at the beginning of hostilities in the Philippines, seeing cities where thousands of people dwell together in peace and prosperity utterly destroyed; but there was no murder, there was no torture; there may even have been a good military excuse, or the insurgents themselves may have lighted the first incendiary torch; and in all cases the lives of non-combatants were sacred, and insurgent soldiers taken prisoners were well cared for in our prisons or tenderly nursed in our hospitals. But, as the greatest observer of human nature has recorded, the hand is subdued to what it works in; and for our three years of hostility in the Philippines the inevitable Nemesis now confronts us. This is a world where effect inexorably follows cause. You cannot have war without inhumanity, and the practise of inhumanity deadens feeling and brutalizes character. When it is a race war, particularly a war of Anglo-Saxons against a colored race, the white man's moral deterioration is facilitated by contempt, by arrogance and by injustice. Most truly was it said in 1898 that the question was

not what shall we do with the Philippines, but what will the Philippines do with us.

This question we are now seeing answered. On the other side of the globe, irritated by a bad climate, confronted by great difficulties and exposed to great temptations without the home restraints that keep men steady, galled and exasperated by the machinations of an elusive foe, whose color and stature make it impossible for the Anglo-Saxon to treat him with respect, some Americans at least have been guilty of conduct which evokes the horror and detestation of mankind. But if our cheeks burn with patriotic shame and our hearts quiver with moral indignation, let the bolt strike not only the unhappy individuals but the system and policy of which they have been the victims.

What, I ask, do you want in the Philippines? More particularly, why in any part of Luzon and the Visayan Islands are you making a howling wilderness and killing children over ten years of age? It will be said that these are the unhappy incidents of war, which is always a stern affair, very different from the holiday-making into which civilians would turn it. Be it so. Why, then, are we making war? Here are 6,500,000 fellow Christians of ours—the only Christian nation in Asia—as highly civilized as most of the people of Central and South America. *What do we want of them? We have never told them.* The Treaty of Paris requires Congress to determine the civil rights and political status of the inhabitants of the Philippines. Congress has been dumb. President Roosevelt, with his noble instincts and straight-seeing statesmanship, declared that we were to prepare them for liberty after the fashion of the really free nations. The period of tutelage should be short, because no nation can

confer freedom upon another, and the most we can do for the Filipinos is to establish favorable conditions and then endow them with independence. This implies doing in the Philippines what we have already done for Cuba, which this month is to start as an independent republic. But, in face of all this, General Wharton says that the Filipinos must be despotically governed, like India and Java, and that any one who advocates their independence should be sent to prison. Congress is silent, the military authorities whistle down the wind the humane and enlightened policy of the President, and the military authorities are the supreme power and final arbiter in the Philippines. Are the American people, then, the freest people on this earth, the very flower and chivalry of liberty, shooting down Filipinos because Filipinos will not do what Americans want, while all the time Filipinos are endeavoring to ascertain, but cannot, what it is Americans do want? Are not your Oriental wards entitled to know how you intend to dispose of them before bidding you welcome to their homes? If we have no policy, let us say so and stop fighting. If we have a policy, let us say so and it may end all fighting. But to keep an army of 40,000 or 50,000 American citizens in Asia to fight for no policy is at once foolish and wicked.

It is said officially that the fighting is over. But the commanding officers agree with the best newspaper reporters that the Christian Filipinos are everywhere against us. And the War Department has stated in confirmation of this situation that the retention of a large army in the Philippines is indispensable. But if this be so, though the insurrection may be ended, the Archipelago is as full of our enemies as ever it was. You have governed them against their will: behold the result. Shall we make of the

Philippines an American Ireland—an Ireland consumed with hatred for us, governed by coercion and bent on rebellion?

Thank God, there is a more excellent way. Drop coercion and try conciliation. Give the Filipinos what *they* want, not what you think is good for them. Regard them not as Sioux or Apache Indians, but as Christianized and civilized brown men, ranking with the Japanese. General Otis said to the Senate Committee that they could, if we withdrew, at least maintain a military government; and with the sedition law before you can you say we are doing much better? Governor Taft is reported as saying at New Haven that, if we conferred independence upon them, power would fall into

the hands of the educated classes; but is an intelligent oligarchy of Filipinos worse than an intelligent oligarchy of Americans?

I was in Ireland last month when the cities of Dublin and Cork conferred their freedom upon the leader of the Nationalist party. His speech on those occasions was printed in full in the newspapers and one sentence of it still rings in my ears. "There are," he said, "only two methods of government—that of freedom and that of force; and Ireland has shown for centuries that the latter is permanently impossible." The remedy for our Philippine ills is to substitute a government by the consent of the Filipinos for a government by the coercion of the Filipinos.



Anglo-Saxon Atrocities

By the Editor

EARLY in 1899, from things then to be observed, Professor Sumner of Yale University felt justified in saying that the most significant result of the then late war was not the American victory over Spain, but the Spaniardizing of Americans. However far-fetched that idea may have seemed at that time, it cannot seem so in the light of recent developments. It is perfectly evident now, partly on testimony that was shamelessly explained away by military officials some time ago, that brutal and inhuman practises on the part of American soldiers have obtained in the Philippines from almost the very beginning of the war.

At the very time when the Secretary of War has grown indignant at the intimation from a high army official that

the war in the Philippines was being conducted with "marked severity," and has declared that the American army has carried on the war "with scrupulous regard for the rules of civilized warfare, with careful and genuine consideration for the prisoners and non-combatants, with self-restraint and with humanity never surpassed, if ever equalled, in any conflict," evidence that cannot be set aside has shown that torture has long been a common practise in the army for obtaining information from natives, that flags of truce have been utterly disregarded, towns burned, and helpless non-combatants slaughtered in cold blood. Natives have not only been shot without trial by order of army officers, but have been tied to trees and shot in different parts of the body day after day until

death ended their agonies. And by order of a brigadier-general of the regular army what is appropriately termed the "howling-wilderness policy" was proclaimed for a territory as large as the State of New York and populated by upwards of two hundred thousand people. The order of this general to his subordinate, with reference to this territory and to these people, was "to kill and burn;" that the more he killed and burned the better pleased he (the general) would be; that it was "no time to take prisoners," but to "make Samar a howling wilderness." Asked as to the age limit for killing, he replied, "Everything over ten." Because of this order, the giving of which has not only been admitted, but avowed and defended in court, the subordinate was acquitted at a court-martial trial for having executed eleven natives without trial, some of them in the inhuman fashion we have mentioned, by being tied to trees and shot day after day.

There is no reason to believe that the inhuman policy adopted by this general was unknown either to the military authorities in the Philippines or in this country. The general himself certainly made no effort to conceal it. Writing in the *Manila Critic*, February 1, he said that when he came to the island he found that the inhabitants "had been treated by both officers and men with such kindness as would be proper to civilized moral people," and that "little or nothing had been done, owing to a feeling of security and confidence which had been engendered by officers who love the 'little brown brother,' and imagined the natives were angels and only needed wings to make them perfect." How this intolerable(?) condition of affairs was quickly altered is plainly indicated by these statements:

It did not take long before it was quite patent to any observer that only the "fire-and-

sword" policy could succeed in bringing these people to understand that they must come under the absolute and complete control of the United States. . . . They obey the wishes, orders, and requirements of Lukban through fear, a feeling which we must instil into them by making "war hell." . . . The energetic hard work of those who have proper ideas of their duty to God and our country is rapidly putting the fear of the Lord into the blood-pumps of the misguided creatures, who, through fear and fanaticism, are opposing the best Government in the world.

Much information as to how those "who have proper ideas of their duty to God and our country" went about it to put "the fear of the Lord into" those hapless people, has now come to light, and there will probably be more later on. It is sufficient here to quote these sentences from a statement by a private soldier who was in this campaign:

Just as soon as we reached our base in Samar all the people were ordered into the town, and everybody found in the hills, man, woman or child, was to be killed. . . . We were ordered to get what information we could about the insurrectos, and to use the "water cure" to get it. All of us disliked to do it, but we had to under pain of severe penalty.

And it has developed also that at the very time the Secretary of War was declaring the unexampled humanity of the American army in the Philippines he had in his possession a report from a civil governor of one of the provinces showing that in his province the attitude and conduct of the American soldiers towards the natives was that of insolence, brutality, and despotism generally, which he declared was fast destroying the friendly feeling which the natives originally had, was engendering in them deep hatred toward all Americans, and "sowing the seeds for a perpetual revolution;" and also another report from the civil authorities of another province, in which the reconcentration policy had been pursued, to the effect that the slaughter

and devastation, aided by the ensuing famine and pestilence, had reduced the population of the province from 300,000 to 200,000 since the beginning of the military occupation, and that the only outlook for the future was "famine with all its horrible consequences." And the declaration that hundreds of court-martial trials of soldiers and officers for offenses against the natives have taken place, which has been made in the attempt to offset the effect of the information that has become public, only goes to establish the fact that brutality has been common. It is certain that no very large per cent. of the instances of cruelty and torture have been taken up by courts-martial, and as for the water torture there has evidently been no pretension of calling its perpetrators to account, for, instead of being condemned, it seems to have become a recognized feature of the military operations. And thus it has become the "water cure," instead of the water torture, which it really is and as it was known to the Spaniards.

The unearthing of these reports, the testimony of returned soldiers as to the practise of the "water cure" and other methods of torture, and the news of other atrocities from the archipelago, naturally aroused considerable indignation and fastened public attention upon the matter. At this point the President, through the Secretary of War, called for a rigid investigation of "these violations of law and humanity," and ordered that those responsible for "acts of cruelty and barbarity" be placed upon trial by court martial at once. It was necessary to urge that no time be lost, from the fact that one of the most conspicuous instances of official brutality occurred so long ago that the statute of limitations would soon save the offenders from any trial at all. And yet it is pretended that all cases of brutality are promptly dealt

with by the military authorities! The trial of the general who gave the "howling-wilderness" order has taken place, but the outcome is unknown. At the trial the giving of the order was boldly acknowledged and defended, and the outcry against it was attributed to "hysterical public opinion" and mere "sentiment" for which "there is no place in war."

One instance of brutality on which the light has at last been turned, was that of the torture of the Presidente of Igbarras, a man of some fifty years of age, on November 27 and 28, 1900. Under the supervision of officers of the regular army this man was tortured until he gave the information demanded. The form of torture was the "water cure." It had to be administered twice to extort the information wanted, and the agony which this torture ordinarily brings was accentuated by the liberal use of salt. On the strength of the information thus obtained the town was burned to the ground, and its 10,000 inhabitants turned adrift with nothing but clothing on their backs. A neighboring town of 12,000 inhabitants was treated in like manner.

And this giving of the "water cure" and the burning of towns was evidently the common practise in the campaigns. There was a regular "water-cure" detachment as a feature of the organization of the Eighteenth United States Infantry. Regarding this "water cure" and other forms of torture which are virtually a reproduction of the hideous features of the Spanish Inquisition itself, a gentleman whom the *Evening Post*, of this city, vouches for as a person of high character and unimpeachable veracity, wrote thus from Manila under date of March 1:

Men are tied up by their thumbs; men are pulled up to limbs of trees and fires kindled underneath them, the heat and smoke compelling submission; men are pounded particu-

larly about the chest, for "you'd be surprised," said a soldier, "how few knocks it takes to cause bleeding at the mouth." Bunches of bamboos tied at one end have the individual rods pushed between the fingers of the hand. When the other end of the bundle is squeezed together the pain is excruciating.

But the water-cure! If the tortures I've mentioned are hellish, the water-cure is plain hell. The native is thrown upon the ground, and while his legs and arms are pinioned, his head is raised partially so as to make pouring in the water an easier matter. An attempt to keep the mouth closed is of no avail, a bamboo stick or a pinching of the nose will produce the desired effect. And now the water is poured in, and swallow the poor wretch must or strangle. A gallon of water is much, but it is followed by a second and a third. By this time the victim is certain his body is about to burst. But he is mistaken, for a fourth, and even a fifth gallon are poured in. By this time the body becomes an object frightful to contemplate, and the pain, agony. While in this condition speech is impossible, and so the water must be squeezed out of him. This is sometimes allowed to occur naturally, but is sometimes hastened by pressure, and "sometimes we jump on them to get it out quick," said a young soldier to me with a smile—a young soldier, a mere boy hardly ten years out of his mother's lap. I did not wonder when an officer, in answer to my question how often he had seen it, said: "Not often; my feelings too much revolted." Does it seem possible that cruelty could further go? And what must we think of the fortitude of the native when we learn that many times the "cure" is twice given ere the native yields? I heard of one who took it three times, and died.

How often is it given? is a natural question. No one knows. A sergeant told me he had seen it taken by between two and three hundred, by as many as twenty sometimes in a day. Another had seen eighty. An officer saw four, but knew of its happening two hundred times.

Another method of torture adopted for obtaining information consisted in fastening bricks or some other heavy, square objects on each side of the victim's head, so that when stretched out upon his back it was impossible for him to turn it, and then allowing water to fall

drop by drop upon his forehead. At first this would seem to be nothing, but it is said that it never fails to accomplish what is desired, for after a time every drop feels like a fearful blow upon the forehead.

It is said that the Americans learned these forms of torture from the Macabebes, in one sense the Hessians of the Philippines, and they were taught them by the Spaniards. And thus the Spaniardizing of Americans proceeds. Back to the Inquisition already! The writer of the letter from which we have just quoted says that the saddest phase of the whole thing is "the effect upon the Americans—the unconcerned way in which the soldiers, and civilians, too, speak of the 'water-cure,' the exulting way in most cases." It is said that the first American officer to put in practise this form of torture was the general who has during the last few months been going about in this country advocating the hanging of men who believe in the Declaration of Independence. This is very natural, and the next thing will be the open advocacy and introduction of these forms of torture in this country, unless some way is found to put a stop to these proceedings and to curb the men who are so ready to adopt such practises.

A great deal more might be given from recent disclosures concerning these Philippine atrocities, but we will present only one more instance. Here is the description given by Richard O'Brien, formerly a corporal in Company M, Twenty-sixth United States Volunteers, of the butchery of the inhabitants of the town of Barrio la Nog on December 27, 1900. It equals the accounts of the fiendish and atrocious wholesale murder of natives which have come from the French and German colonies in Africa, and it was not given as an exceptional instance,

As we approached the town the word passed

along the line that there would be no prisoners taken. It meant that we were to shoot every living thing in sight, man, woman or child. The first shot was fired by the then first sergeant of our company. His target was a mere boy, who was coming down the mountain path into the town astride of a caribou. The boy was not struck by the bullet, but that was not the sergeant's fault. The little Filipino boy slid from the back of his caribou and fled in terror up the mountain side. Half a dozen shots were fired after him. The shooting now had attracted the villagers, who came out of their homes in alarm, wondering what it all meant. They offered no offense, did not display a weapon, made no hostile movement whatsoever, but they were ruthlessly shot down in cold blood, men, women and children. The poor natives huddled together or fled in terror. Many were pursued and killed on the spot.

Two old men, bearing between them a white flag and clasping hands like two brothers, approached the lines. Their hair was white. They fairly tottered, they were so feeble under the weight of years. To my horror and that of the other men in the command, the order was given to fire, and the two old men were shot down in their tracks. We entered the village. A man who had been on a sick-bed appeared at the doorway of his home. He received a bullet in the abdomen and fell dead in the doorway. Dum-dum bullets were used in that massacre, but we were not told the name of the bullets. We didn't have to be told. We knew what they were.

This seems too horrible to believe, but such things can no longer be brushed aside as they have been hitherto. The "stories" from the Philippines can no longer be treated as so many falsehoods, and those journals that have always insisted that it was not possible that any outrage could be committed by Americans, have been obliged to shift from that position and endeavor as best they can to patch up some excuse for what they can no longer deny, and, failing in that, to endeavor to separate these atrocities from the general Philippine policy itself. Even *The Outlook* owns that "inevitable regrettable incidents" have occurred, but consoles itself with the ob-

servation that such incidents "accompany the imposition of any government, however rightful, by force."

And at this point we cannot forego calling attention to the fact that these recent "revelations" are not so much revelations after all, and should not have been so surprising to many people as they seem to have been. And certainly there is no reason why *The Outlook* should have been in ignorance of the fact that cruelty, torture, and brutality was attending the American military operations in the Philippines. More than a year ago *The Outlook* published a series of papers on "The Philippines" by Mr. George Kennan, which it declared were prepared at Washington with the greatest care, being "the outcome of a thorough study of official documents, interviews with officers, civil officials, and soldiers, and the reading of many private letters on the subject." Mr. Kennan went to Washington at the request of *The Outlook* to obtain for it and its readers "accurate information" regarding Philippine affairs, and he was instructed to ascertain and make known "the absolute truth, whoever it hits, whatever it affects." And in his investigations at the War Department he had the cooperation of "the highest authority in Government circles." What Mr. Kennan learned led him to say these things in his concluding paper, which was published in *The Outlook* of March 9, 1901:

It is painful and humiliating to have to confess that in some of our dealings with the Filipinos we seem to be following more or less closely the example of Spain. We have established a penal colony; we burn native villages near which there has been an ambush or an attack by insurgent guerillas; we kill the wounded; we resort to torture as a means of obtaining information; and in private letters from two officers of the regular army in the Philippines I find the prediction that in certain provinces we shall probably have to resort

to the method of reconcentration practised by General Weyler in Cuba.

Was there ever a stranger illustration of the irony of fate than that presented by such a situation as ours? We generously undertake to free eight million Filipinos from the tyranny and cruelty of Spain; and then, in the effort to convince them of the benevolence of our intentions and make them accept the blessings of security and peace, we find ourselves following the example of General Weyler and resorting—if not forced to resort—to the old Spanish methods—murder, torture, and reconcentration.

We can give only these paragraphs from Mr. Kennan's article. He dealt with the matter at greater length, and among other things presented an extract from a letter by an officer of the regular army then serving in Luzon, in which the water torture was described and its use in the American army acknowledged. "For the practise of torture in the Philippines there is no excuse whatever," said Mr. Kennan in that connection.

But notwithstanding the fact that this information was obtained almost first-hand with the cooperation of the "highest authority in Government circles," and was published as "the absolute truth" in such a journal as *The Outlook*, it was evidently ignored and soon forgotten. And it is not at all unlikely that these later "revelations" will after a time have the same fate; for after all there is not the deep feeling and great moral indignation throughout the country that there was a few years ago with regard to even lesser atrocities by the Spaniards in Cuba. The shooting of Cuban prisoners in Morro Castle according to regular military form then sent a more general shudder throughout America than the news of these atrocities in the Philippines has done.

The attempt is made to explain away these deeds and to relieve the army, and especially the policy which brought the army to the archipelago, of all blame

and responsibility in the matter. As long as possible it is denied that anything brutal or inhuman has occurred. Then it is declared that whatever was done was justified because the Filipinos are treacherous, cruel, and resort to torture. This failing, it is asserted that the brutality with which military operations are attended and conducted does not affect in the slightest degree the cause on behalf of which they are being carried on—not even if the acts of cruelty were multiplied ten-fold what they are now, says *The Outlook*. In his time Abraham Lincoln declared that he hated slavery "because it deprives our republican example of its just influence in the world," and "especially because it forces so many really good men among ourselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticising the Declaration of Independence." If he lived to-day he would say that he hated something else for all this *and more*. He would say that he hated something else because it forces really good men not only into an open war with the fundamental principles of civil liberty, but into an open war with the fundamental instincts of humanity and principles of civilization itself, placing them in the position of defenders and apologizers for deeds which outrage the deepest feelings and most sacred and elemental rights of human nature.

"Forcible annexation is criminal aggression," once declared the late President McKinley. The war upon the Filipinos is a war of more than forcible annexation, and wherever lies the responsibility for this war, or in other words for this criminal aggression, there lies in a large degree the responsibility for these criminal atrocities that have been perpetrated on Filipinos by American soldiers, at the command, in some notorious instances, of American officers. Yes, even

more than this. Wherever lies the responsibility for this criminal aggression there lies also in a large degree the moral responsibility for even the outrages which have been committed by the Filipinos themselves in their hopelessness and desperation. There are no people on earth, never mind how highly civilized they may be, who would not be driven to desperate deeds if they thought their fellow-citizens were betraying them and their nation to the invaders of their country. What was it that made the Tenth of August and the Massacres of September in Paris in 1792? What would occur in the United States if, while the country was being invaded by the armies of an alien race, which demanded unconditional submission, the people believed and saw that among them were those who were yielding to the conquerors and giving them aid and information in their warfare upon the country? There would be atrocities, of course, for there would be people frenzied with fury, and deeds almost as abominable as those done by the Philippine soldiery, or the lynching mobs of the United States in recent years, would ensue.

What, then, is to be expected of the Filipinos, who find themselves in exactly this condition? It is the most natural thing in the world that they have butchered and tortured those of their countrymen whom they deemed to be traitors to the common cause. Americans may regard it as a very terrible thing that a peaceable Filipino who has yielded to American authority is butchered by his countrymen, but they must remember that the Filipinos see no particular virtue in yielding to a foreign enemy. They no doubt regard it as many people in this country would regard it if the circumstances were reversed, as simply treason to the land of their birth. The

brutality of the Filipinos is explainable upon grounds that are not altogether incompatible with the ordinary passions and infirmities of human nature, but the brutality of the soldiery of an invading and a "superior" race is explainable upon no grounds but those which show it to be unmitigated devilishness.

And why is all this written? We can only say here that it is because we love the principles of human justice and human liberty, and want it to be known that they cannot be safely disregarded. We want it known, as declared by a leading journal, that "colonizing Americans are not one whit better than colonizing Italians, or Germans, or French or English." The idea that Americans can follow in the track of other peoples with entirely different results is an idea that has obtained wide and deep acceptance, and it lies at the root of all that has gone wrong in recent years. But it is a mistake, a very great mistake, and one that if persisted in will bring far graver results than have yet come. There is a higher law than the Declaration of Independence, and though it may be laughed at, they who trample upon its principles will be convicted and confounded by the very march of events themselves.

In conclusion we will add that not alone in the Philippines have Anglo-Saxons been guilty of brutal and inhuman conduct. From South Africa have come reports of atrocities also. But it must be said that first came the news of the execution of those found guilty. These executions brought out the fact that men, women and children had been killed in cold blood by officers and soldiers in the English army. In some instances women were used as shields, and in others deliberately murdered. Little children who were seeking food and refuge were shot to death by English soldiers as they approached. In view of

these black deeds by the representatives of nations which assume to be the leaders of humanity and the bearers of "the white man's burden," it is highly fitting that such outbursts as the following impassioned poem by Robert Underwood Johnston, written for the *New York Evening Post* "On Reading of Atrocities in War," should be published far and wide:

Mild is the air of April,
Gentle the sky above,
And the budding and the mating
Call for a song of love;
But the season on my singing
Has lost its olden spell
Because of a shame and sorrow
Men close their eyes to tell.

I see but the tears of women
In the rain of the springtime flood;

I cannot brook the flowers—
They only smell of blood.
Lost is the playground frolic—
Its joy and laughter melt
In the moan of children sobbing
From jungle and from veldt.

O ye in the halls of council;
You may conquer the distant foe,
But still before a higher court
Your needless wars must go.
Too much you ask of silence;
Too fierce the iron heel;
Because a statesman blundered
Must every heart be steel?

O Britain! O Columbia!
Too much of sodden strife,
Back to the banished gospel—
The sacredness of life!
Else shall our ties of language
And law and race and fame
Be naught to the bond that binds us
In one eternal shame.



A Futile and Mischievous Idea

[From the *Christian Work*; New York.]

AT the recent meeting of the State Teachers' Association of Illinois, among other things said was an utterance of President Thwing, of Western Reserve University, which has attracted some attention. Remarking that he, "a Protestant," "would rather have" his children "taught by a good Catholic nun than by a wise agnostic"—a view to which we heartily assent—he added:

We have gone farther in the elimination of religious teaching than is necessary. Of course, we must observe the statutes, but Illinois is a Christian commonwealth and the United States a Christian nation. As a Christian nation and a Christian commonwealth the United States and the State of Illinois should recognize that there is a Divine Being, and to that Divine Being we owe certain duties. We should go so far, therefore, as to teach

that there is a God, and a God we ought to love.

This statement seems to lack clearness, and its correctness will be questioned in some quarters. And let us say we are unable to accept the statement that Illinois or any State—much less the nation—is distinctively "Christian," as it certainly is not. The constitution of Illinois, like that of New York, and the Federal Constitution, does not specially recognize Christianity as having official relation to the State. And this brings us to say that a sharp cleavage exists between the terms "State," "Nation," and "People" which should have full recognition. That our States recognize a Divine Being is true; but that does not make the State or nation essentially Christian.

Further, that we distinctively are *not* a Christian nation has not only been affirmed by various courts (Ohio Supreme Court, Bloom vs. Richards—"neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is part of the law of this State"), but if we were a Christian nation the Federal Constitution would scarcely contain a clause prohibiting Congress from making "any law respecting an establishment of religion"—which is the first amendment to the Constitution.

It is true we should, as Thwing says, teach that there is a God and a God whom we should love. But that is very different from saying that we are a Christian nation composed of "Christian" States.

[The exception here taken to the utterance of Professor Thwing is sound, and it is refreshing to see so prominent a religious journal as the *Christian Work* take this position with reference to the seductive "Christian-nation" fiction now so solemnly accepted and proclaimed in religious and political circles. But the exception to Professor Thwing's utterance might well have gone farther, if he meant that the States and the nation should undertake to teach what he says should be taught, and of course that is what he meant. There are not a great many people who would see anything very objectionable in the inculcation even by State or nation of the simple statement "that there is a God, and a God we ought to love." Not only would the many Christian bodies in this country see nothing objectionable in this statement, but even Mohammedans, Hindoos, Buddhists, and all other believers in a Supreme Being could readily assent to it. One great trouble with such teaching, so far as its being taught by the State or nation is

concerned, is that just simply what is stated by Professor Thwing cannot be taught, and nobody wants *just simply that* taught. Suppose these words, "There is a God, and a God we ought to love," were hung upon the walls of schoolrooms, or even conspicuously printed in text-books, would Professor Thwing or any one else see any very great attainment in that? When instruction of the sort called for by Professor Thwing is begun there must be teaching as to *how* we know there is a God, and as to *how* and *why* we ought to love Him. This involves a great deal, and it is on this point that the world is divided into great religious systems, and on which those systems are divided into many sects. If all the people of any country or State were agreed in their thought about and toward God, and were of one opinion as to how and why He should be loved, the matter of governmental instruction on this point might present a very different aspect. But as such is not the case, and in the nature of things can never be the case, such propositions as that of Professor Thwing are perfectly useless. The founders of the American public school system evidently knew well the lesson which can be gathered on this point from the experiences of mankind. If this lesson has now lost its vividness and force, and in spite of the wise action of the pioneers, religious instruction is introduced into the public schools, the inevitable result will simply demonstrate the wisdom of those who excluded religion from the schools and the folly of those who reverse their policy. No good purpose can be served by the attempt to teach religion in State and national schools.—EDITOR SENTINEL.]

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. JUNE, 1902. No. 7.

Self-government is government by principle.

Without self-government liberty is impossible.

The power of God unto salvation is the only power by which human beings can really govern themselves.

Christianity can never consent to the subjection of the individual conscience to any human authority.

The Lord's day is not Caesar's day; and hence it is not for Caesar to regulate and enforce its observance.

The assumption of infallibility in religion and of divine right in government is contained in every statute regulating and enforcing a religious observance.

The rights of an individual or a church are the same at all times, upon all days; hence they do not need more protection on Sunday than upon other days.

A trend toward "stronger government" in the state usually attends and signifies a trend toward weaker government in the individuals composing the state.

The gospel is the power of God unto salvation. It is only through the power of the life of the perfectly self-governed, principle-governed Man, Christ Jesus, that the members of the race of which He became one, can attain to perfect self-government.

Without freedom of the individual conscience there can be no such thing as a public or collective conscience. They who in their devotion to the "collective conscience" disregard the rights of the individual conscience are undermining the foundations of the structure which they are attempting to erect.

The great optimists of the world are they whose lives and words have been such that they have left to all succeeding ages the inestimable legacy of inspiration to righteousness, truth, and justice. And with few exceptions these have been they

who were pronounced "pessimists" by the "optimists" of their generation, whose fleeting fame lived only while they lauded, and passed into oblivion even quicker than the perishing objects of their adulation.



We are obliged again, on account of the press of other matter, to leave over the third installment of "The Papal Theory of the Relation Between Church and State." But it will keep, and will be well worth reading and study when it does appear.



The question of Sunday enforcement is not dead, as may be seen by reading this number of THE SENTINEL. There are more cases of Sunday arrests and agitations for Sunday enforcement reported in this number than was probably ever the case before for the same length of time.



We were very glad to see recently in a Boston paper which has in the past given considerable endorsement to the National "Reform" cause, an address in full, as delivered at Berkeley Hall, Boston, on Easter Sunday, on "Religious Legislation," by Mrs. Stella Archer Maloney, a good representative of religious liberty. Mrs. Maloney has sent us a copy of the address, and the best portions of it will appear in our next issue.



Although they do not care to say so, the real meaning of the position of those who demand that people shall be compelled to cease work and play on the first day of the week, is that they shall be compelled to go to church on that day. Formerly there was positive enforcement of church attendance in connection with Sunday laws; now there is negative enforcement of the same thing. The law which compelled people to go to church

and the law which compels them to do nothing else are not essentially different, though it is now more politic to advocate the one than the other.



"Probably, taking into account the vast increase in the population of the world, there are as many people who believe in astrology to-day as there were in the Middle Ages," observes a journal which holds that the human race is constantly progressing toward perfection. And many who do not believe in astrology believe in other things that are no better, though having their origin some time this side of the Middle Ages.



The French Chamber of Deputies recently passed a bill requiring "a weekly day of obligatory rest for shop assistants, including workmen and workwomen, and applying to hotels, restaurants and confectioners." About the same time the Chamber held business sessions on Sundays, but we do not know whether this compulsory rest bill was passed on Sunday or not, or whether it was made to apply to legislators.



"By all means preserve the American Sunday as long as possible from legal sacrilege," says the Albert Lea (Minn.) *Tribune*, "and if somebody desecrates it by brazenly and viciously violating the laws of his country, let the odium be upon his head and not upon the masses of the people." The process of letting whatever odium attaches to "Sunday-breaking" rest upon the head of him who is guilty would be much simplified by removing all laws on the subject from the statute books and leaving the whole matter to the free action of individuals, where it properly belongs.

Professor Goldwin Smith observes in present conditions and tendencies "the growth of a vacuum in the region of religious belief which music, art, flowers and pageantry are required to fill." This means that the drift is Romeward, for no other religion can so well fill the vacuum here described as the Catholic. Music, art, flowers and pageantry, and all those brilliant externals which attract the unrenowned heart, charm the eye, captivate the ear, and silence the voice of reason and of conscience, are and have ever been the specialities of the Roman system.



The *Christian Work* says the saloon is open on Sunday in New York "all day long, contrary to law and Gospel." The saloon is also open all day long six other days in the week contrary to law and Gospel, and there is no precept of moral law nor any principle of the Gospel that does not apply with equally as much force against the week-day saloon as against the Sunday saloon. The strange and unfortunate condition exists, however, in which many of those who profess to speak with regard to this matter in the name of the moral law and the Gospel practically limit the application of both to one-seventh of the time, suspending their condemnation the remaining six-sevenths of the time.



When the discussion on the anti-anarchy bill was in progress in the Senate some weeks ago Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, declared: "I have an utter abhorrence of anarchy, and would give a thousand dollars to get a good shot at an anarchist." This represents an attitude which widely obtains in this matter, and indicates that the spirit of anarchy is by no means confined to the few desperate characters who openly declare themselves anarchists. The New Bedford (Mass.) *Evening Standard* says

that it is not sure that the above remark "was not itself anarchical, as it seems to be the endorsement of the extreme individualistic theory of dispensing a fancied justice."



"Sunday is a day of rest ordained by the church and made compulsory by law," observes the Austin (Minn.) *Times* in an editorial discountenancing Sunday ball playing. This statement sums up the matter of Sunday enforcement quite concisely. What the church has ordained the state enforces. The union of church and state has never gone farther than that. When men were burned at the stake it was simply the state carrying out what the church had ordained. The fact that an ordinance of the church is made compulsory by law is enough to arouse grave suspicions with regard to the matter, for the law has no business to make a thing compulsory because it is an ordinance of the church.



At a recent meeting of the Indianapolis Ministers' Association "the ministers by a rising vote pledged themselves to endeavor to keep members of their congregations from patronizing groceries on Sunday." At the same meeting a committee was appointed "to formulate some action to bring about a recognition of Thursday evening as an evening to be kept apart for religious purposes, and to influence public sentiment so that such religious meetings may have 'the right-of-way.'" We suppose it will not occur to the ministers to attempt to get public sentiment on this point crystallized into law, as is the case with Sunday which has been set "apart for religious purposes," but certainly legislation is just as proper in the one case as in the other.

The New York *Sun* sees a marked movement in the leading evangelical denominations toward Episcopalian forms of worship, shown in many instances by the flocking of the members of these denominations to Episcopal churches and services. The *Sun* pronounces this "one of the most suggestive of the religious phenomena of this time." It is suggestive, and, without intending any reflection whatever upon the Episcopal Church, we must conclude that it is not indicative of the growth of true religion. This tendency does not spring from deep moral conviction and devotion to religious principle, but rather from that craving for external religion in which the form of godliness is substituted for the power and substance. ❖

By a vote of twenty-five to two the Presbyterian ministers of Rochester, N. Y., at a recent Monday morning meeting, "placed themselves on record as being opposed to Sunday opening of saloons." It is to be hoped, although it would not be inferred from the above action, that they are also opposed to the Monday, the Wednesday or the Saturday opening of saloons. When ministers begin to place themselves on record concerning the saloon in a manner that does not suggest so strongly that they are opposed to it *only* on Sunday and, therefore, practically in favor of it the rest of the time, their action will bear more of the impress of genuine opposition to the liquor traffic and less of the impress of a zeal for enforced religion. ❖

The general who it is supposed will succeed General Miles as the head of the United States army, in an address in this city a few weeks ago in which he undertook to defend the water torture and other inhuman practises by the soldiers in the Philippines, declared that he could not "understand, being a military man,

why the American people will not stand for military government in the Philippines." The general who a few months ago in the Philippines declared that the Declaration of Independence was "a — incendiary document," doubtless has difficulty in understanding the same thing. And probably both of them are at just as much of a loss to comprehend "why the American people will not stand for military government" in the United States. ❖

The Brooklyn *Eagle* recently made a canvass of 5,000 Brooklyn voters on the question of Sunday saloons. One thousand declined to express any decided opinion. Of those who voted 63 per cent. favored partial opening on Sunday, 24 per cent. favored opening all day, and 13 per cent. were in favor of absolute closing. This is, no doubt, fairly representative of the opinion of metropolitan voters, and would indicate that warfare against the Sunday saloon, or the saloon on any other day, which relies upon legislation for the accomplishment of reforms in this direction, rests upon a very shaky foundation. The liquor traffic, both on Sundays and other days, will flourish as widely as ever so long as those who are battling against it give more attention to the enactment of laws than they do to the training, molding, and reformation of individuals. ❖

THE SENTINEL regrets very much to note the death of Dr. Julius Wise, for many years editor of the *Chicago Israelite*, which occurred in Chicago on April 19. For almost two years the editorial rooms of THE SENTINEL were on the same floor and adjoined those of the *Israelite*, and on many occasions it was the pleasure of THE SENTINEL staff to receive visits from "Nickerdown," as he was known to the readers of the interesting "Note and Comment" department of

his own paper and the *American Israelite* of Cincinnati. He was an alert and able defender of his race against the misrepresentation of ignorance and prejudice, but, as we had ample opportunity to learn, his heart was broad, and embraced the cause of all those who were struggling against any sort of oppression and persecution. We sympathize with the Jewish press in the loss it has sustained.



Dr. John Bancroft Devins, at the Broome Street Tabernacle in this city on a recent Sunday evening, "used the incident of the stand taken by the great patriotic leader of the Jews, Nehemiah, toward Sabbath observance to illustrate the attitude that should now be assumed on the same question in this city." After naming over the different classes of persons who, in his opinion, desired open saloons on Sunday, he presented the opponents of "the open Sunday" thus: "(1) Almighty God, who has never repealed the Fourth Commandment; (2) the religious bodies, almost, if not quite, without exception; (3) pastors, missionaries, and church workers who labor among the poor." And yet there are those who say that religion plays no part in this matter. And, strange to say, those who say this are usually themselves conspicuously animated by religious motives and considerations.



In what we say from time to time regarding the Papacy, and the Pope as the head of the Papacy, we mean no reflection upon the Pope himself as an individual. There can be no doubt but that there is something venerable about the man himself. His career has been a long and eventful one, and he has no doubt been as good an occupant of "the throne of St. Peter" as any of his predecessors. Certainly he has to a remarkable degree

gained the respect and admiration, if not adoration, of the world, and has secured for the Papacy much of the prestige and favor that she formerly possessed. But one Pope—Pius IX., who was pontiff for thirty-two years—has held the office longer than Leo. He is reckoned as the two hundred and sixty-third successor of Peter, who, it is said, "reigned thirty-four years." This would no doubt be news to Peter if he could know of it. In his day there was not much "reigning" going on in the Christian church.



Mr. Thomas I. Kidd, Secretary of the Amalgamated Woodworkers' Union of America, thinks that if ministers who are preaching "against Sabbath desecration" would devote themselves to efforts for securing more leisure for the workingman during the week they would have far less reason to complain of his "desecration of the Sabbath." Speaking at the Hull House, in Chicago, recently he said that "in England and Australia, South Africa and Canada, where the wage-earners work eight hours a day and have Saturday afternoon to themselves, there is no necessity for the minister to talk of Sabbath desecration. But what can you expect where men toil ten hours every day in the week?" This is a very plain "pointer" for those religious people who combine a zeal for the "Sabbath" with that of "securing rest for the poor workingman." What the workingman wants is a shorter working day, not a day of compulsory idleness.



A correspondent writes to us from Buenos Ayres, Argentine Republic, that the Sunday enforcement movement is manifesting itself in that part of South America. Among employees of stores and barber shops is growing a sentiment for strict Sunday closing. Last September a procession of workingmen went to

the President and asked for the enactment of a Sunday law. The President told them he thought such a law would be a good thing, and that he would use his influence to have the matter brought before the national legislature as soon as possible. At a convention held in Buenos Ayres in February all the Protestant denominations united in a demand for Sunday legislation, and a letter was read at the convention from "Father" Edward, of the Catholic Church, stating that he and the bishops under him heartily approved of this movement. The significant observation was made in this communication that "God does not always wait until the judgment to chastise the profanation of Sunday."



"There can be no doubt," says an opponent of Sunday opening, "that the Sunday saloon adds largely to the 'respectability' of the whole [liquor] business." We do not see how this is made out. If Sunday opening is such a terrible thing it would seem that the saloon would lose respectability by Sunday traffic. So far as the Sunday law is concerned the "whole business" of the liquor dealer is just as respectable as any other business, for it is treated just the same as all others. The saloon should not have this standing; so, if Sunday opening is such a terrible thing, why not alter the law so that the saloon can be open on Sunday, and thus get into a position where it can be rated as the odious thing that it is? So far as the present Sunday law is concerned the saloon is kept respectable; why not allow it to become as offensive as it can? Perhaps then there will be such a revulsion of sentiment against it as will enable more to be accomplished in the direction of its abolition than will ever be the case if it is kept "respectable" by being made to "observe the Sabbath."

The matter of "Sabbath" observance by law and otherwise was one of the prominent subjects before the Presbyterian General Assembly in session in New York from May 15 to 26. On the afternoon of May 18 "a popular meeting in the interest of Sabbath observance" was held in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church under the auspices of "the Committee on Sabbath Observance." The meeting was addressed by the chairman of the committee and four speakers, including Dr. I. W. Hathaway, Secretary of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union, and Mrs. Wellington White, Secretary of the Woman's National Sabbath (Sunday) Alliance. It was announced at this meeting that the report of the "Sabbath Observance Committee" would be read on the following Friday morning, and that general discussion of the question would then be the order of the day. We will present a report of this discussion in the July SENTINEL, and also of the meeting mentioned, which occurred too late to be reported more fully in this number.



Those who are watching the matter cannot fail to note that things are rapidly coming to the point where persons engaged in any common business or trade are obliged to abide by the decision of the majority of those engaged in the same business or following the same trade in the matter of Sunday closing. This is evident from cases frequently mentioned in our "Sunday Enforcement" notes. And it also appears that in this the law is by no means the only method employed. Those interested in Sunday closing take the matter into their own hands, and already such coercive measures as the boycott of the trades unions and the competition-strangling methods of the trusts are coming into use against those who venture to disregard the edict of those who undertake to say that the particu-

lar business or trade in which they are engaged shall be completely suspended on the first day of the week. No doubt it is well to have uniformity in the conduct of each business and trade, but it is going too far when this is secured by coercion.



Self-government and liberty are exceedingly broad subjects. Read carefully the first article in this number and see the close connection between tea and coffee drinking and government by the people. And then ask yourself if what is involved in this apparently insignificant matter of the indulgence in these common beverages does not lie at the very root of the whole matter of self-government. Swiftiness to anger and uncontrollableness of spirit is perhaps the most common manifestation of the impairment of the faculty of self-government in the individual, and certainly at the last it is the most conspicuous and inevitable accompaniment of its overthrow. Therefore it is of the highest importance that indulgences which produce mental irritability should be avoided, and it is quite possible that he who has forsaken such an indulgence has done more in the direction of real self-government than if he had performed some great political act, for it is the truth that "he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."



With regard to one of the excuses now offered for the brutalities practised by the American military forces in the Philippines, the New York *Evening Post* well observes: "To fall back on the miserable sophistry that 'war is hell' is only another way of making out those who engage in that kind of war to be fiends." Those journals which once declared that America could never do in the Philippines what

other nations have done in similar undertakings now have the inglorious task of excusing and palliating what they were so sure could never be. Their contention now that these brutalities have no connection with the policy in behalf of which they have been committed is just as far from the truth as was their confident assertion in the first place that no such things would ever come to pass. They who insist upon waging war upon another people simply because they want to rule them do not make their cause any better by shouting that "war is hell." If that is what war is, so much greater is the guilt of those who, knowing exactly what it is, bring it upon others without any warrant or excuse but their own wilfulness.



Mr. Malcolm R. Birnie, an officer of the "good citizenship" department of the New York Christian Endeavor Union, was not pleased with the condition of affairs which obtained in the Jewish quarter on the East Side during the two Sundays of the Passover season. Mayor Low had directed that the Jews be not molested in their Sunday trading, and Mr. Birnie, who went down to see the push-carts, peddlers, boxes, baskets, etc., on one Sunday, pronounced the whole thing "a disgrace, and worse even than was ever known in the palmiest days of Tammany Hall." "It is painfully evident," he said further, "that the Christian people have no rights and very little protection in this section of the city. The American Christian Sabbath is ignored." As long as the disciples of "good citizenship" hold this attitude of mind their cause will deserve to make no progress whatever. The idolatrous veneration in which they hold the legal Sunday blinds them alike to fairness, justice and good government. They prefer the rule of their idol and Tammany to the rule of

equal rights and respectable government. If the Jews on the East Side insisted that every Christian in that district and elsewhere should be compelled by law to cease all business on the seventh day of the week their attitude would be an exact parallel to that of Mr. Birnie and those for whom he speaks.



"There are some questions that ought not to be submitted to the people, because there is a higher law than the people's will," says a friend of Sunday enforcement in opposing local option on that question. This is an interesting statement from such a source. If it be true, it shows that Sunday enforcement is utterly inconsistent with the fundamental principle of republicanism. If the question of Sunday enforcement cannot be submitted to the people, and if the law of its observance is too high to be determined by the people's will, then it is a matter utterly out of place in the legislation of republican governments. They who in the United States demand Sunday enforcement while declaring that it is a question that ought not to be submitted to the people are virtually demanding that the fundamental principle of the nation give way to the old Dark Ages' theory of the "divine right" of rulers and legislators. They might as well say that no question should be submitted to the people, but that government should be taken out of the people's hands entirely. And the logic of Sunday enforcement leads exactly to this thing. If Sunday observance is a matter that ought not to be submitted to the people, let us hear no more demands for its enforcement by the people's representatives. If it rests upon a higher law than the people's will, let it rest there, and let there be no more demands for its regulation and promulgation in the people's statute books.

A number of New York clergymen, with Dr. C. H. Parkhurst at their head, have issued an appeal to the ministers throughout the country "to protest against the conditions in the Philippines revealed by testimony before the Senate Committee." It will be surprising if there is any general response to this appeal. As nearly as we have been able to gather it the greater portion of the clergymen in this country are agreed with Rev. Charles W. Briggs, who wrote from the Philippines to the Boston *Transcript* not long ago that "the general influence of the army upon the people has not been so bad," not as bad as that of the Spanish army, which "indulged in all kinds of immorality and bad treatment of the natives." True, he had "heard of natives being shot down without quarter, prisoners being bayoneted without mercy," but then "war is hell, and human passions are terrible when aroused and turned loose," and "the power of Almighty God can use war and wicked armies to advance His purposes in the world." And, besides, "we are in a world of cold, hard facts, and our army has been meeting such cold, hard facts, and we may be proud of them for so doing," for "our army, our Government has been meeting these facts as a Christian nation could best meet them," and "ours is, after all, the most humane way to deal with the problem."



In the St. Charles (Iowa) *Hawkeye* of recent date Rev. L. Proudfoot asks, "How is it that so many Protestant churches observe Easter?" and states on the authority of the Encyclopedia Britannica and the church historian Socrates that the celebration of Easter as a Christian festival was unknown to Christ, His apostles, or the early fathers, and no trace of it is to be found in the New Testament. "We can all assuredly know

that there is no Easter in the Bible," says Mr. Proudfit. "Like the word Sunday, it has come in from the heathen world." But in the same article he says that "after the resurrection of Christ the first day of the week was to be kept holy in commemoration of the resurrection," and that "we know the inspired apostles kept the first day for religious purposes." Mr. Proudfit and a great many other people "know" this in the same way that so many "know" that Easter is a Christian festival. The observance of Sunday and the observance of Easter rest upon identically the same foundation. The one is as much unknown to the Bible and as much unwarranted by the example and teachings of Christ and His apostles as is the other. Not only did the name Sunday come in from the heathen world, but the observance itself came from the same source, and it came at about the same time and in the same manner as did the observance of Easter. Mr. Proudfit should extend his investigations further, and not stop half way in exposing the pagan observances which have become established in the Christian churches.



Owing to a number of things the Jews of the United States seem to be gradually losing their grip upon the Sabbath of their fathers and the Fourth Commandment, and this in turn has given rise to a party, which now has at its head some half-dozen of the leading rabbis of the country, which favors the formal substitution of the observance of the first day of the week for that of the seventh day. This was perhaps the most important question that was expected to come before the Conference of American Rabbis which was held at New Orleans in May. But we learn from the *American Israelite* that merely the matter of the institution of Sunday services, "supplemen-

tary to those of the Sabbath," was discussed, and that the matter of "Sabbath transfer was referred to a committee to report next year." Already the prospect of this transfer by the Jews is occasioning considerable exultation on the part of Sunday observers, some of whom look upon it as a striking evidence that the Jews are being gradually won over to Christianity. And it is not difficult to see that if the Jews do make this transfer it will be a mighty incentive to the Sunday-enforcement advocates, who will then with far less patience than now regard the opposition of that "less than one-tenth of one per cent." of Christians who still persist in clinging to the "Jewish" Sabbath. Then the seventh-day Christians will be to them merely a Mordecai in the gate to be gotten rid of in any way in the interests of the man-made and law-enforced "Sabbath."



Notwithstanding the efforts that are being made to separate the two it is evident, when sifted to the bottom, that the cause of American brutalities in the Philippines is identical with that of the assertion of American sovereignty over the Filipinos. America requires the subjection of the Filipinos to her authority because she holds that they are an inferior people and not entitled to the rights which they claim and other people exercise, but fit only to be governed from without, peaceably if possible, but by force if necessary. It is exactly on this ground that American soldiers have been torturing them and American generals have been ordering their extermination. The arguments which with such dexterity have been formulated by publicists and leading men in the United States for justifying the unconditional subjection of the Filipinos to American authority may spring from cultured minds and be flawless in literary style, but in substance

and essence they are not to be distinguished from the argument of that single word "nigger," which we are informed is the common appellation for the Filipino by the American soldier. The attitude of mind behind the one is about the same as that behind the other. The insolent swagger of the soldier as he treats with contempt the dark-skinned people with whom he is in close contact is simply the practical application of the intellectual and moral (or immoral) swagger of the orator or the publicist who preaches the doctrine of Anglo-Saxon fitness and duty to rule "inferior" peoples.



In connection with the Sunday closing agitation with regard to saloons the friends of Sunday enforcement have been publishing quite widely some utterances made by Mr. Roosevelt when he was police commissioner in New York. He is quoted as having said that "if the poor man has the right to break the law so as to get beer on Sunday he has the right to break the law so as to get it on any day," and that "the people who try to teach him that he has the right to break the law on one day to take beer are doing their best to prepare him for breaking the law some other day to take bread." This is quite concise, and certainly it leaves no course open but strict enforcement of and obedience to statutes, regardless of their merits or the consequences. The difficulty is that the time is past when a statute needs no reason for its enforcement but the fact that it is on the statute books. People reason about things, and a statute that fails to appeal to the common sense and reason of men is bound to suffer from more or less laxity in its enforcement. It is rather difficult to get people to see that the purchasing of beer on Sunday is the same thing as the stealing

of bread on week days. There are not many people who can see this, and the people who try to teach the beer-drinker and to enforce upon him the doctrine that the purchase of beer, which for six days in the week is treated as perfectly legitimate, is on Sunday a crime equal to stealing simply because the statutes say so, are certainly doing their share toward instilling into his mind a contempt for "law."



It is reported from Paris that "no little astonishment has been caused by the recent vote of the Chamber of Deputies to forbid work on Sundays." It is declared that "not only all work in shops, offices, mines, ship-loading and unloading, expressage and freight is proscribed, but an amendment was actually introduced and passed forbidding any cooking to be done on Sunday." What is declared to be the strangest part of the whole thing is "the catering to the lower classes" in that "inspectors and managers of manufactories must remain on duty to see that no employee, through excess of zeal, violates the law by coming back to finish a job left undone the day previous." And, it is added, "a hotel keeper could be prosecuted if the scullions endeavored on Sunday morning to clean the pots and dishes neglected after Saturday's dinner." It is said that the law has "nothing to do with religion." We should judge from the above that the purpose of the law-makers was to make sure as far as legislation can of carrying out the rest-day idea for workingmen that is so persistently proclaimed by the religious Sunday forces. And, notwithstanding the fact that Sunday will be the day chosen by most employees, it must not be overlooked that the law in question does not designate Sunday; it simply requires that employers shall allow their employees one day off each week. The law throughout is

thoroughly consistent with the idea of legislative protection of "one day of rest in seven for workingmen" that is so commonly proclaimed by the Sunday enforcement people. Yet we will venture to say that they will not look with much satisfaction upon this new law in France.



Under the Massachusetts Sunday law at present it is permissible to attend and take part in "sacred concerts." Very naturally under this law all entertainments in the nature of concerts that take place on Sunday have become "sacred." The forces which have assumed the guardianship of the "sacredness" of the legal "Sabbath" are not satisfied with the sacredness of many of the entertainments given, and so another bill has come before the legislature "to further regulate" such entertainments. It provides that "no entertainment may be given on the Lord's day that is not of a sacred character." It retains the present plan of giving incorporated religious and charitable societies a monopoly of the Sunday concert business, but declares that the officers of such societies must prove the sacredness of the concerts given under their auspices. The "entire proceeds must be devoted to religious and charitable purposes." Evidently this is to be only a re-enactment of the present law. The Haverhill (Mass.) *Gazette* says the present law "is a sufficient guarantee against rowdyism or unfit gatherings, and while the concerts are not always strictly sacred, there is seldom anything offered that would interfere with the observance of the day by those who are so inclined." But the Sunday-enforcement people are not thinking about rowdyism, nor are they concerned with merely preventing interference "with the observance of the day by those who are so inclined." It is with those who are not "so inclined" that they

are concerned. They want everybody to be made to act as if they were observing the day religiously—as they want it observed—and they will be satisfied with nothing less than that. But they will no doubt always be in trouble over this matter of "sacred" concerts, for there can never be any certainty as to what are sacred and what are not, at least as far as the State is concerned.



It should not be necessary for us to inform the *Truth Seeker* that we do not regard the conscience of the Jew as entitled to any more consideration before the law than that of the agnostic, or that we do not regard it as proper to exempt one class of people from the operation of the Sunday law while it is enforced upon other classes. We regard all people, whether Jews, Christians, agnostics, infidels, or what not, as having equal rights and being entitled to equal protection before the law, and what appeared in THE SENTINEL with reference to Mayor Low's suspension of Sunday enforcement against the Jews was not meant to convey the impression that it was proper to extend to them privileges which were denied to other people, and we do not see how that idea could be gathered from what we said concerning the matter. It is the *individual* who has rights before the law, not Jews, Christians, agnostics, infidels, etc. As to the propriety of the Mayor's action, that is rather a difficult question. Nevertheless there is to us a wide difference between anarchy and the refusal to enforce a statute that is manifestly unconstitutional and unjust, and we do not believe that it is inconsistent with the principles of American law for an executive officer to refuse to carry into effect an act which he regards as at variance with the highest law of the State or the nation. Most assuredly an executive officer is not a maker of laws,

but the spirit, and the letter in most instances, of the oath of every executive officer in this country binds him to uphold the constitution of the State or nation and to enforce only the laws passed in accordance therewith, and manifestly he has some discretion in the matter. Of course if the courts and public opinion go against him he will have to yield or surrender his office.

But of course, as we say, this is a difficult point, and there will always be those who will insist that it is the duty of an executive officer always to enforce the laws which he finds upon the statute books, regardless of what they may be or the consequences that may follow. Our opinion is that it is quite possible that there might be instances in which such a course would be more lawless than was the recent action of Mayor Low.



“The Kingdom of God on Earth”

A true conception of the nature and character of the kingdom of which Christ is king, and in the interests of which He lived and died in this world, would seem to be sufficient to preserve His followers from that common and fatal mistake of the ages—the appeal to and dependence upon secular and external authority in behalf of that kingdom. But it is to be wondered sometimes if it is not possible that this conception may be held in the intellect while the conduct, in part at least, is consistent only with an altogether different sort of a kingdom, or at least an altogether different sort of a conception of the nature of the kingdom of heaven.

This thought was suggested to us while listening to a recent discourse by Dr. Geo. C. Lorimer at the Madison Avenue Baptist Church in this city. On the morning of April 6 Dr. Lorimer preached on “The Kingdom of God on

Earth.” He presented many excellent thoughts on the subject, among them that the kingdom of God is preëminently a spiritual kingdom, that its domain is as broad and as great as is spiritual life and aspiration, and that it is altogether different in nature and character from the kingdoms and governments of this world. Its laws are not coercive, but are persuasive; it is not to dominate, but to permeate; it is not power and might and authority, but “righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost;” it is “with-in you,” and yet it is not an invisible kingdom, but it becomes visible not in hierarchical, episcopal or other ecclesiastical organizations; not in magnificent edifices or the pomp of theatrical and spectacular worship, nor in any rites, forms, and ceremonies; but in righteousness and joy and peace, in the unloosing of the bands of wickedness, in the undoing of the heavy burdens, and in letting the oppressed go free.

In connection with the reading of those memorable words of Jesus to Pilate, “My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight,” Dr. Lorimer exclaimed: “These words were forgotten by St. Augustine when, contrary to his own earlier teachings, he called upon the secular power to crush out the poor Donatists; they were forgotten by Gregory VII. when he declared the Papacy to be the supreme monarchy of the world; and they were forgotten when the Reformation was ruthlessly driven from France.” And Dr. Lorimer might have declared with equally as much truth that these words are forgotten to-day by those Christians who seek to promote “Sabbath” observance by means of the civil law. Dr. Lorimer’s name has for years occupied a prominent place on the official roll of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, an organ-

ization which claims to be working for the Lord in the interests of the "Lord's day." Its object is "to maintain the observance of the Lord's day," and among the "methods" which it espouses are "the protection and enforcement of Sunday laws, and the securing of better legislation." Civil legislation, State legislation, coercive legislation is what is meant. We submit that such "methods" in such a matter are as much at variance with the character of the kingdom of God on earth as set forth by Dr. Lorimer as was the appeal of Augustine to the secular power to crush out the Donatists, or the assumption of Gregory VII. that it was the business of the Christian church to lord it over the kingdoms of the world.

It has been the rule in the past that an appeal by Christians to the secular power in the interests of religion and its institutions has been attended by and has generally resulted from a very erroneous conception of the nature and character of the kingdom in the interests of which they claimed to be working. We sincerely hope that an even more lamentable and melancholy state of affairs than that is not now at hand. We do not want to see the time when Christians, while proclaiming the true nature and character of that spiritual kingdom in which they claim citizenship, will still cling to and pursue the methods which others have adopted only when the true conception had passed from them. And yet there is something very much like that in view now. "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" and what concord is there between the kingdom of God on earth and the methods of those who appeal to civil law in its behalf?



The New Calvinism

Of the different series of lectures for popular instruction given at the Cooper

Union in this city during the past winter none was been more characterized by breadth of view, keenness of perception and an intelligent grasp of the subject than that on the "History of Civilization" by Mr. Earl Barnes, of the Society for the Extension of University Teaching.

In his concluding lecture Mr. Barnes sketched "The Last Century," and, following the method which he had employed throughout, he set over against one another two great and controlling characteristics of the period. During the nineteenth century it was the individual versus the mass or the ancient, authoritative institutions of society—individualism versus imperialism and ecclesiasticism. As a result democracy had made great progress; popular government, popular education, and the elevation of the common man to his proper place in society had been largely realized. Church and state had been separated, and this had made greatly for individual freedom. Mr. Barnes declared, and it is an interesting and important point, that with the divorce of these two great dominating forces in society the individual had an opportunity to come into his own, but with them united his case was well-nigh hopeless. With church and state united the individual was powerless against the cramping and repressive domination of neither, but with separation of church and state he could be virtually independent of both. Mr. Barnes meant no reflection upon either church or state, but he simply recognized the fact to which he called attention a number of times throughout his lectures, that the tendency of all organizations, both political and ecclesiastical, is to become more and more repressive of the individual until his freedom of thought and action is practically suppressed.

But while emphasizing the progress which has been made along the pathway

of liberty, Mr. Barnes did not paint the present and the future in the roseate hues now so commonly applied. He said that civilization was on the eve of, or perhaps in the midst of, a great transition period, but that present indications did not promise a great deal in the direction of individual freedom. On the contrary, the individual feeling was being succeeded by the group feeling; that instead of a passion for individual liberty there was developing a passion for combination and centralization with the view of powerful and extensive control. The tendency is more and more to subject the individual to the group. Throughout the Anglo-Saxon world there is abroad what Mr. Barnes termed "a fateful feeling," shown in the growing prevalence of the idea of "destiny," which is fatal to individualism and tends to the consolidation and the absolutism of the mass. In short, although Mr. Barnes did not use this language, that imperialism is developing in the world, and developing just as it is obliged to when it springs out of such conditions as now obtain in the civilized world. It is democratic imperialism at first, and manifests itself by emphasizing the authority and power of the mass and belittling the rights and liberties of the individual.

It was at this point that Mr. Barnes touched upon that which gives the head to this article. He said that this new state of affairs was due more than anything else to the doctrine and theories of evolution, now so widely accepted. From what we gathered from his lectures Mr. Barnes by no means rejects the theory of evolution, but he declared plainly in his last lecture that it was coming to teach the doctrine of predestination as certainly and as absolutely as ever Calvinism did. It laid down the doctrine that all things are controlled by inexorable law which the individual was pow-

erless to affect one way or the other, and hence that what was to be would be in spite of all that could be done. This produced that widespread "fateful feeling" and the doctrine of destiny which swept aside moral considerations and subordinated the individual to the mass.

Mr. Barnes declared, and properly so, that this was a fatal and dangerous attitude. It is an attitude which may boast of its intellectual accuracy and its scientific precision, but in essence it does not differ materially from the attitude of Mary Tudor who once said: "As the souls of heretics are hereafter to be eternally burning in hell, there can be nothing more proper than for me to imitate the divine vengeance by burning them on earth."

There are certain publicists of high personal character in the United States to-day who hold that because civilization should take the place of barbarism, the civilized nations are justified in trampling upon every moral principle in the attempt to spread civilization among "inferior" peoples.

So far as this world is concerned the new Calvinism is more fatal and dangerous than the old. The old Calvinism was a theological belief and had to do with conditions and destinies in a future state; the new Calvinism is also theological, but it is far more social and political, and it demands that all the affairs of men shall be made to bend to it here and now.



Another Sunday Bill in Congress

The first Sunday bill to make its appearance in Congress since 1895 was introduced in the Senate on May 1 by Senator Dillingham of Vermont. It is entitled, "A Bill to further protect the first day of the week in the District of Columbia." After being read twice it was

referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The bill reads as follows :

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be lawful for any person to keep open any place of business or maintain a stand for the sale of any articles of profit during Sunday, excepting vendors of books or newspapers, and apothecaries for the dispensing of medicines, and undertakers for the purpose of providing for the dead, or others for the purposes of charity or necessity; nor shall any public playing of football, or any other kind of playing, sports, pastimes, or diversions disturbing the peace and quiet of the day be practised by any person or persons within the District of Columbia on Sunday; nor shall any building operations or work upon railroad construction be lawful upon said day; and for any violation of this Act the person offending shall, for each offense, be liable to a fine of not less than five dollars nor more than fifty dollars, and in case of corporations there shall be a like fine for every person employed in violation of this Act laid upon the corporation offending.

SEC. 2. That it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest, and that the labor complained of was done in such a manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest. This Act shall not be construed to prevent the sale of refreshments other than malt or spirituous liquors, or to prevent the sale of malt and spirituous liquors as now provided for by law, or tobacco, cigars, railroad and steamboat tickets, or the collection and delivery of baggage.

Thus Congress is again confronted with the opportunity to commit itself to the same evil principle of religious legislation in behalf of which it has been importuned so much in the last dozen years. And this importuning heretofore has not been entirely without results, for Congress has not in these later years maintained that position with regard to Sunday legislation which it boldly and consistently took in 1829-30 with regard to the demands that the transportation of

the mails on Sunday be discontinued by act of Congress in the interests of Sunday observance. But what was said then by the committees which reported on the subject is just as true now as it was then, and just as applicable to this bill introduced by Senator Dillingham as it was to those petitions for legislation to stop the mails on Sundays. It is hard to make a selection from those noble reports, for every sentence is important, but among others here are some which should be considered in connection with this new Sunday bill :

Congress acts under a Constitution of delegated and limited powers. The committee look in vain to that instrument for a delegation of power authorizing this body to inquire and determine what part of time, or whether any, has been set apart by the Almighty for religious exercises. On the contrary, among the few prohibitions which it contains, is one that prohibits a religious test, and another that declares that Congress shall pass no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

If Congress shall, by the authority of law, sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy in which even Christians themselves are at issue. However suited such a decision may be to an ecclesiastical council, it is incompatible with a republican legislature, which is purely for political, and not for religious, purposes.

If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers.

Although it was reported from Washington that this bill was approved by the Central Labor Union of that city, before its introduction in the Senate, it is not difficult to discover the real forces behind it. Senator Dillingham is a member of the executive committee of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Pro-

tective League, and his introduction of the bill was "by request." The source of this request, and of the bill itself, is indicated in the fact, as stated by a religious journal that has opportunity to know regarding the matter, that "the National Reform Bureau is doing its best to get the bill passed, and there are strong hopes of success." This is the religious-legislation lobby maintained in Washington by the National Reform Association and superintended by Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts. It remains to be seen what success will attend this latest effort of this somewhat ancient religio-political organization.



The Thing Has Been Done

In a former number we quoted in these columns the following statement from the *Evening Telegram*, of this city, which was made with reference to "the position of those who hold that the sanctity of the Sabbath [Sunday] is commanded by divine and should be enforced by human law:"

This Sabbatarian doctrine has never been recognized in American legislation, State or national, nor can it be without violating both letter and spirit of our fundamental law.

Now, it is very true that no such doctrine as enforced Sabbath or Sunday observance can be recognized in American legislation "without violating both letter and spirit of our fundamental law," but the idea held by the *Telegram*, which is a very common one, that no such thing has ever been done, is a very great mistake. The statute books of every State in this country, with the exception of not more than two States, contain laws which not only recognize but very distinctly incorporate "this Sabbatarian doctrine" of enforced Sabbath (Sunday) observance. The Sunday laws of the various States have existed from the very beginning of the Republic in viola-

tion of "both letter and spirit of our fundamental law." So much for the States.

Ten years ago the statement of the *Telegram* that this doctrine had not been recognized in national legislation would have been correct, but, unfortunately, such cannot be truthfully said now. In 1829-30 Congress refused emphatically to recognize this doctrine, but in the year 1892 Congress yielded to the clamor of various religious forces which demanded with threats that it recognize "this Sabbatarian doctrine" in national legislation. And it was done in that amendment to the World's Fair appropriation bill in which it was stipulated that the Fair should be closed on Sundays. Any one who will read the debate which accompanied this action, and who will look into the causes which brought it about, will see plainly that it was this very "Sabbatarian doctrine" referred to by the *Telegram* that was then recognized. One of the chief supporters of the measure had the Fourth Commandment read by the clerk of the Senate as the warrant for the legislation.

When this legislation was secured the religious forces behind it boasted throughout the country of the great thing they had accomplished in getting Congress committed to this doctrine of enforced Sabbath (Sunday) observance. And now the very same thing, with not quite so much stir, has been done with reference to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition; and this, too, is being boasted of by those forces "who hold that the sanctity of the Sabbath [Sunday] is commanded by divine and should be enforced by human law."

And all this is just what the *Telegram* declared such a thing would be—a violation of "both letter and spirit of our fundamental law." It is too bad that the idea prevails that the very thing that has been done has never been done at all, for

it is important that the knowledge of all this and its real meaning should be brought to the attention of all the people.



A Sunday Ordinance Judicially Annulled

The campaign for Sunday closing of stores by law in St. Joseph, Mo., has brought forth a decision from Police Judge Carolus to the effect that the city ordinance on the subject is invalid because unreasonable. The opinion was rendered on April 23 in the cases of a number of clothing merchants who had been arrested for Sunday opening at the instance of the Retail Grocers' Association. As the opinion is not long, and is of interest throughout, we present it almost entire:

In passing upon laws generally called "Sunday Laws," the courts of the various States differ widely in their opinions, largely due to statutory regulations and the policy of each State. They all agree, however, in holding that any law which might be based on the idea of the holiness of the day, or the observance of any particular day as compulsory, to be void, for the reason that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to Jew, Gentile, Mohammedan, and every other sect, equal rights of worship, according to the dictates of their own conscience, which necessarily allows them to worship on any other day than the Sabbath. And on this ground it has been held in some States that a Jew, having worshipped on Saturday, was not amenable to a law setting apart another day as the Sabbath.

The ground upon which Sunday laws are sustained, therefore, is not because of the nature of the day itself, but in order that those who wish, may worship on some particular day without being disturbed or offended by the noise and turmoil of business.

Another reason given by the law writers is that, by nature, man should be entitled to rest at least one day in seven, in order that the race may be preserved and not driven to destruction by unscrupulous, selfish men who would compel labor without cessation, taking advantage of the circumstances of the unfortunate.

The object of the law being for the preservation of comfort and welfare of the race, giving to each the protection necessary to allow him to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, interfering with none, therefore a law which does not secure these ends, or which, endeavoring to secure these ends, reaches beyond its intended purpose, may inflict limitations, which may utterly destroy the beneficent objects of its creation. So that it is one of the reasons which might be urged against the validity of a law or ordinance that it is unreasonable.

This ordinance has been before me upon numerous occasions and every conceivable objection except the present one urged against its validity, but up to the present time all such objections were held to be without merit.

A number of years ago it was before the Court of Appeals on a question whether its general clause, "or other places of business," included any business that was not of a like nature with "stores and shops," and the court held practically that it covered everything. The question of its reasonableness was not in the mind of the court, nor was it raised in that case. The very broad sweep given to this ordinance in that case, reported in the 47 Mo. Appeal Report, simply aggravates the question now before me. If the ordinance would bear the construction contended for it by the defendant in that case, that it must be limited to "stores and shops" and "other places of business" similar in nature, I should still hold the ordinance reasonable and valid. But in the face of this decision it is practically unlimited, including everything. If a prescription were filled by a druggist to save a human life, this would be no defense to the selling of the drug. If the object of the law is to save and preserve humanity, such a law could not stand. This is contrary to reason, and therefore the law must be held to be void.

Moreover, it is the policy of the State to except the sale of drugs, provisions and necessities, and our State laws make these exceptions, but our ordinances do not.

The ordinance is for the foregoing reasons held to be void, and the defendants are discharged.

The point here made against this Sunday ordinance is no doubt sound, although it is sustained by rather strict construction. Of course Sunday legislation itself is not called in question, but on

the contrary is endorsed. Now, it seems to us that the point made against this Sunday ordinance could be made upon grounds no less strong, broad and obvious, and certainly not bearing so much the appearance of technicality, against the Sunday laws themselves. Let us consider the matter in the light of this decision.

If the Jew, Gentile and Mohammedan have equal rights of worship under the Constitution how is it that there can be legislation by which one of them may worship on the day which he observes "without being disturbed or offended by the noise and turmoil of business," while the other two are left to worship on the days which they observe without the aid and protection of any such compulsory suspension of business? If the proper protection of the rights of the Sunday observer requires that there shall be legislation preventing the noise and turmoil of business on the day on which he worships, why does not the proper protection of the rights of the Jew or the Mohammedan require that there shall be legislation preventing the noise and turmoil of business on the days on which they worship? If there is such legislation in the one case and not in the other does it not create a condition in which the Sunday observer receives more than he is guaranteed by the Constitution, or else that the Jew and the Mohammedan receive less than is guaranteed them by the Constitution? And in either case can it be said that there is equal protection before the law?

Now, is not a law which rests upon the assumption that the Mohammedan and the Jew are amply protected in their rights under the Constitution when there is no legislation prohibiting the noise and turmoil of business on the sixth and seventh days of the week, while the Sunday observer is not protected in his rights of

worship under the Constitution unless there is legislation prohibiting the noise and turmoil of business on the first day of the week, an unreasonable law? We do not see how it can be regarded as otherwise, and hence it seems to us that on the very ground on which the above decision holds the St. Joseph Sunday-closing ordinance to be invalid and void, that all the Sunday legislation of the character endorsed by the decision can also be held to be invalid and void.

The above decision is mistaken in saying that Sunday laws have not been sustained upon the ground of the nature of the day, and that the courts agree in holding any law based upon the idea of the holiness of the day to be void. Of course Sunday laws should not have been sustained upon such ground, and the courts should have agreed in holding that a law so sustained was void, but such has not been the case. The indisputable fact with regard to Sunday legislation as it exists in the United States and other Anglo-Saxon countries to-day, is that it became statute law originally solely on the ground of divine command, or in other words on the ground of the holiness of the day itself. On such ground it is still sustained, but not universally. Very naturally, in the United States, there has been a disposition to seek other ground for such legislation, and the reasons presented have been various, but a candid examination of the decisions in which they are elaborated shows that they are adduced because of reluctance to appeal to the original and real ground upon which the legislation rests. The idea has been to sustain the legislation, and where that to which it owes its origin has been forsaken it has been done simply in order that the legislation might survive. All arguments for Sunday legislation aside from that of the original ground of divine command and the holiness of the

day have been merely apologetic and defensive. Of such character is the reason cited above from law writers, that "by nature man should be entitled to rest at least one day in seven in order that the race may be preserved," etc.

But that the courts even in the United States have not hesitated to sustain such legislation upon its original and real ground is evident from many citations that might be given. In New York Judge Kent has declared that "the statute has for over a century *recognized the sanctity of the day*" (Ruggle's Case, 8 Johns, 290). In Georgia the code denominates Sunday "the Lord's day," and as *the Lord's day and as a holy day* all courts and magistrates are to treat and respect it, by not being "allowed to invade its *sanctity*," and by abstaining "from the transaction of ordinary business on this *holy day*" (Gholston vs. Gholston, 31 Ga., 625, and Bass vs. Irwin, 49 Ga., 436); and the Sunday law of the State "but *re-enacts the law of the Almighty*" (Salter vs. Smith, 55 Ga., 244). In Arkansas the day is "set apart by *divine appointment* as well as by the law of the land" (Stockden's Case, 18 Ark., 186); in Pennsylvania by "*divine command* and human legislation" (Johnston's Case, 22 Pa., 102); and in Iowa the observance of the day is "established by laws both human *and divine*" (Davis vs. Fish, 1 Green, 406). And other citations to the same effect can be adduced. So then it is not true that the courts have agreed in holding as void Sunday laws based on the idea of the holiness of the day. On the contrary they have in abundant instances, and in most instances, in fact, sustained them upon this very ground.

One somewhat curious but very natural result of the attempt to maintain in the United States a sacred day by law has been in some instances a reversal of the

original theory. Whereas originally the legislation sprang from the idea of the sacredness of the day, the idea has been broached in some decisions that the sacredness of the day springs from the "civil" legislation "setting it apart as the Sabbath." Thus in the New York case cited above the intimation is that the day has been "consecrated" by statute. Roughly speaking the latter is the theory which generally obtains to-day with regard to such legislation, but the first has by no means been abandoned. Of course neither is tenable where the principle of the separation of religion and government obtains—where civil government is limited to civil affairs, as is the theory in the United States.



Another Theocratic Party Launched

What is said to have been "the most unique political convention ever held in the State of Illinois, and possibly in the United States," was held at "Zion City," Ill., on the evening of April 7. The convention was for the purpose of nominating officers for the new city, which is being built up by the followers of John Alexander Dowie, and which was incorporated under the State laws on March 31. Some three hundred voters assembled in the new Shiloh Tabernacle, and the meeting was opened with song and prayer. Although its object was rather local in character the convention saw fit to make the meeting the occasion for the launching of the following "platform," which makes its action of general interest, especially to all interested in present tendencies toward church-and-state union:

The citizens of the city of Zion, Lake County, State of Illinois, being assembled in their first convention, held in Zion City, on the night of Monday, April 7, 1902, for the purpose of

nominating the first officers of their city, do so on a Theocratic Platform, and desire to set forth their position and their reasons for the formation of this new party in the political affairs of the United States of America, in the manner following:

First. We declare our loyalty to the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

Second. We affirm that both the Constitution and the laws are capable of amendment and improvement in a Theocratic direction; and we simply propose to advocate the making of such alterations in the manner provided by the laws of the United States.

Third. We declare the motto of our party to be the unalterable and unassailable truth that "Where God rules, man prospers."

Fourth. Our object is, therefore, the establishment of the rule of God in every department of government, by the free will of the people.

Fifth. We declare our conviction that the Holy Scriptures, which contain the Ten Commandments, and the inspired gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, constitute the principles of all righteous government for the individual, for the Nation, and for the whole world.

This "platform" was unanimously adopted after Judge V. V. Barnes and Deacon Charles J. Barnard had "made eloquent addresses upon it, which were received with intense but quiet and orderly enthusiasm."

The promoters of this new "party" seem to be under the impression that they are starting upon something entirely new, but their platform is in substance and almost word for word what the National Reformers have proclaimed for many years. And in principle it is identical with that upon which Sunday enforcement is based and which has a wide acceptance in the ranks of the predominating religious elements in this country. This new "party" simply means another addition to a movement which has already gained considerable headway. While by its blunt and unequivocal declaration of its theocratic purpose and character it may somewhat discredit itself, it

is not at all improbable that when votes are wanted in behalf of legal religion that "Zion" will prove of great assistance to the church-and-state elements. We have heard Dr. Dowie, in his tabernacle in Chicago, boast that the 50,000 votes of "Zion" were held in his hand, and that they were cast as he directed. He declared that under his direction the votes of his followers were cast for Mr. McKinley at his first election to the Presidency, and that he had received the personal thanks of Mr. McKinley because of the same. It remains to be seen how the practise of voting men in the mass on religious issues will pan out. In other matters it is clearly recognized as a grave abuse.

The Waukegan (Ill.) *Daily Gazette*, from which we gather the information concerning this matter, notes as one of the unique features of the convention "the fact that no cigars were passed around by the candidates." It says there was not even the smell of tobacco in the meeting and that the entire proceedings were characterized by "deep earnestness, sincerity, and dignity." This is certainly something to the credit of those who assembled in this convention, but it does not argue that the cause to which they are devoted will prove insignificant and unimportant. Those who are not addicted to the common vices and who pursue their object with deep earnestness and sincerity are the persons who are more likely than any others to gain prestige and endorsement for the theocratic theory of government



The W. C. T. U. and Sunday Closing Again

In the March SENTINEL we published a statement from the president of the New York State W.C.T.U. as to why that organization was opposed to local

option on the question of Sunday saloons, and in some comment added thereto emphasized the position set forth. Our attention has now been called to an article in the April *Woman's Temperance Work*, the official organ of the State Union, in which it is stated that we have put forth what "is a grievous error" concerning the position of the W.C.T.U., and appeal is made "to any fair-minded person of average intelligence if a more unfair statement of the position of the W.C.T.U. on this question could possibly be made without absolutely falsifying the facts" than was made by THE SENTINEL.

Now we have no desire to misrepresent the W.C.T.U. nor to falsify the facts in this matter or any other, and if such has been done in this instance we desire to do what we can to rectify it at once. The quotation from the president of the W.C.T.U. organization was given exactly as it appeared in the official organ, but we notice that the same care has not been exercised in quoting the words of THE SENTINEL. However, that is immaterial here. In order that the matter may be made as clear as possible, we will again give space to the full statement of Mrs. Boole:

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

Now, our deduction from this state-

ment was that the thing uppermost in it was "the question of the observance of Sunday," and we stated that in it the Sunday saloon was opposed because of the religious character of the day rather than because of the blighting character of the liquor traffic. We still deduce the same thing from it, and see no reason whatever to alter the statement made.

We did not say that "the W.C.T.U. makes no distinction between the liquor traffic and any other kind of business." We said that in opposing Sunday saloons on the ground that they would open the way for the operation on Sunday of "every other business" and thus "lessen the safeguards about the day," that the W.C.T.U. *in that* virtually declared that so far as the matter of Sunday closing was concerned there was no distinction between the liquor traffic and "every other business;" that the question as presented by the president of the W.C.T.U. was not a question between a business which produces evil, crime and drunkenness and those which do not, but a question between all businesses, good and evil alike, and "the observance of Sunday;" that it was a question of safeguarding Sunday not simply against the liquor traffic, but against all traffic. And we see no reason now to change these statements. And we fail to see how, in the face of the quotation given, these statements can be regarded as unfair and as embodying "a grievous error" with regard to the position of the W.C.T.U.

We are told that "it is 'known and read of all men' and women that the W.C.T.U. is opposed to the open saloon on Sunday, Monday and each and all of the five other days and every one of the seven nights of the week." Yes, this is known; but it is not known that the W.C.T.U. is opposed to the saloon on Monday, or any other day except Sunday, because its being open on such day would "lessen

the safeguards about the day," and open the way for "every business" to proceed on that day. It is not known that the open saloon on Monday is opposed by the W.C.T.U. because it is considered to be in violation of a commandment requiring the religious observance of the day. We raised no question as to the W.C.T.U.'s being opposed to the open saloon all the time; we simply emphasized the principal reason given by it for its opposition to the open saloon on Sunday, and pointed out that this reason was not a proper one to urge in behalf of civil legislation.

The article to which we have referred says that "the W.C.T.U. is a firm believer in the commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' It believes in an entire cessation of all unnecessary work on that day." But it is added:

If the consciences of some demand that they shall observe the seventh day of the week instead of the first day, the W. C. T. U. does not attempt to decide the question for anyone. If anyone wishes especially to close all saloons on the seventh day of the week, we will gladly help them to do so. If for any reason some other people want to close the saloons on some other day of the week, the W. C. T. U. will gladly, to the extent of its ability, help them. Never, however, relaxing by one iota its efforts to close all saloons on all days regardless of the peculiar beliefs or wishes of any.

We are glad to note the kindly spirit here manifested toward seventh-day observers, but we cannot refrain from pointing out that in this very thing the principle which we are opposing seems to be endorsed. The intimation is that the attitude of seventh-day observers in this matter is simply a question of days and of their own "peculiar beliefs," and that if the proposition were to close the saloons on the seventh day instead of to close them on the first day, that they would be in favor of it for the same rea-

son that the W.C.T.U. and others are in favor of Sunday closing. This is a great mistake. If we understand the position of seventh-day observers their opposition to Sunday enforcement arises from their loyalty to the principle of complete separation of church and state, and this principle applies with equally as much force against the enforcement of Saturday observance as it does against the enforcement of Sunday observance. The difference of days makes no difference in the principle. Seventh-day observers are also firm believers in the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and they believe in an entire cessation of all unnecessary labor on that day, but they do not believe that they have any right to ask of government legislation enforcing the observance of this day, even upon saloons. And hence they do not want any assistance in securing such legislation, however gladly it may be offered.

The statement that the W.C.T.U. is "opposed to the open saloon on Sunday because it believes that more harm can be done on that day than on any other day, as so many men are on that day relieved from their usual occupation, and have at least a part of their week's wages, which the barroom is liable to get," touches upon the question from the right standpoint. Nobody has any right to demand that the saloons shall be closed by law out of regard for what they regard as holy time. The saloon must be regulated by the State only from the standpoint of the State. The influence of the saloon upon those interests which concern the State and with which it can properly deal must determine its regulation by the State. Hence if the saloon is more dangerous to the legitimate interests of civil society on one day of the week than on others it may be proper to have special legislation against it on that day. And,

from this standpoint, seventh-day observers will be in perfect accord with Sunday observers. But they will not endorse any scheme for enforcing a religious observance however plausible may be the excuse offered for it. If there is special legislation closing saloons on Sunday it must be for no other reason than that they are a menace to public order on that day, and not that their being open is contrary to somebody's religious belief. And when this principle is honestly and consistently applied to the matter there will follow an abrogation of the laws now compelling people to be idle on Sunday, for the law prohibiting honest labor on Sunday is the best ally that the Sunday saloon has.

And now, as we said before, we say again, that we have every sympathy with the W.C.T.U. in its opposition to the liquor traffic, but we have no sympathy with efforts that are based on the idea that the question of the observance of Sunday or any other day is a matter for State legislation. We believe that the W.C.T.U. has done and is doing a noble work, but we believe that its efforts for Sunday enforcement are a mistake and are just that much to its discredit. And so long as there are those who insist upon riding the hobby of Sunday enforcement we shall consider it necessary to ride the hobby of opposition to it. But in doing so we shall always try to "play fair," as we are convinced that we have done in this instance, notwithstanding the contrary opinion of the *Woman's Temperance Work*.



"Blue-Law" Agitation in Massachusetts

The "Sunday-Soda Bill," which so amends the present law as to permit the sale of soda-water, ice-cream and confec-

tionery on Sunday, has been a matter of considerable interest in Massachusetts of late. On April 24 the bill was favorably reported by the committee of the legislature to which it had been referred. On May 2 it passed the lower house by a large majority, and on the 13th it was announced that it would be ready to go to the governor for his signature as soon as the lower house agreed to the senate amendment excluding from the privileges of the bill common victualers having liquor licenses. Very little opposition was shown to it in the legislature, although one member protested against it vigorously on the ground that it was "but an entering wedge to break down the Sabbath laws" and would "open every retail store in Massachusetts on Sundays."

Of course the bill itself did not touch the vital question of the legitimacy of Sunday legislation, and although there was opportunity in the discussions which attended its passage, there seemed to be very little disposition on the part of legislators, even those most opposed to the "blue laws," to advocate the principle of church and state separation in the matter. Such terms as "the Sabbath," "the Lord's day," "the Sabbath law now on our statute books," etc., were freely used. The issue thus was not upon the question of Sunday enforcement itself, but simply upon the sort of observance that should be enforced.

But while the bill itself is of very little consequence, some of the utterances which it called forth from certain quarters are worthy of note. On April 24, at a joint meeting in Boston of representatives of eight druggists' associations of Massachusetts, who of course were especially interested in the passage of the bill, it was unanimously endorsed, and those present pledged themselves to do everything possible to secure its passage. One section of the resolutions adopted

and sent to the legislature read as follows:

Resolved, That we hereby express our surprise, very much akin to disgust, as we contemplate that our honored State of Massachusetts, to which the whole country looks for example and leadership—and rightly so—in all matters of learning, education and advancement, especially in the matter of law, should not only have on its statute books to-day a sixteenth century blue law, but actually enforce the same, especially in Boston, the Athens of America and the great seat of learning, culture, advancement, independent thought and original investigation.

At a meeting composed largely of church members and addressed by a number of ministers, prominent among them being Rev. F. L. Goodspeed, of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, held in Springfield on the evening of May 4, the pending measure was vigorously denounced, and a long "appeal," protesting against its passage and demanding at least its postponement "until a fuller and more general expression of public sentiment may be obtained," was adopted and sent to the governor and each member of the senate. It was declared that the bill was "an outrage on Christian sentiment of the Commonwealth," and was "frivolous in its pretensions, inconsistent in its argument, unconstitutional in its substance, and clearly at variance with other eminently worthy determinations of your honorable body." The document ended with the devout (?) sentence, "God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," and a portion of it read as follows:

As regards the relation of this bill to public rights, it is an infringement of the liberty and equity of trade. It establishes a privilege and creates a monopoly in law in violation of that important provision in the Constitution of the United States which withholds the power to legislate on behalf of particular persons or classes of the people. The proposed measure specifically names the class of traders to whom

this privilege shall be granted and should any other citizen of the Commonwealth open his shop or store in other commodities he is punishable by law of the same Commonwealth. The proposed legislation is, therefore, neither constitutional nor final. It must be logically and legally but one of a series of acts which shall in succession legalize all pursuits on the Lord's day. At a time when there is much perplexity and some hardship on account of trusts and monopolies, it appears to us to be a grave error if the State, pre-eminent in the Union for its order, the stability of its institutions, and the equity of its laws, should create a privilege for a particular class, and set the example of the establishment of a legal monopoly.

With regard to the constitution of this Commonwealth, we believe that the proposed legislation is subversive of "the worship of the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the universe."

The Hampden (County) Conference of Congregational Churches, assembled at Chicopee on May 7, also adopted and sent to the senate a strong protest against the passage of the bill. It was set forth that the petitioners represented forty-seven churches and 9,000 members, and the reasons given for their opposition to the bill were, in brief, (1) that "the articles specified in the bill are not necessities, but luxuries;" (2) that "it opens the door still wider for the secularization of the Lord's day;" (3) that "it is a menace to the public health, because a man worn and jaded with labor seven days in the week is in no condition for the responsible and exacting work of compounding medicines for the sick;" (4) that "it is unjust to the laboring classes," in that "by making it necessary for one class of toilers to work on the Lord's day it encourages the same demand on the part of other employees of labor, and so leads on toward industrial slavery;" and (5) that "the bill is class legislation," in that "it establishes a monopoly and places that monopoly in the hands of a special class of tradesmen specified in the bill,"

and "is therefore plainly contrary both to the Constitution of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

It is gratifying to note that these religious champions of Sunday legislation are so awake to the grave danger and unconstitutional character of class legislation and the legal establishment of a monopoly. It is to be regretted, however, that they do not seem to perceive that the principle which they so stoutly urged, and not without reason, too, against this "Sunday-Soda Bill," applies with even more force against the legislation for the preservation of which they are so much concerned. Sunday legislation is pre-eminently class legislation, and that of the most dangerous sort, for it is in the interests of a religious class; and consequently it establishes a monopoly of the most dangerous and inexcusable sort. On the one hand a set of religionists secure the power of the law for the enforcement of a religious institution which they want everybody to observe, and on the other hand the state, controlled of course in the matter by the class which it has especially favored, monopolizes the matter of Sabbath observance, taking it out of the realm of free action and making it a matter of statute law. It was well said by a committee of Congress in 1830, with reference to demands for legislation in behalf of Sunday observance, that if Congress should, by the authority of law, sanction and set apart as the Sabbath the day observed by the religious class observing Sunday, that "it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy in which even Christians themselves are at issue," and that "the obligation of government is the same on all these classes [Sabbatarians, Jews, Gentiles and infidels],"—"to protect all and determine for none."

The Great West Indian Catastrophe

Those who read these lines will not need to be told of the great West Indian disaster which has startled and shocked the world. The lives of thirty thousand people snuffed out and a beautiful city consumed and buried within thirty seconds by a hot blast from the bowels of the earth! An area of six by ten miles in which everything and almost the soil itself was instantly destroyed! The mind turns at once to the ill-fated cities which nestled at the base of Vesuvius in the year 79, or still farther back, to the twin cities of the Vale of Siddim on which fire and brimstone rained out of heaven in total and eternal destruction.

No one knows how many thousands or millions of people perished with Sodom and Gomorrah; it is simply known that only four persons escaped from Sodom. But it seems that the eruption of the morning of the 8th of May was more disastrous when measured by the mortality entailed than was that of the year 79, for it is estimated that not more than 25,000 persons fell a prey to the fury of Vesuvius at that time, while not less than 30,000 were stricken by the great sheet of flame and terrible gaseous whirlwind which burst from the side of Mont Pélee. And more than that it is estimated that nearly two thousand persons have perished on the neighboring island of St. Vincent, where the volcano of La Soufrière began its work of destruction immediately after the great outburst upon Martinique. And in addition to this the survivors on both islands have been left almost destitute of any means of sustenance, and although quick and generous aid has been extended to them, especially by the United States, it is not improbable that many people will yet die for the lack of the necessities of life.

The seismic disturbances, of which this tremendous outburst of Mont Pélee was evidently the great climax, have extended throughout the American tropics, and there have even been simultaneous disturbances on the islands off the coast of Alaska. In Mexico and Central America, especially in the latter, there was volcanic activity and serious earthquakes in April. It is estimated that in Guatemala 2,000 people were killed, and the city of Quezaltenango was practically laid in ruins.

Here are some of the statements from prominent sources with regard to this terrible disaster in the West Indies :

One of the most startling events in history.—*The Independent*.

In many respects the most appalling calamity of modern times.—*New York Times*.

Ranks as perhaps the greatest disaster from volcanic causes in history.—*Springfield Republican*.

Will take rank with destruction of Pompeii, the earthquake at Lisbon, and the explosion of Krakatoa.—*New York Tribune*.

The disaster is without a parallel in human history. Nature seemed to have wished to remind man of his littleness.—*New York Sun*.

The greatest disaster of the world, with the exception of the Lisbon earthquake, when the sea rolled in and drowned 60,000 people.—*James Furman Kemp, Professor of Geology at Columbia University*.

The catastrophe in Martinique is about the most terrible of that kind that has occurred since the earthquake at Lisbon.—*Professor Goldwin Smith*.

No description of the appalling scenes . . . can exaggerate the heart-rending tragedy of the facts. Death and devastation fell with instantaneous and resistless force. . . . It is comparable only with the event just named [the burial under a storm of fire and lava of Pompeii and Herculaneum], with the destruction of Lisbon by earthquake, and with the stupendous eruption of Krakatoa, near Java, in 1883.—*The Outlook*.

The greatest volcanic eruption ever known is said to have been that of the island of Krakatoa, between Java and

Sumatra, in 1883. After three months of eruption the great explosion came on August 26. It was heard at Borneo, over a thousand miles distant, and was felt in West Australia nearly two thousand miles away, the sound zone covering one-thirteenth of the earth's surface. Air waves were set in motion which traveled around the world four times one way and three times the other, and the volcanic dust which was projected into the upper atmosphere remained there for months, producing extraordinary atmospheric phenomena visible over the greater portion of the globe. Five thousand square miles of ocean were covered with lava dust, an island six miles square was submerged, and two new islands were made. A tidal wave 135 feet high at one point was raised, and in all more than 36,000 persons lost their lives.

The great earthquake of November 1, 1755, which shook three continents, but which has come to be known as the earthquake of Lisbon, because that city suffered most from it, was also attended by a tidal wave and followed in Lisbon by a very destructive conflagration. The lowest estimate of the number of people who perished at Lisbon is 40,000, but it is estimated that on that fatal day more than twice that number perished throughout Portugal, Spain and northern Africa.

It is recorded that 200,000 persons perished by an earthquake at Yeddo, Japan, in 1703. In 1812 the city of Caracas, Venezuela, was destroyed, and 12,000 persons perished. About 1835 there were very great volcanic and earthquake disturbances in Central America, and shocks extending far down into South America. In 1868 several towns in Peru and Ecuador were destroyed and 25,000 lives lost. The Charleston earthquake of 1886 is the principal disturbance of that sort that has been experienced in the

United States. Only forty-one lives were lost, but the property damage amounted to \$5,000,000.

While disavowing, and calling attention to the fact that the world no longer holds to, the "belief or superstition" that there is a relation between human wickedness and the catastrophes of nature, the New York *Tribune* made these observations regarding the island and the city visited by this late catastrophe:

Martinique is the most romantically beautiful island of the West Indies, with its wonderful flora and its precipitous contours softened with a wealth of verdure which robs them of all forbidding aspect. Only for the dreaded serpent—the deadly *fer-de-lance*—in the thickets it might seem to be an island paradise. Man, however, is no more perfect in Martinique than in any other Eden. Few places of its size showed more on its surface the degraded side of human nature than St. Pierre. . . . The traditional morals of a seaport were there conspicuous. No town in the West Indies so forced the low character of its people upon attention, and, in spite of the beauty of its surroundings and the charm of its higher classes, left a more unpleasant taste.

But there is no reason to believe that the people of St. Pierre were sinners above the people of many other cities of the earth; and yet it does not follow that there was no connection between its destruction and human wickedness. But the most important connection that it could possibly have had or can have with human conduct is to bring forcibly to the minds of men the thought contained in the words, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," and thereby influence them to turn from wickedness to righteousness.



A Prominent Daily on the Sunday Question

The action of various bodies of Congregationalists in Massachusetts in protesting against the passage of the bill by

the State legislature legalizing the sale of ice-cream, soda-water, and confectionery by druggists and news-dealers on Sunday, and the discussion of the "question of Sabbath observance" by the Presbyterian General Assembly, in session in this city from May 15 to 26, formed the basis of an editorial on "The Church and Sunday" in the New York *Evening Post* of May 17. The *Post* notes that "the coincidence results in showing the attitude toward an important question of public policy which is now generally held by representatives of two 'orthodox' denominations." And it may be added that there are other large denominations of the same description, notably the Methodist, which maintain a like attitude in this matter.

The *Post* calls attention to the fact that in the protests against the Massachusetts bill the "chief stress was laid upon the argument that 'it opens the door still wider to the entire secularization of the Lord's day,'" and that underlying all "was the assumption, clearly expressed in the deliverance of the Springfield meeting, that such legislation 'is subversive of the worship of the Supreme Being.'" Here is, in part, what the *Post* has to say on the subject:

The disposition of the church still is to take its stand on the old theory that Sunday is a day for the worship of God, and that pretty much everything except such worship shall be prevented by law. It was possible to enforce this theory in the rural communities which made up nearly all of New England when church and state were largely synonymous in the eighteenth century, and the force of tradition secured its acceptance among descendants of the Puritans during much of the nineteenth century; but it is as hopeless to apply it in our cities during the twentieth century as it would be to revive the system of having the town support the Congregational clergyman. Modern society accepts the principle that the first day of the week shall, in the language of the New York Penal Code, be "set apart for rest

and religious uses," and it approves laws which, to quote further from the same source, "prohibit the doing on that day of acts which are serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community"—but beyond this point statutes cannot go, or if they do go, they cannot be enforced, which amounts to the same thing in the long run.

The churches cannot any longer force people to "go to meeting," as they once could and did in New England. They cannot any longer make it a crime for people to use the weekly rest day in any way which they consider most beneficial, so long as such use does not disturb the repose of the community. But they can weaken the influence for good which they should exert if they array themselves against the drift of modern civilization, and insist upon restrictions which society will never again endure.

The *Post* thinks "the church is justified in resisting any real attempt to break down Sunday as a day 'for rest and religious uses,'" but declares that it must exercise common sense and make a discrimination between a general opening of city shops and the running of manufacturing establishments seven days a week and bicycle riding, ball playing, the taking of needed outings by the families of the poor, the giving of concerts in public parks, and the opening of libraries and art galleries on Sunday.

While it is true that the churches show such a lack of common sense in this matter that it will probably be a most effective obstacle in the way of their own purpose, they are by no means inconsistent. The enforcement of the observance of a *religious* institution is what they want, and all they want, and, with no doubt good reason, they regard ball-playing, bicycle riding, concerts, and the visiting of libraries and art galleries to be as inconsistent with the proper observance of the day as a religious institution as would be the general opening of city shops and the operating of manufacturing establishments.

Before this question can be settled

right the doctrine must prevail that legislation in behalf of religious observances is not proper in any respect, not even in the matter of preventing a general opening of city shops and the operating of manufacturing establishments. We regret to see that modern society, as truly represented by the *Evening Post*, halts half way in this matter, and is still so controlled by "the force of tradition" handed down from the time "when church and state were largely synonymous," that it is unwilling yet to consistently apply to this Sunday question the plain principle of separation of church and state so clearly announced at the founding of the Republic. Modern society insists that it shall have its recreation, its pleasures and its luxuries on Sunday in spite of the force of religio-political tradition in the matter, but it is quite willing that this same force shall, in spite of the progress that has been made in religious freedom and the separation of church and state, still continue to make honest labor and business a crime on the first day of the week.

There is no more reason why shops and manufacturing establishments should be closed by law on the first day of the week out of deference to the religious character of the day than there is that Congregational clergymen, or any other clergymen, should be supported by public taxation. The only difference is that modern society is used to the one and not to the other. The law has no business to set apart time for religious uses; its business is to protect people in using their time as they choose, religiously or otherwise. And it can never be established, except upon the grounds on which clergymen were supported by public taxation and dissenters were flogged, imprisoned and burned, that the mere labor or business operations of one man are such an interruption of the repose and re-

ligious liberty of another as should be taken cognizance of by the law, and for the same reason that the labor or business operations of any number of men are "serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty" of a community.



Some Sunday Sophistry

A correspondent writes us from Benton Harbor, Mich., that an agitation in favor of Sunday enforcement has recently created some stir in the "Twin Cities" of the Michigan fruit belt—St. Joseph and Benton Harbor. On the evening of March 30 "the Methodist pastor spoke on Sunday closing, and the following Sunday evening, April 6, the Congregationalist pastor, Rev. J. W. Cady, gave a discourse on 'Early Closing and Sunday Closing.'" The address was quite thoroughly advertised by means of handbills, and "the church was nearly filled." The speaker prefaced his remarks by reading the Fourth Commandment, and also Isaiah 58: 13, 14, and Jeremiah 17: 27. The address may be summarized as follows:

1. National prosperity is dependent upon Sabbath (Sunday) observance. The Jews were destroyed as a nation because of their Sabbath-breaking, and the same fate will overtake any nation that disregards the Sabbath. The nations that observe the Sabbath are the wealthiest. England and the United States were cited as examples, with the exclamation, "we can whip the world, and you all know it." France sees how England has prospered in Sabbath-keeping and her statesmen are taking measures to secure its better observance. "A monarchy can be run without religion, but you can't have a republican government without religious principles."

2. The physical well-being of the individual is dependent upon Sabbath (Sunday) observance. The Jews, because of their Sabbath observance, live longer than other peoples, and are less liable to contract disease. "Those who have observed the laws of Sabbath rest have prospered physically, but when you find a people given over to seven days labor and contin-

ual dissipation, you find physical degeneracy." There is a physiological law that demands one day's rest in seven: the vitality of the body is weaker at the close of a day's work than at the beginning; during the night the vitality is not quite restored to what it was the preceding morning; it keeps dropping one notch lower every day until Sunday, when "the day of rest just brings it back to a normal condition!" A draught horse that draws a load eight miles a day for six days will keep in better condition than one that draws a load six miles a day for seven days! The increasing frequency of accidents on railroads is due to "the tired nerves and weary brains of men compelled to work seven days in the week." "Greedy men and corporations," exclaimed the speaker, "are trying to get ahead of the Almighty."

3. "Sabbath desecration" makes criminals. The man who is kept at work all the time is not much better off than a mule, and his mind becomes a blank to all that is honest and good. Many criminals can trace the beginning of their downward career to "Sabbath-breaking." Employers who compel their clerks to work on Sunday in violation of the laws of God and the state, reap what they sow when a clerk goes to their till and takes what does not belong to him, and one is no worse than the other.

4. Sunday enforcement is needed to protect rights. The man who buys on Sunday, or who employs others to work for him, is utterly selfish and is robbing others of their Sunday rest. The man who will not close his store on Sunday must be restrained. The laws against stealing are for those who will not respect the rights of others; the laws against Sunday-breaking are for the purpose of restraining those who do not respect the rights of others.

5. With regard to early closing, the speaker advised the clerks to use great care and deliberation, to remember the interests of their employers, and if necessary to compromise somewhat; but he gave them no such advice with regard to Sunday closing.

Addresses like the above, which are common with the advocates of Sunday enforcement, are chiefly valuable as showing to what absurd lengths intelligent men are willing to go in order to secure the enforcement of a religious observance, and how abjectly they will prostrate themselves before the Sunday idol. In it all things center and con-

verge; it is the sun of all beneficence and blessing, and if it is not made to shine by legislative enactment and police enforcement woe, woe, woe, unto the material, political, social, physical and moral prospects of mankind! Without it nothing can be attained, and all that has been attained will relapse into "chaos and eternal night."

We cannot undertake here to examine at length the points presented. Every one of them has been considered over and over in these columns before. It is sufficient to say with reference to the first point that there is not necessarily any connection between Sabbath observance and national prosperity, and certainly national welfare cannot be advanced by *enforced* Sabbath observance. It is by no means certain that England and the United States are Sabbath-observing nations. Whatever material and political prosperity they enjoy must be attributed to other sources. Perhaps a monarchy can be run without religion, but very few of them have been run without just such religion as is embodied in enforced Sunday observance. Religious principles may be important to the citizens of a republic, and may make for its welfare, but no such religious principles as those upon which enforced religion rests are needed in a republic.

With regard to the second point it may be said that entirely too much is made of the importance of Sabbath rest as a physical necessity. Nature indicates that sleep is the restorative of lost vitality, and that it must be taken daily. There is no foundation whatever for the idea that one day of rest in seven is needed to bring the body back to its normal condition. The Sabbath is a day for spiritual exercise, not for physical rest. The man who takes a proper amount of sleep and is temperate in all things may observe no day at all without injuring his physical

constitution a particle; whereas a people given over to continual dissipation would be ruined physically, never mind if they stopped labor altogether.

"Sabbath desecration" makes criminals chiefly because that which is innocent in itself men have undertaken without any warrant whatever to make a crime on a certain day of the week.

Sunday enforcement is needed to protect rights about as much as a law compelling people to sleep, eat or to marry is needed to protect rights. In this country no man is compelled to work and no man is compelled to keep his store open against his will. The man who wants to stop work on Sunday or who wants to close his store and insists that there shall be a law compelling everybody else to stop work and to close up, is the man who is utterly selfish, and it is the *repeal* of such a law that is needed to protect rights. No man has a right to insist that other people shall do what he does so long as he is legally at liberty to do as he chooses, and therefore he is not respecting the rights of others when he demands a law compelling them to do as he does.

And, finally, Sunday enforcement is not Sabbath enforcement. The passages cited by Mr. Cady have no reference to the first day of the week at all. They contain no warrant for Sunday observance, much less for Sunday enforcement.



According to some of the smaller grocers on the East Side, New York, there exists among the police a policy with reference to the matter of permitting the sale of groceries on Sunday similar to that which obtained so long, and probably does to some extent yet, with reference to the sale of liquor on Sunday, although of course on a much smaller scale. It is said that some stores are allowed to

sell openly during the entire day, while the proprietors of others are arrested as soon as they are caught selling "even a box of matches." A number of grocers declare that they have repeatedly observed such discrimination, and have been led to believe that the system of "shake-down" accounts for it. It is certain that no law is better fitted to serve such a corrupt purpose than the Sunday law.



"Governor Taft's Mission to Rome"

On May 10 an official announcement was made public at the War Department in Washington concerning "Governor Taft's mission to Rome." It was expected that he would leave for Rome before the end of the month, and he was to be accompanied by Judge Smith, of the Philippine Supreme Court, and Major John B. Porter, who is to act as secretary in Rome. It was declared that "Governor Taft's errand is not in any sense a diplomatic mission; it is simply a business transaction with the owners of property," and that it is "for the purpose of reaching, if possible, a friendly understanding with the authorities having control of the disposition of the property of religious orders and other church property in the Philippines, and laying the basis for the settlement of the many property questions which have resulted in [from] the separation of church and state in the islands."

It was also stated that the nature of the questions involved in the purchase of the friar's lands, which "is the principle thing," is such "that it is impossible to settle them by negotiation with the friars themselves in the Philippines." But aside from this there are other matters which have caused it to be "thought best not to lose the opportunity afforded by

Governor Taft's presence in Europe to begin the negotiations and make as much progress as possible, so that they may be readily closed up after Congress has acted, if it does act favorably." Here is the statement concerning these other matters:

There are many other questions, however, to be settled, such as the rights to property held for purposes of instruction and for charitable purposes, and the right of the church to land, the title to which is now in the Government, but upon which buildings for religious purposes have been built. Some of these matters could be settled by the courts, but it would require many years, and it is very desirable to settle them in a speedy and friendly way. Prior to American occupation the church and state were so closely united and their interests so interwoven that now when they are separated it is very difficult to tell to whom the property, which was devoted to their joint uses under the former system, belongs.

It is hoped that when a full understanding of the claims and views of each side has been reached, and the facts are fully understood, all the questions existing can be settled in such a way as to benefit both parties. The object of this conference is to secure the separation of church and state, and it would seem to be a condition precedent to such a result.

This virtually says that the close union existing between church and state under Spain has not yet been abolished by American occupation, and that this conference at Rome, or mission to Rome, is necessary for bringing about that result. The complete separation of church and state is certainly a worthy object, but it remains to be seen whether this conference will bring about that result. The aspect of the whole matter leads us to believe that it will not have that result, but will lead to a more firm uniting of the Catholic Church with the state either in the Philippines or in this country, and perhaps in both. We hope we are mistaken. Certainly we are if the Chicago *Inter Ocean* is correct on this point. After stating that Governor Taft "goes

to Rome merely as a commercial negotiator," it says:

The absolute separation of the functions of church and state is a fundamental principle of this Republic. To this Government all churches are merely associations of citizens for the promotion of benevolence and morality. As such their utility is recognized and their rights are protected, but none ever has been, and none ever will be, in the Philippines or elsewhere, granted privileges not given to all or conceded for an instant to possess such privileges. That is the American principle of religious freedom and equality and that principle will be maintained.

About the time the announcement mentioned was issued from the War Department it was stated in the press that Governor Taft had just "had a conference with Cardinal Gibbons concerning his coming negotiations with the Vatican," and that "the American prelate will play an important part in this affair, since the Pope will be guided largely by Cardinal Gibbons' advice." And this leads again to the inquiry of last month, as to why it is necessary to go to Rome regarding these matters, or if it is necessary, why this consultation with papal prelates in this country? If Cardinal Gibbons is going to direct the Pope in the matter, why run away from the Cardinal to the Pope? And if the Cardinal is not to direct in the matter, why is he consulted and dealt with at all? We confess that there are some things connected with this matter that do not give it, to us, the appearance of "simply a business transaction with the owners of property."



Mr. Bourke Cockran is of the opinion that "the Roman Catholic Church is the oldest republican form of government existing," and that "to St. Patrick may be justly attributed the unquestionable glory of being the original architect of modern popular government." So he declared to a large audience in Minneap-

olis on the evening of March 17. In this city recently Mr. Cockran made a minute comparison between the civil government in this country and the government of "the Church," "comparing the town to the parish, the county to the diocese, the State to the province, and the Federal Government to the Holy See." "Our Constitution stands," said Mr. Cockran, "because it carries with it the right to interpret its provisions. And so it is with the Word of God. Its interpretation by the Church has made that moral law that has led men from darkness to light, from oppression to prosperity. No individual is free to interpret the moral law for himself any more than he is free to interpret the civil law. In the state, freedom of interpretation of the Constitution is followed by secession. In the Church freedom of interpretation of the moral law is followed by dissent." Referring to the method employed in the interpretation of the Constitution, he said that the Supreme Court was usually divided, and that "the final vote was often cast by one member of the court after all, and he is usually the weakest member." "But," he added, "in the Catholic Church the interpretation of God's law is not the result of a chance division, but to a man chosen almost by the machinery of heaven itself."

So Mr. Cockran does find at least one point of difference between the Republic and "the Church." There can be no doubt that Mr. Cockran's loyalty to the Republic is equalled only by his loyalty to "the Church," and that his loyalty to the latter is equalled only by his loyalty to the former, and perhaps he is not to be blamed for this illusion that one is the exact counterpart of the other. Mr. Cockran has the happy faculty of being able to present things to an audience so that they appear to be so whether they are so or not, but he is usually more

happy and rational in the choice of the positions in defense of which he employs his gift of eloquence than in the above instances.



Whatever *Harper's Weekly* may have been a while back it is evident that under its new editorial management it is neither the apologist for imperialism nor the ally of Romanism. Its editorial utterances now have the ring that those of a journal of its standing should have. Regarding American brutalities in the Philippines, and with special reference to the Smith order, it says:

The whole business smacks too closely of Weylerism to find any toleration in this country. We have applied to the Spanish general the epithets of Butcher and others of woful significance too persistently to permit of our facing about at this late date and even tacitly approving of methods precisely similar to his. We declined to permit the Spaniards to prolong the campaign of cruelty instituted by him in Cuba, and in October, 1897, the United States peremptorily demanded the recall of General Weyler. We are face to face with an analogous position to-day, only the boot is on the other leg. It is our own inhumanities that we are called upon to abandon, and what was our plain duty in the case of an outsider four years ago is none the less our duty in our own case to-day.

With reference to another most significant phase of this whole matter, it says:

Unless the American idea of government is all wrong, the people have got to understand, or the whole mechanism will go to pieces, and here is the reason for a continual and vehement protest against a danger which is insidious because it takes on the guise of a good. Under the theory that the people ought not to be bothered or worried, or with the conviction that a policy can be best carried out to the ultimate benefit of all concerned if questioning and criticism is avoided, some very well-meaning servants of the public adopt and justify the policy of silence.

Imperialism has gone ahead on the

avowed assumption that the wisdom, the intelligence, the good judgment, the honor, the humanity of the American people was such that the domination of another people could be safely undertaken by them. *So soon* it has come to the conclusion that this work is of such a nature that the wisdom, the intelligence, the good judgment, the honor, the humanity on which alone it can have any possible justification, is not needed, and in fact is far more of a hindrance than a help. And thus the policy of silence, a strange policy for a republic, and certainly a new policy in America, is adopted and defended.



According to *The Independent* a defender of religious liberty has appeared in the very stronghold of orthodoxy and intolerance in Russia. The Greek Church of Russia has for a decade or longer been holding annual "Mission Congresses" for the purpose of devising ways and means to spread its influence and especially to extend its power over the "Rascol," or Sects. At the last annual congress, which was held at Orel, Mr. Stacowitz, the marshal of the nobility in the government of Orel, delivered an address that has not only greatly stirred the whole orthodox church, but has secured wide attention not only in Russia but in other countries. The speaker declared that in antagonizing religious liberty the Russian Church authorities had been building its structure in forgetfulness of the cornerstone. He declared that it should be the privilege of every one to decide upon his own religious convictions, and that any person should have the privilege of severing his connection with the state church if he so desired, and the state should not any longer punish such a step. This is said to have been the first time a prominent and influential Russian official and layman in a

convention consisting chiefly of clergymen and ecclesiastics, assembled purposely to suppress religious dissent, has uttered such sentiments on religious liberty and tolerance. Although such utterances come very near being crimes in Russia, it seems that the only thing that is being done to counteract the influence of the address is the publication of pamphlet replies, or attempted replies, for the arguments are said to be exceedingly weak, by some of the church bishops.



"If a generation ago the United States Government," says the *Chicago Israelite*, "had given official recognition to the See of Rome, the entire Protestant church of this country would have protested with loud lamentation. Time and the spread of toleration has, however, modified the antagonism between the two great branches of Christianity, and to-day the red of the "Scarlet Woman" no longer appears of so deep a dye as in the past. Hence the appointment of an American commission to Rome to confer with the Pope in regard to the settlement of matters concerning the Catholics of the Philippines, has scarcely caused a ripple upon the surface of Protestant susceptibilities. Who knows what the next generation may witness? Perhaps a minister plenipotentiary or even an ambassador may represent this country at the Vatican—at least, some of the Catholic papers are hinting at such a possibility."

We hope the *Israelite* does not look upon the disposition to accept as fitting and proper the official recognition of the See of Rome by the Government as an indication of true tolerance. Does not all this rather suggest that there is something seriously the matter with Protestantism, and that the Papacy is making considerable headway in this country in

her old policy of insinuating herself into the affairs of government?



A reporter of the *New York Sun*, who has been investigating "society" with reference to the matter, finds "a wide difference between the Sunday of a dozen years ago and that of to-day," and predicts that there are to be "no more blue Sundays." In New York society "the social importance of Sunday was first brought to notice a few winters ago when dinners at the fashionable hotels became a custom. People grew weary of the quiet of the afternoons devoid of the usual calling, shopping, or business activity, and they flocked to the gayly-lit dining rooms for the evening meal. Then calling in the afternoon between 4 and 6 became popular, and now it is quite customary to entertain with tea and music on this afternoon as on the others of the week." It is said that well-known clergymen are now content if the people will only attend church in the morning, and "no longer frown upon Sunday entertaining, golf and other out-door sports" in the afternoon. No doubt this is the drift of things in "society," but so far as legislation is concerned there is very little to indicate that "blue Sundays" are a thing of the past. He who engages in common labor on Sunday, or carries on some little store or business for the support of himself and family, is likely to find the day "blue" for some time to come.



The manager of the Duluth, Minn., baseball team has announced that the club will be disbanded as the result of the action of the Civic Federation, which, with Rev. H. W. Knowles, Methodist preacher and State chaplain, at its head, has issued notice that all persons playing ball on Sundays will be vigorously

prosecuted under the State Sunday law. A number of business men have expressed their disapprobation of the threat of the Civic Federation, and are of the opinion that its action in this matter will be more to the detriment of the city than to its advantage. They say that there are many things going on on Sunday far more harmful than the "legitimate and clean sport of baseball," and that to stop the ball playing is simply to furnish more business for the saloons. The Civic Federation announces its object to be "the closer union of the churches for the moral welfare of the city." It is peculiar how these closer unions of the churches for the moral welfare of communities seem to find their chief expression in Sunday enforcement, which often, as in the above case, is more in the interests of immorality than of morality.



Rev. Dr. E. J. Lloyd, rector of St. Mark's Episcopal church in Cleveland, Ohio, in a recent sermon declared his belief that "any man, especially if he be one of the toiling masses, may be present at any ball game on Sunday without committing a breach of the Sabbath law." He pointed out that among the Jews, "after the lapse of many generations, exaggerated views of the Sabbath law became prevalent, and Christ himself was the first to rebuke them." He thought that it would be wrong for a professing Christian to attend a Sunday ball game, "unless he had paid homage to God in the early hours of Sunday morning, and was ready at the end of the day to return to God's house and give Him thanks." This seems to be the position generally taken by Episcopal clergymen, and it agrees substantially with the position and practise of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics. Certainly it is not a breach of the *Sabbath* law to be present at *Sunday* games.

It was ruled by Judge Lochren, of Minneapolis, recently, in a suit of the Pressed Steel Car Company against the Eastern Railway of Minnesota, that in reckoning damages at so much per day for failure to deliver cars at the time specified by contract the Sundays must be excluded from the computation. The plaintiff held that the defendant could recover nothing for the Sundays intervening between the date specified and the date of final delivery, "as such delivery [Sunday delivery] would be illegal." The defendant maintained that it was like computing interest, that the days were merely units of compensation and that the fact that some of them were Sundays made no difference at all. The court agreed with the plaintiff, and it was ordered that one-seventh of the damages that had been collected, with interest, should be returned, and thus the legal "Sabbath" was given whatever "protection" such an incident may afford.



Angling on Sunday in Massachusetts is a crime, but bicycling is not. This is suggestive of the consistency (?) which obtains in State regulation of "Sabbath" observance. An effort is being made to repeal the law against fishing. An exchange soliloquizes thus with regard to Sunday fishing: "A man may be of a religious nature and yet fish on Sunday. It could be understood if even a rather strict Sabbatarian should indulge in the sport on Sunday. Such a person might reason that it was wrong for the fish to bite on Sunday, when they should be at home thinking of higher things than grasshoppers, flies, frogs and other luxuries, and that getting caught on Sunday is their punishment for not observing the day in proper manner. If fishing breaks the Sabbath it is at least a very mild way of doing so, when compared with the many other forms of sport that

in these days are indulged in upon that day."



In a vigorous speech on the excise question in this city recently District Attorney Jerome declared that it was "a question which has to be met with sound, cold judgment, and not with any preconceived notions that we are legislating for a body of saints, or that you are to turn this cosmopolitan city into a Garden of Eden. You will have to keep in mind that you are legislating for a community with much of sorrow and sin in it; that you are making laws for men and women who, while not absolutely bad or absolutely good, are constantly slipping back in their attempts to use their own dead selves as stepping stones to higher things." He very properly declared that "the 'American Sabbath' element have no right to saddle their views on those of a different opinion."



Replying to the protest of a laboring man against the Sunday closing of meat markets, William Fishbeck, of Burlington, Iowa, secretary of the local union of Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, declares in the *Gazette* of that city that "in contrast with his hundreds of people who want the markets open Sundays, there are thousands of Christian people who want the markets closed on Sunday." It would be interesting to know what leads to this attitude on the part of "thousands of Christian people"—whether it is simply the desire that the meat cutters and butchers shall have more freedom from business, or whether it is the desire that the religious institution shall be honored and observed.



An illustration of how difficult and almost impossible it is to change and reform abuses which are common in these

times is afforded by the fact recently clearly brought out that the Board of Railroad Commissioners of New York State, which was instituted to protect the rights of the people against the railroad corporations, is now virtually a creature of those corporations. When it was first instituted it was denounced by railroad officials as a weapon of Socialism threatening the "confiscation" of railroad property, but now it is said to be composed of "a body of machine politicians whose services are paid for by the very railroad companies they are supposed to control."



Mayor Ryan, of Elizabeth, N. J., has granted to "amateur ball players the privilege of playing ball on Sundays." He says that he sees no harm in the sport, "provided there is no disorderly conduct and no selling of intoxicating beverages on the grounds." When he finds that these conditions have been violated he will revoke the permit. Three thousand people witnessed a game on a recent Sunday, and games were announced for succeeding Sundays. Thus while Sunday ball playing is officially recognized and endorsed at Elizabeth it is stopped by mounted policemen at Newark, as noted elsewhere.



According to the testimony of a soldier who was there, the Balangiga massacre of American soldiers in Samar last fall came because of harsh treatment of the natives by the Americans. Ninety men were compelled to work long hours in the heat during several successive days without food, except what the villagers may have furnished them, and to sleep at night on the ground in the extremely close quarters into which they were huddled. Two or three relays of men were treated in this way, and the village food supply of rice and fish destroyed, before the massacre occurred.

The meat cutters and grocery clerks of Chicago have received help in their efforts for Sunday closing from an unexpected quarter. High prices have so affected the meat trade that dealers find it to their advantage to close on Sundays, and are doing so quite generally. But the assistance of the beef trust is not altogether an unmixed blessing to those who desire Sunday closing, for "while the clerks and meat cutters are joyful over this victory they are wroth over the fact that some of the men have lost their jobs or been compelled to work for less pay."



It is rather difficult to completely separate church and state when once they have been united. Mail matter and telegrams issued by the Vatican are toll-free throughout Italy under a law passed May 31, 1871. Immediately after the recent robberies at the Vatican the telegraph lines of Italy were used by the Vatican to the amount of 38,000 francs, for which the Italian government made no charge. Much of the stolen valuables have already been returned to the Pope, among them being \$80,000 in American government bonds.



The Waconia (Minn.) *Patriot* announces that "the merchants of New Prague have unanimously agreed to close their stores on Sunday so that they and their clerks may rest upon the Sabbath according to the Scriptures." The agreement went into effect on May 1, and each merchant has "deposited a cash consideration as an act of good faith in the matter." This sort of Sunday closing is proper enough, and it is not clear how anything more than such voluntary agreements as this can rightfully and justly be employed in the matter.

It was recently reported from Wisconsin that the paper-mill workers of that State had gone on a strike "for the Sunday rest day," their demand being that the mills should be closed from 6 p.m. Saturday to 7 a.m. Monday. This is the first strike for a weekly rest day that has ever come to our notice. Of course if workmen are required to work on Sunday against their wishes they have the right by any and every means consistent with the rights of others to seek to bring about a change in the matter.



The Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) *Press* reports that that city "has a novelty in the way of a Sunday barber shop. There are fourteen barber shops in the city, and all are members of the union except this one. This particular shop closes on Saturday, and is open for business on Sunday. The proprietors are Seventh-day Adventists and observe the rules of that church. How long this innovation will last remains to be seen."



It is announced that Sunday burials are at an end in Trenton, N. J., "owing to the action of the coachmen's union, which is backed by the ministers." Clergymen of La Crosse, Wis., have adopted a resolution "against holding funerals on the Sabbath," and "propose to make a strong fight against the practise."



The Montevideo (Minn.) *Leader*, having expressed its hope that the baseball fraternity of that city would not "encourage games on the Sabbath," the Appleton *Press* remarks that "public sentiment would heartily endorse the abolition of the practise everywhere."



There are signs that 1848 is coming back to Europe, says *The Independent*.

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.

"Plattsmouth is enforcing the Sunday-closing law," reports the Lincoln (Neb.) *Record*.

Max Amdusky, a butcher of Syracuse, N.Y., was fined \$5 on April 23 "for selling meat on Sunday."

It is reported from Toronto that "the law preventing barbers working on Sunday is well observed" in that city.

The church people of Port Washington, L. I., "are engaged in a movement to stop Sunday fishing" at that place.

The mayor of Alton, Ill., has issued an order forbidding the sale and delivery of ice on the streets of that city on Sundays.

By order of the police department the common victualers of Taunton, Mass., were forbidden to sell food and serve meals on Sunday, May 4.

The Epworth League Alliance of East Harrisburg, Pa., has by a unanimous vote petitioned the mayor to enforce the Sunday-closing law against all places of business.

From West Superior, Wis., it is announced that "the ministers of the city will start a crusade against the conduct of visitors in the several parks on Sundays."

On April 22 Lawrence Santospits, of the Roxbury district, Boston, was arraigned in the police court on the charge

of "keeping open shop on the Lord's day." He was fined \$5.

Work on a large building in Birmingham, Ala., which had been permitted on the previous Sunday by the mayor, was stopped at the order of the chief of police on May 4.

Mounted policemen endeavored to put a stop to Sunday ball playing on May 4 in Irvington, a suburb of Newark, N. J. Complaints of being disturbed by Sunday games had been made by residents.

On May 4, by direction of the Monongahela (Pa.) Presbytery, the ministers of the United Presbyterian churches throughout that presbytery preached "on the enforcement of the Sunday laws."

Through the efforts of the Ministerial Association of Waynesborough, Pa., the merchants of that place have agreed to stop the sale of everything but newspapers and drugs on Sundays hereafter.

Seven boys, ranging in age from eleven to eighteen years, were arrested "for playing ball" at one point in Philadelphia on Sunday, April 27. We did not learn the outcome of the hearings, which were to take place in the police court the next day.

On May 10 the Ministers' Union of Hoboken, N. J., appointed a committee to interview the governor of the State "in the interest of Sunday observance" in that city. Sunday ball playing seems to

be the principal thing to which the ministers object.



The "reformers' league" of Prairie du Chien, Wis., is making efforts "to close all business houses on Sunday." Thirteen saloonkeepers were the first to feel the effects of the movement, having been notified to appear for trial on the charge of Sunday selling.



John J. Yopp, a grocer and meat dealer of Terre Haute, Ind., was recently arraigned in court at the instance of the Retail Merchants' Association on the charge of keeping open on Sunday. The magistrate did not consider the case strong enough, and discharged the prisoner.



By action of the sheriff of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, the playing of the game of ball in the American League series, scheduled for Sunday, May 11, was prevented at Cleveland. An injunction against Sunday playing has been applied for by five persons living near the ball grounds.



The Retail Clerk's Protective Association of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., has announced that it "will prosecute all merchants of the Soo who keep their places of business open in violation of the State statute." A dispatch says this means "a closed town on Sundays for all classes of business."



John Haney, a veteran barber of Casseleton, N. Dak., was recently arrested on complaint of E. J. Goodrich, "who conducts a rival shop," on the charge of violating "the Sabbath-breaking law." Mr. Haney asked for a jury trial, and was promptly acquitted. On the strength of this the local papers announce that "it

is no crime in North Dakota to keep a barber shop open on Sunday."



At a recent meeting of the city council of Little Rock, Ark., a communication from the Secretary of the Retail Grocers' Association, calling attention to violations of the Sunday-closing law by grocers, was read and discussed, and the matter was referred "to the mayor, with power to act."



On a recent Sunday Henry Schroeder, owner and occupant of a house at 1772 Weeks Avenue, New York, spent fifteen minutes in repairing the gate in front of his house. His next-door neighbor complained that he "disturbed the peace" thereby, and he was fined \$10 in the Morristania police court.



The Indianapolis-Kansas City American Association ball game, scheduled for Indianapolis on April 27, was "transferred until later in the season owing to the Sunday law." Mayor Bookwalter declared that "as long as there is this law on the statutes that forbids the games they will not be permitted."



Constable Newble, of Clinton, N. Y., on a recent Sunday arrested several fishermen, who were passing through the village, on the charge of "Sabbath-breaking." The case against them was rather weak, and after an admonition from the justice that the town proposed "to preserve an orderly Sunday," they were discharged.



Druggists Isaac Katz and E. T. Hatch, of Boston, were fined \$10 each in the municipal criminal court on May 1 for Sunday selling. One sold candy and the other soda on the previous Sunday. On the same day J. Lipinsky, Gil Brown,

Henry Shapiro, and Maurice Bercovitz were fined \$10 each "for working on the Lord's day."



One of the results of a recent series of revivals in Watertown, N. Dak., is announced to be "a move to shut off Sabbath desecration." Those engaged in the movement are "determined that Watertown shall have no Sunday ball or excursions this summer," and are now "studying the statutes to decide upon their legal rights."



G. H. Gilbert, a barber of Winchester, Va., was recently arrested and fined "for keeping his barber shop open on Sunday." At the time the police entered his shop to make the arrest one of his customers was a city councilman. This is said to have been the first enforcement of "the Sunday, blue laws" in Winchester for some time.



Beginning with Sunday, May 4, the "selling of cigars, tobacco, ice cream, candies, soda water and other luxuries on Sundays" was forbidden in Williamsport, Pa. "All offenders will be arrested, and if proven guilty of a crime will be fined." The action of the authorities is "the outcome of numerous complaints made of late by church people and others."



Two men, one of them a seventh-day observer, were recently arrested at Rock Hall, Md., on the charge of Sunday labor. As nearly as we have been able to learn the prosecution has fallen through, the court before which the cases were called having referred the matter back to the committing magistrate, who was not disposed to consider it again.



E. R. Strome, a prominent merchant of Minto, N. Dak., was recently arrested and tried on the charge of "selling goods

on the Sabbath day." "He was found guilty and sentenced to pay a heavy fine," and the word from the clerks of the place is that "he will be given plenty of attention during the balance of the season if he does not agree to close with the balance of the merchants."



The merchants of Lyons, Iowa, have been notified by the city authorities that "hereafter they must close all day Sunday under penalty of prosecution under the State law." The only exemptions to the order are restaurants, drug stores and livery stables. It is said that "certain citizens, or an organization of citizens, are the ones who intend to see the law enforced."



Although the Retail Grocers' Association of St. Joseph, Mo., has, in the recent decision of Police Judge Carolus declaring the present Sunday-closing ordinance invalid, met with what its president denominates "a stunner" in its efforts for Sunday closing by law, the campaign has not been given up, and with the cooperation of the clerks', meat cutters', and butchers' organizations it proposes to secure the passage of a new ordinance.



In response to the petitions of dealers in ice-cream, candies, fruit, mineral water, cigars, etc., a member of the Montreal, Canada, city council recently gave the requisite thirty days' notice that he would soon introduce an amendment to the present Sunday-closing ordinance so as to allow small shop keepers to keep open on Sundays. He expressed himself as strongly in favor of closing the large stores, many of which are said to be open on Sundays.



An Indianapolis jury, to which had been submitted "the legal issue of the validity of the Sunday-closing law," re-

cently spent eighteen hours in balloting and debating on the question, and then failed to reach a decision and had to be discharged. The case was that of Gottfried Graf, a grocer, who had been prosecuted by the retail grocers' and clerks' associations for keeping open on Sunday, and had appealed from the judgment of the lower court.



A campaign has been started by the Retail Clerks' Union, of Omaha, Neb., "to have the grocery stores of the city closed on Sunday." It takes the form of the circulation of petitions at first. It seems that the Retail Grocers' Association has been "working on the same plan for several weeks," also. With the grocers and their clerks both in favor of Sunday closing of stores it is difficult to see what more is necessary in order to secure Sunday closing. If they want to close, why do they not close?



The playing of golf, polo, tennis and bridge whist on Sundays by the fashionable winter visitors at Aiken, S. C., a popular winter resort, has stirred up the ministers of the place. They have adopted resolutions "denouncing the Sabbath-breakers," and have appealed to the city council for strict enforcement of the Sunday law. The council has not shown any great alacrity in acting in the matter, believing that it would be an injury to the town commercially by driving away the wealthy winter visitors.



Senator Hand, of Cape May, N. J., recently introduced into the legislature of that State a bill to repeal those portions of the present Sunday law "which make unlawful printing and selling newspapers, selling milk, walking, riding, driving and bathing for recreation, hiring horses and wagons, and hiring or renting bath-

ing suits on Sunday." All these things are now commonly done and many people would be surprised to know that they are illegal, but they are under the Sunday law as it has come down from the past.



The action of the legislature of Manitoba, Canada, allowing the city of Winnipeg to decide for itself with regard to running street-cars on Sunday, has stirred up several of the friends of Sunday enforcement and they have sent to the local papers some long and vigorous communications of protest. The "physical and moral welfare of a civilized people" is declared to be dependent upon "the civic day of rest," and it is considered a terrible thing that so important a matter is allowed to be regulated by local authority.



The barbers of Evansville, Ind., who close their shops on Sunday "are determined that Sunday shaving shall stop, and say they will use every means within their power to accomplish their object." The city officials have refused to cooperate with them, saying that they will not enforce the Sunday closing law against one line of business while others are allowed to go on. And they "regard the matter as something out of their line, and think if a man wants to keep his place open on Sunday it is nobody's business but his own." These officials take a sensible view of the matter.



At a recent annual meeting of the Wheaton (Ill.), Golf Club an effort was made to change that portion of the constitution forbidding Sunday playing. After quite a warm discussion the proposition was defeated by a vote of twenty-seven in favor and twenty-five against, it being necessary to have a two-thirds vote in order to amend the constitution. A

motion to permit playing after one o'clock in the afternoon, with a provision that members carry their own clubs, "thus relieving the club of the stigma of contributing to the demoralization of caddies," was also defeated.



The saloon-keepers of Tomah, Wis., have organized for the purpose of compelling "every barber shop, restaurant, livery stable and other business place to close on Sundays." This action is taken because of a recent order of the mayor directing that the saloons be strictly closed on Sunday. The saloon men are said to be "highly indignant at what they term unjustifiable discrimination against them." Such cases as this afford the friends of Sunday enforcement good opportunities to demonstrate whether or not they really believe that there is a great difference "between the liquor traffic and every other business."



At a recent session of the Executive Committee of the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance of Canada, at Toronto, it was decided to send a delegation to the managers of the principal railway systems to ask that they "make an effort to secure a cessation of the great and increasing unnecessary traffic on Sundays." It was declared that 50,000 persons were "deprived of their weekly day of rest by the Sunday traffic." It was also decided to call upon the Canadian authorities "to prohibit the importation into Canada of the Sunday editions of American newspapers, and the landing in Canada of American Sunday excursions."



At a meeting of the "Pastors' Union" of Detroit, Mich., on May 5, "an appeal was made to the citizens of Detroit to take such an interest in the election of municipal and State officers as shall se-

cure the amendment of Sunday laws." A committee, of which Rev. A. H. Barr, of the Jefferson Avenue Presbyterian church, was the secretary, reported that "very many of the saloons are open on the Lord's day," and declared strongly against Sunday theaters, Sunday golf, and Sunday baseball. "It is a fact," read the report, "that during the season the interests of baseball are regarded as paramount to those of Michigan law."



After securing the co-operation of twelve merchants of the place Mayor Shotwell, of Scott, Ohio, on May 7, issued this notice, to go into effect on the following Sunday:

To the Business Men of Scott:

As Mayor of the village of Scott, I hereby request you to close your places of business on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, except in cases of absolute necessity.

The *Scott Review* says that the places of those business men who did not sign the Sunday closing petition or agreement "will be more closely watched, and for the first infringement of the law they will be dealt with accordingly."



Several sportsmen were fined at Rockwell, Iowa, recently for hunting on Sunday. One of them, a Mr. Quimby, a deputy game warden and deputy United States marshal, "presented in extenuation of his Sunday shooting that he conscientiously observed Saturday as his Sabbath day, and his honor replied with some asperity that he couldn't conscientiously accept the statement as extenuating evidence, and felt that a nice little plaster of about \$14.30 would have to be applied." It is not likely that Mr. Quimby observes the seventh day, but he probably got as much benefit from that portion of the law exempting seventh-day observers as any one of them would get if arrested for Sunday work.

A dispatch from Cedar Falls, Iowa, under date of April 24, announced that "a joint committee representing the churches and the women's Christian associations will soon wait upon Mayor Robinson and the members of the city council and petition them to enforce the Sunday-closing laws." The committee "will urge that the council order the cessation of business of every kind during the Sabbath hours, and particularize that drug stores, restaurants, livery stables, clothing stores, and in fact all stores of any kind and character, be forbidden to keep their doors open." It was not known what action the mayor and council would take in the matter.



A communication signed by "Taxpayer" has been published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) *Herald* calling attention to the fact that both State and city law "expressly forbid and provide for the punishment of Sabbath-breaking" and forbid all kinds of traffic on Sunday. "Yet," the writer goes on to say, "we know that almost any article that can be bought during the week can be bought just as easily on the Sabbath day, and that some of the stores in our city make no pretense of closing on Sunday." The communication concludes by calling upon the three candidates who are running for mayor to declare themselves "on this question."



The business men of Lawton, Mich., many of whom are Jews, are adhering strictly to the Sunday closing law, owing to the efforts of the Law and Order League of that place. Some time since the league sent a communication to every business man in the place notifying him of its purpose "to make complaint against the proprietors of all business places found unlawfully open on the first day of the week." It was stated that the

reasons for this action were "that the step is in the interest of morality," and "that existing law should be obeyed and enforced." It is understood that the Baptist minister of the place has been the leading spirit in the matter.



The barbers' union of Manitowoc, Wis., is not relying upon the customary appeal to the law in its effort to secure complete Sunday closing of shops in that city. One barber has refused to join the union, and continues "to keep his shop open Sundays contrary to union regulations." In order to accomplish their object the barbers have adopted what is termed a novel plan, but certainly one that is not novel to "trust" operators. They have opened "a three-chair, first-class barber shop next door to Schweitzer's place, where free shaves will be given every Sunday, the shop to be run by the different union barbers alternatively." It is believed that "in this way Schweitzer can be forced to capitulate."



At a recent meeting of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Retail Grocers' Association members called attention to the fact that a number of stores were being kept open a part of the day on Sunday. Strong resolutions were adopted, expressing "unqualified disapproval of the Sunday grocery store," and declaring that the association would "use every legitimate means at its command to secure the closing of all grocery stores all day Sunday throughout the city." It was declared that no merchant would "find it either profitable or beneficial to his trade to keep open on the Sabbath day; first, because he is violating the laws of nature, and, second, because he will earn the opprobrium of all who regard this day as one of rest and necessary to right living."



Although having secured the passage

of a law making it a misdemeanor to sell meat on Sundays, the butchers of New York still find it necessary to work very much as of old to secure Sunday closing. At a recent meeting of the Benchmen's Association of Retail Butchers Sunday closing was a prominent topic, and it was decided to circulate a petition among the "boss" butchers and "obtain their signatures in favor of Sunday closing." It is said that "if by June 1 most of the butchers do not sign, the association will start to fight the matter in court. Bosses will be arrested under the vice and immorality act of 1888, providing a fine of \$2 for every piece of meat sold on Sunday." The butchers are finding out that legislation is not as effective in this matter as they had supposed.



The Washington (Pa.) *Observer*, of May 5, described at some length the launching on the previous day of a "crusade against vice," in which "the law is to be invoked," and in which Sunday enforcement is to be a prominent feature. The "launchers" were "Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts and Rev. O. R. Miller, superintendent and field secretary, respectively, of the International Reform Bureau." These gentlemen "made addresses at a number of churches and at the Y.M.C.A., and advocated extreme measures against alleged violations of the Sunday laws," which they had discovered by a personal "tour of the news stands and restaurants of the town Sunday morning." In a series of resolutions passed by the Y.M.C.A. the burgess was called upon "to suppress at least the crying of Sunday papers which is not only illegal but useless, . . . and disturbs churches and homes and mars the quiet of the day."



From Matteawan, N. Y., comes word

that "the Rev. Plato J. Jones, a Presbyterian minister, has raised an animated discussion as to whether Sunday work for the town is proper or otherwise." A bridge which spanned the Fishkill Creek and connected the two sections of the village was swept away by a flood recently, and the public has been greatly inconvenienced thereby. The contractors who have the work of reconstruction in charge had been offered a bonus to complete the bridge before Memorial Day, and on May 11 a large force of men worked on the bridge. The result was that "the clergymen filed a protest and consulted a lawyer for a mandamus," and it was expected that an injunction against Sunday work on the bridge would be secured by them.



An experience that he had hardly bargained for came to Wm. C. Wellman, president of a New York local branch of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters' and Butcher Workmen's Association, as a result of his activity in behalf of Sunday enforcement on April 27. He had a butcher arrested on the charge of selling meat on Sunday, and in giving his evidence in the police court declared that he had purchased from the prisoner 15 cents' worth of chops. The magistrate turned to the Penal Code and read to him the section which says that any person who aids, abets or induces another to commit a crime is as guilty as the principal, and then told him that he (the magistrate) would have to hold him on his own testimony as accessory to the crime which he was seeking to establish. He was released on bail, and tried several days later, with what result we did not learn.



The South Side Grocers' Association of Minneapolis has commenced "a strong campaign for the Sunday closing of all

grocery stores in the city." Circulars have been sent to all the grocers of the city in which it is set forth that "it is both a moral and a State law for the retail grocers to close Sundays," and "those who violate this law are liable to both a fine and imprisonment, and may pay more in fines than their entire day's sales amount to on Sunday." It is declared that "over nine-tenths of the grocers of this city close on Sunday," and the significant inquiry is made: "Are you endeavoring to take advantage of them because they observe the laws, and to secure trade which does not rightfully belong to you?" The president of the grocers' organization has announced that all grocers who fail to heed the second warning to close on Sunday will be prosecuted under the State Sunday law.



Sunday ball playing has occasioned some stir in West Nashville, Tenn., recently, and "effectual efforts will be taken to stop the Sunday desecration." Rev. O. C. Peyton, of the Howell Memorial Baptist church, has issued what he designates a "timely warning" "to whom it may concern," in which he quotes from the Tennessee Code the law "against ball playing, etc., on the Sabbath day," and, "in the name of our law-abiding people," he demands "of the resident constable of the thirteen civil districts of Davidson County that the above law be strictly enforced, and all offenders punished." He declares that as a citizen of West Nashville he is "sincerely and deeply concerned for the morals of our boys, the peacefulness of our Sabbath, and the good name of our beautiful town." The penalty in Tennessee for engaging in any game that "is played with ball, bat, or club," or for encouraging, aiding, or assisting in playing any such game, on Sunday, is a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$50 for each offense.

A deputation of six persons representing the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance of Canada waited upon the Minister of Customs at Ottawa on April 14, and "urged that the importation of Sunday newspapers into Canada should be prohibited, and also that the officers of the Customs Department cooperate in preventing the landing of Sunday excursions from outside Canada." "Both of these evils," it was declared, "have become pretty widespread, and are producing very serious conditions in the neighborhoods affected." It was urged that the provincial laws had been found inadequate to meet the situation, and that only the Dominion authorities could prevent these "evils." Inasmuch as the customs authorities control the entry and departure of vessels in the public harbors of Canada, it was urged that at their discretion they could refuse "to provide facilities for that purpose, which they are in no wise compelled to provide," and thus prevent the landing and embarking of Sunday excursions. The Minister of Customs promised to give the matter his consideration.



Sunday night entertainments have followed the opening of a new theatre in Appleton, Wis. This has occasioned quite a vigorous protest on the part of the ministers and some church members of the place. The Presbyterian minister urged his people "to withdraw their patronage until Sunday performances are no longer given," and the Congregational minister has declared that "if the management of the opera house does not close the place on Sundays, he will take the necessary legal course and close it by law." A union meeting of church people has been held for the purpose of taking steps "to suppress Sunday shows." One interesting feature of the situation is that among the 1,500 stockholders in the theatre building are many influential church

members who side with the management of the theatre rather than with the ministers. The president of the Lawrence University has announced that any student from that institution "apprehended in the act of attending a performance on Sunday will be dealt with most severely."



The city council of Cranston, R. I., recently decided to make "all possible endeavors to enforce the laws against Sunday selling." It was understood that this action was taken with special reference to saloons, but the chief of police, in carrying out his instructions, felt called upon to close the postoffice, and as a result people were unable to get into their lock boxes for mail. This action met with very little favor, one paper remarking that "the chief of police of Cranston should carefully avoid making himself ridiculous in the matter of Sunday-law enforcement," and that "he should not assume that because the order-loving citizens of Cranston want Sabbath quiet they expect him to go to the length of closing the postoffice, or doing other things equally foolish and futile." At the next meeting of the city council a resolution was submitted stating that the previous action of the council with reference to Sunday closing applied only to saloons, and not to barbers, bakers, milk dealers, etc., but no action was taken on the resolution.



The introduction into the Ohio legislature of a bill repealing the law against Sunday baseball has greatly stirred the friends of Sunday enforcement in that State. At a mass-meeting held in the Trinity Congregational church in Cleveland, where ministers and others spoke in protest against the passage of the bill, it was declared that "our most sacred institutions are imperiled;" that the question raised was not "whether we shall have

Sunday baseball, but in reality whether we are to have any Sabbath at all;" that it "was an attack upon the religion and the freedom of the people to worship," and that "the passage of any bill which would permit a desecration of the Sabbath is a blow at morality and would result in spiritual anarchy." The Ohio Law and Order League has been working up a sentiment against the passage of the bill, and the Secretary, Rev. Alexander Jackson, has declared that four Baptist, eight Congregational, eleven Presbyterian, eleven Methodist, and five churches of other persuasions in Cleveland and vicinity have put themselves "on record as unalterably opposed to any tampering with the present Sabbath law in favor of baseball or any other form of Sunday desecration."



Although there was very strict Sunday enforcement in Boston on April 20, it hardly equalled that of the following Sunday when, in addition to druggists, fruit dealers, bakers and laundrymen, the Sunday enforcement order was extended to and enforced upon dentists, photographers and even "camera fiends." Photograph galleries were obliged to suspend entirely, while dentists were allowed to pull and fill teeth only when "the molar was aching." Work on artificial teeth was prohibited. It seems that even the sale of postage stamps was not allowed, and the *Boston Journal* related at some length the difficulty that a young woman had in securing a stamp for a letter that she desired to despatch immediately. After much urging and many refusals the clerk finally bethought himself of a stamp that he had in a little book in his vest pocket. He hastily gave this to the young lady, and thus secured the retraction of her declaration never to buy "another cent's worth of goods from you as long as I live." The dissatisfaction

caused by this strict enforcement for several Sundays no doubt contributed much toward the passage of the bill by the legislature permitting the sale of ice-cream, soda-water, etc., on Sunday.



As a result of complaints by the "Sabbath" Society several ball games were stopped and a number of persons arrested for taking part in the same on Sunday, April 27, in the Westchester district of Greater New York. One of the games stopped was that being played by the boys of the "Catholic Protectors" on the grounds of the institution. It has been the custom at this place for years to have a ball game every Sunday afternoon, such diversion being considered good for the boys by "Brother" Leontine, of the "Christian Brothers," who is in charge of the institution. Boxes are kept at the gates where spectators can contribute whatever money they are disposed to give. Those in charge of the institution protested strongly against the interference with the Sunday playing, holding that they had a right to have the games or not as they chose on their own premises. On the following Sunday, May 5, another game was played in order to make a test case of the matter, and when the boys who had been arrested were arraigned in the police court the next morning Magistrate Meade upheld the contention of the institution and discharged the boys, holding that as "they were playing on the private grounds of a private institution they should have been left alone."



The anticipated opening of the baseball season at Battle Creek, Mich., on May 4, by a game between the Grand Rapids and local teams, was prevented by the action of five persons—a lumberman, a teamster, a painter, a shoemaker and a carpenter—who, following "the

precedent set by the supreme court in the case of a preacher who stopped Sunday ball in Owosso by serving notice on the sheriff that he must stop the games or be held responsible," notified the sheriff that he must, under the statute in which "any public diversion, show, entertainment, game or play" is prohibited on the first day of the week, prevent the playing of the game. Although it is said he did not personally favor the crusade, the sheriff notified the ball players that the game could not be played. But it seems that some members of the local team disregarded the order and were arrested. A dispatch states that "Battle Creek is distinctively a workingman's town, and few have leisure to attend week-day games," and that during previous seasons Sunday playing has proceeded without molestation. The ball people threaten that if this Sunday enforcement against them continues, they will stop the food and other factories which are run on Sunday in Battle Creek. They anticipate that this step would put an end to the Sunday enforcement movement.



Three grocermen of Lynn, Mass., were recently arraigned in the police court of that city on the charge of "selling goods on the Lord's day." The evidence presented was of such an unsatisfactory character that the magistrate discharged the defendants. The Grocers' Association had complained to City Marshal Burckes that small grocers about town were keeping open on Sunday, and he resolved to stop the practise. "To that end he detailed one of his special officers in plain clothes to go among them and make such purchases as he could, the evidence thus obtained to be used in court. Special Officer House was selected as the plain-clothes man, and as a result of his work warrants were sworn out against John Egan, Jacob Robin-

son and Walter G. King." The officer testified that he had purchased goods from each of these grocerymen, but as he had no one to corroborate his testimony the judge pronounced the evidence insufficient. Mr. King testified that he did sell the article mentioned, sugar, but that he did it to accommodate. "He knew it was in violation of the law, but the special officer told him that he wanted to make some lemonade for a person who was sick, and he accommodated him, although there was a sign hanging up in the store saying, 'No groceries sold on Sundays.'" The judge very properly declared, as he discharged the grocer: "I don't like this style of getting evidence—holding out inducements to a man to violate the law. I don't think a man ought to be urged to violate the law." And certainly it is despicable in officers of the law, by means of deception and artifice, to induce people to do what they pretend to be trying to prevent.



The matter of Sunday ball playing has occasioned some little agitation in Austin, Minn., recently, and the outcome has been that, "as a result of the efforts of the Austin ministers, Sunday games have been prohibited." From Rev. Alfred Cressey's account of his participation in a meeting called by the ball people at the outset of the agitation, to which they invited those opposed to Sunday playing, we take the following:

On reading the object of the meeting my soul was "stirred within me." Although wearied with the day's labor, and preferring some one else would attend, I got ready and went, inviting a few others to go with me.

We found ourselves invited to the basement of the Fox hotel to urge the citizens of Austin to become wilful transgressors of the laws of our country, and the laws of the God of our fathers, and our God.

After the address by the gentleman from St. Paul or Chicago, I, Alfred Cressey, took the floor, read the invitation, or challenge, as I

called it, and said to the gentlemen present in a kind and friendly manner what I was there to do. I told them I was not opposed to the men enjoying themselves on six days in the week by playing ball, but on Sunday I was decidedly opposed to the business. It is contrary to the laws of the United States and Minnesota that games should be played on what we call Sunday, or the Lord's day. And further that the laws of Minnesota forbid it, and all persons playing or taking part in the same become transgressors of the law and lay themselves subject to arrest and a fine of two dollars each for doing the same. And still further, if they organize a ball club with the intention of playing games on Sunday, they become wilful transgressors of the law and are not good citizens. . . . I assured them that I meant business, and should oppose all Sunday ball games with all the authority and influence I had, even to the calling for the help of the laws of the State if necessary.

On the last Sunday in April some twenty-five or thirty of the ball players of the place assembled about three miles south of Austin for a game of ball, but the sheriff and Rev. Cressey were telephoned for, and the playing was stopped. A local paper observes that "Sunday ball playing is prohibited by a State law and, while it cannot be regarded as a harmful sport, it is a desecration of the Sabbath and should be abstained from on that account."



A recent Monday night entertainment at the Chase Theatre in Washington, D. C., was preceded by a dress rehearsal in the theatre on Sunday afternoon, which occasioned somewhat of a stir when the fact became known. It is said that "several well-known society women, when they learned that the rehearsal had been held, returned the seats which they had purchased." Rev. Henry Y. Satterlee, Episcopal Bishop of Washington, was moved to write a vigorous letter regarding the matter to the editor of the *Washington Post*, in which he said:

I was so much surprised by your account of

an amateur rehearsal, on Sunday last, of a play to be given for charity, that at first I could scarcely give it credence.

An event like this must have such serious consequences upon the moral tone of the community that, not only as a minister of God, but as one who owes a responsibility to Christian parents, I must utter my strong protest.

Whether we regard the first day of the week as the "American Sunday," or as the "Lord's Day," its associations have been hallowed in the eyes of the people of Washington ever since this city was founded.

All through the nineteenth century the traditions of American life have been preserved in Washington to a remarkable degree; and its atmosphere has been characterized by simplicity of life, by courteous consideration for the conscience of others, and by reverence for all that is good. Even those who have not shared the convictions of most of the residents regarding the observance of Sunday have, from motives of courtesy, respected the feelings of Christian people.

I most earnestly trust that we who are living in the twentieth century will realize the great responsibility resting upon us in maintaining these traditions of the past.

The theatre people claim that the rehearsal had to take place, and that Sunday was the only available day for it. Of course there is nothing especially improper in the action of those who returned their tickets, or in the letter written by Bishop Satterlee, but as such feeling with regard to Sunday entertainments, etc., is so commonly attended by or leads to an appeal to the law, it seems proper to us to call attention to this incident.



An organization of haberdashers, hatters and shoe dealers of Louisville, Ky., known as the Merchants' Outfitters' Association, has commenced a movement which has for its object the closing of all stores in that city on Sunday. The following petition has been presented to the mayor:

Hon. Charles F. Grainger, Mayor of the City of Louisville, Ky.—Sir: We, the under-

signed, representing the Merchants' Outfitters' Association, an association composed of the haberdashers, hatters, and shoe dealers of the city of Louisville, respectfully beg to call your attention to the general violation of Section 1,321 of the Kentucky Statutes, which section provides as follows:

"If any person on the Sabbath day shall himself be found at his own, or any other trade or calling, or shall employ his apprentices, or other person, in a labor or other business, whether the same be for profit or amusement, unless the same is permitted above (ordinary household work, or work of necessity or charity or work required in the operation of a ferry, skiff or steamboat, or steam or street railroad), he shall be fined not less than two nor more than fifty dollars."

We are endeavoring to secure an enforcement of this statute, to the end that our salesmen might have the advantage of it. Our efforts to accomplish this are practically of no service while some of our merchants persist in violating the statute. It is a law enacted for the benefit of the workingmen, and for the general moral good of the community, and we respectfully urge that you use all the means which the law affords to enforce this statute. Its operation will work no harm, and will meet with general approval.

The mayor promised to give the matter his immediate attention. The president of the Merchants' Association is reported as follows: "Louisville is about the only city of its size in the United States that has no respect for the Sabbath. Ever since I can remember some merchants in this city have persistently kept their places of business open on Sunday, thereby forcing their neighbors and competitors to do likewise or else to suffer in the long run. There is really nothing to be gained in the end by keeping open on Sunday if everybody would close, and it would certainly show a proper spirit of Sabbath observance and allow those who wish to observe it as a day of rest to do so. It is a shame that any of the stores in this city keep open on Sunday."



From Poughkeepsie, N. Y., comes the announcement that "photographers will

keep open galleries on Sunday hereafter." Recently a new photographer came to the city, and, contrary to the custom of those already engaged in the same business, he kept his gallery open and took pictures on Sundays. This aroused the other photographers, who protested that it was in violation of "the law in this State which prohibits the transaction of any business on Sunday, except it be a business of necessity." After some discussion it was decided to have Mr. Howe, the offending photographer, arrested. The arrest is thus described by the *Poughkeepsie News-Press*:

The policeman made his way into the gallery, where the photographer was busy taking pictures. The photographer pointed to the crowd of people who wanted to be served with pictures on Sunday as one of the reasons why he should be allowed to operate his camera. "Arrest him, arrest him!" cried the other photographers, "and let us see if it is not possible to have a quiet Sunday in this Christian city."

Mr. Howe decided to make a test case of the matter, and although "he was told that the State law was very plainly against him, and that if he were allowed to work, carpenters, laborers, blacksmiths, barbers, tinkers and tailors might also claim the right to toil on through the whole Sunday," he called for a jury

trial. The prosecuting attorney "threw his whole heart into the case, as he was very anxious that no violation of the Sunday law should go unpunished." Persons who had visited the gallery and had their pictures taken on Sunday testified to the fact, but admitted that "posterity would probably never be able to look upon their faces" if pictures could be taken only on week days. This point was emphasized by the defense, which claimed on the strength of it that the work was necessary. It was also contended that the law was not violated, inasmuch as the work was not done in public. Although the jury was composed of men whom "no one would ever have thought any amount of evidence could convince that any sort of business being transacted on Sunday was anything but a violation of the law," they rendered an immediate verdict of "not guilty." And now the other photographers announce that their galleries will be open every Sunday hereafter. One leading photographer explained that "some time ago the Law Enforcement Society made us close up, or rather sent a notification to us that we must close, and hence we did not like to see an outsider come in and do what the city's own taxpayers and citizens could not do."



The Buddhist sect at Kyoto, in Japan, has framed a parliamentary bill for the union of Buddhism with the state. The sect lately sent a delegation to the celebrated Buddhist priest, Shaku Shoyan, for the purpose of obtaining his indorsement of the bill, but the attempt was a failure. The delegates, so the Japanese *Weekly Mail* reports, "were told that what they proposed could not be reconciled with the constitution, which grants freedom of conscience to all; that a re-

ligion which requires the support of the law is evidently in a debilitated condition; and that if there is a genuine desire to propagate the faith and develop its useful potentialities, the plain course is for its priests to lead pure lives, to devote themselves to learning, and by examples of piety and erudition to show the wholesome efficacy of the creed they professed." The Rev. Shaku Shoyan displays the wisdom of a Franklin.—*Truth Seeker*.

NOTE AND COMMENT

There is a truth more than suggested in the following words by E. S. Marten in *Harper's Weekly* that should be taken very much to heart by the American people:

It is not so certain that we at home can afford to shudder at the water cure unless we disown the whole job, and if we do disown the whole job we cannot put the responsibility on the army. The army has obeyed orders. It was sent to the Philippines to subdue the Filipinos, and it seems to have made remarkable progress. Having the devil to fight, it has sometimes used fire; having liars to fight, it has sometimes used lies; having semi-civilized men to fight, it has in some instances used semi-civilized methods. That was inevitable, and will be inevitable as long as soldiers are men . . . It is our job, not theirs.

The great, inclusive, comprehensive cruelty has been that of the general situation which has seemed to constrain our people to compel the Filipinos to submit to our domination. That cruelty we determined to be necessary, and each of us has a share of responsibility in it, and in all the minor, supplementary, cruelties it has involved.



Commenting on the statement of Bishop Montgomery, Catholic, made before the Los Angeles (Cal.) Ministerial Union, that "if the great non-Catholic bodies of this country . . . would unite with the Catholics and German Lutherans in asking for a modification of the present system [of public education], the sense of fairness that there is in the American people, when appealed to, would grant it," the *Lutheran Witness* says:

Why the bishop should link the German Lutherans with the Catholics in this connection it is rather difficult for us to comprehend,

for they have never and do not now seek any support for their schools from the State, but they willingly and gladly support them with their own money and cheerfully pay their share of the taxes besides for the support of the public schools.

The Catholics had better emulate the Lutherans in this matter instead of trying to create the false impression that they have the Lutherans with them in the scheme for securing public support for Catholic schools.



The attitude of those Jews who favor the entire repudiation of the Sabbath and the substitution of Sunday as a rest day in its stead is no doubt expressed in these words, uttered by Dr. Emil G. Hirsch in a sermon at Israel Temple, Chicago, on the evening of May 16:

The Sabbath of the Jews is dead. Let us bury it. God never ordained the Sabbath day. It is an institution of man. Only millionaires and peddlers can observe the Jewish Sabbath in these days of activity. Sunday, to all intents and purposes, already has become our day of rest. The inspiration of the Sabbath can be restored only by participating in the flood of life about us and recognizing as our day of rest the day set apart by the nations in which we live.

Sentiment must be thrown to the four winds, and we must realize that it has come to be with us a question of economic and industrial life or economic and industrial death. We have no right to put aside opportunity to do good for others simply because sentiment demands that we remain idle on a day of activity. No lawyer has the right to place his client's freedom in jeopardy because his sentiment will not permit him to go to court on Saturday. No merchant has the right to imperil his independence by closing his store on the Jewish Sabbath.

We will make no comment upon this matter now, except to say that at the public meeting under the auspices of the "Sabbath" Observance Committee of the Presbyterian General Assembly, held in this city on the afternoon of May 18, these words were read with evident great satisfaction by the chairman, who rejoiced at the prospect that "the Jews are going to give up their Sabbath and come over and observe the rest day with us on *the Sabbath*;" and that Dr. Hirsch has also recently declared that the religion of Judaism is a religion of this life and holds out no promise as to a life beyond this, and that therefore he did not want to preach any more funeral discourses.



Significant of a condition of things that is increasing rather than lessening, notwithstanding the roseate representations commonly made with regard to the present and the future, are these words which occurred in the report of the St. Louis grand jury which recently investigated the traction franchise bribery corruption in that city:

Our investigation, covering a period of ten years, shows that with few exceptions no ordinance has been passed wherein valuable privileges or franchises are granted until those interested in the passage thereof have paid the legislators the money demanded for action in each particular case. . . . The evidence shows us that there are in St. Louis men of seeming great respectability, directors in large corporations and prominent in business and social circles, who have not hesitated to put up money for the purpose of bribing through the assembly measures in which they were interested. When called before our body some of these men have added to the offence of bribery the crime of perjury, and only escaped the ignominy attaching to their infamous conduct by reason of the fact that the evidence, though satisfying to our minds, would not be admissible in the trial courts.

Four of these men of "seeming great respectability," two of whom were millionaires, were indicted by the grand

jury. It is said that the St. Louis Central Traction Company distributed a corruption fund of \$250,000 in securing a recent franchise, and afterwards sold it for \$1,250,000. A prominent journal asks why it is that such things do not startle the country and occasion more comment and denunciation than they do, and answers its own question with these significant words: "Because conditions in St. Louis are typical of conditions in many other cities and towns of the country." Some are declaring that the only cure for such evils is "municipal ownership of public utilities." This might for a time work better, but it would not cure the evil. The evil is not in the system of managing things, but in the men who manage, and no new system will be able to produce new and incorruptible men.



Not the least significant of the developments of recent years in the United States is that of the assumption of extra-judicial powers by the judiciary, popularly described as "government by injunction." The *Springfield Republican* says:

The judge who has taken to himself the functions of lawmaker, law administrator and law prosecutor, as well as law interpreter, is a condition and not a theory at the present writing. "Government by injunction" has already become a substantial growth, and as matters are now proceeding it will not be long before much of the administration of the law will be taken over from the duly constituted authorities into the hands of courts of equity. The ordinary machinery of the law is set aside without any warrant of law. We accordingly drift into a government not of law, but of men.

"Government by injunction" has become notable in connection with conflicts between capital and labor, and has usually been employed at the request of employers in restraining and limiting the action of striking workmen. It has therefore incurred the special enmity of labor. But recently it has reached out in an-

other direction, Judge Grosscup, of Chicago, having issued a restraining order against the officials of several of the great railroads centering in that city, commanding them to observe the Interstate Commerce Law with reference to rate discrimination. And now the *Railway Age*, which speaks for the railroads, protests against this resort to the court of equity in a matter that is amply covered by statute. The corporations, having so often in the past invoked this sort of interference, cannot with very good grace object when it is occasionally felt by themselves. The danger in the whole matter is just what the *Republican* points out: it tends to substitute a government of men for that of law—the will and personal inclination of an individual in the place of the mandates of the law which it is his business to administer. In this matter even *The Outlook* ceases for the moment its habitual cry that “all is well,” and observes:

It is not in accord with the spirit of English civilization that the protection of society should be vested in courts, empowered to prosecute, try, and sentence, without the cooperation of juries, or of officials representing the executive branch of the government. Such an enlargement of the functions of the judiciary, no matter for how good a purpose, is to be regarded with alarm.



With the unconditional surrender of General Malver, one of the principal Filipino leaders then in the field, on April 16, to the Americans, came the announcement of the complete “pacification” of the provinces of Laguna and Batangas. But at the same time came the news that trouble had started with the Moros, the fiercest warriors in the archipelago. The Moros had refused to deliver to the American authorities certain men said to have murdered two American soldiers, and an expedition was planned to be sent against them, it being deemed “ab-

solutely important that our authority shall be respected by these people and that the sovereignty of the United States shall be fully acknowledged.” Some fighting had already taken place when instructions were received from Washington to withdraw the American forces from Mindanao, but as it was emphasized by the army officials that withdrawal “would destroy American prestige,” later instructions were given to “go ahead, using every means to avoid a general conflict.” A battle resulted on May 3 with the forces of the Sultan of Bayan, in which the 300 Moros were severely defeated. The Sultan and several of his leading Dattos and many of his followers were killed, and eighty-four were taken prisoners. Eight Americans were killed and forty-one wounded. Later about half of the Moro prisoners were killed in an attempt to escape. The taking of the fort in which the Moros were entrenched was officially described as “one of the most gallant performances of American arms.” “By attacking them,” read the official dispatch, “they have been completely crushed—the only kind of lesson these wild Moros seem to be able to understand.” And it is declared that this “secures respect for United States authority in the center of Moro savagery.” While it is now thought that this ends all Moro resistance, it is not at all unlikely that it is the beginning of a conflict worse than any that has thus far been known in the Philippines.



With regard to the two measures now proposed in Congress for dealing with the Philippine question, *The Commoner* says:

The main point of difference between the Democratic plan and the Republican plan is that the Democratic plan recognizes the right of the Filipinos to self-government and prom-

ises that independence shall be given as soon as a stable government is established, while the Republican plan contemplates a permanent colonial policy patterned after England's former government in the American colonies and her present government in India.

And to those who are neither Republicans nor Democrats this appears to be a fair statement of the situation, and it also appears that the Republican plan is the one that will be carried out by the Government. The taking of a very detailed census of the islands as soon as peace is established with the view of finding out "whether or not all or certain of the Philippine Islands are capable, fit and ready for the establishment of a permanent popular representative government," is contemplated in the latter plan. The authority of the Philippine Commission is increased, and at its discretion it is "to continue to establish additional municipal and provincial governments . . . with popular representative government so far and so fast as communities . . . are capable, fit, and ready for the same, . . . with the purpose of gradually extending to municipalities and provinces permanent popular representative government." The restrictions on the suffrage now are such that but a small per cent. of the people can vote in these municipalities, and it is directed that these restrictions shall continue. Nevertheless this, with the autocratic control of the Commission, is called "popular representative government," and to all appearances this is the kind of "popular representative government" that is to be made permanent. The Democratic plan, which is never likely to get any farther than it already has, provides that the Filipinos shall be allowed to elect delegates for the holding of a constitutional convention as soon as possible after hostilities have ceased; the issuing of a proclamation by the President of the United States declar-

ing the independence of the Filipinos as soon as a constitution and government shall have been formed and sufficient guarantees have been given for the performance of treaty obligations with Spain and the safety of those persons who have adhered to the United States, and the United States shall have been given possession of such lands and waters for naval, military and coaling stations and terminal facilities for submarine cables as the President shall designate; that full amnesty is to be granted to all inhabitants of the islands for all political offenses against the United States; and that within two months after the inauguration of officers elected under the Philippine constitution the President is to cause the armed forces of the United States to be withdrawn from the archipelago. It is also provided that the President shall negotiate an agreement between the United States, the Philippines, and Great Britain, Germany, France and such other powers as may deem best, providing for perpetual neutrality and inviolability from all foreign interference with the territory of the archipelago. This bill is entitled, and it would seem properly so, "A bill to promote the welfare and to establish the independence of the Philippine Islands." The United States has boasted loudly of its benevolent intentions with regard to the Philippines—which plan will it now adopt? In the light of what has already been done, it will adopt the first and not the second plan. And when that first plan is adopted in the face of this second plan it means that republicanism is at a very low ebb in the United States, or else that it has very little influence in the councils of Government. And this is not politics; it is simply a common-sense view of a matter of very great importance.

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.
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.

A LARGE NUMBER

of subscriptions expire with this issue. If the date on your wrapper reads "June, 1902" your subscription should be renewed at once. We hope all our subscribers to whom this applies will give this matter their prompt attention.



AN OPPORTUNITY FOR BOYS

to earn their own spending money. THE SENTINEL has a plan whereby one or more boys in every community can earn a nice little sum of money each month. It requires no capital to begin with. Full particulars will be sent to every boy who is interested enough to inquire. A boy nine or ten can do this as well as one older. The sooner you begin the better it will be.

Address, THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, 11 W. 20th St., New York City.

THE JULY SENTINEL

We hope to make the next number of THE SENTINEL the best number of the year—or at any rate the best number of the year up to that time.

It can be announced already that there will appear the best portions of an excellent address on "Religious Legislation," recently delivered by Mrs. Stella Archer Maloney in Boston. Also an article by W. N. Glenn, entitled "Lest We Forget," which, going back to the times of Roger Williams, brings to view and impresses a much-needed lesson as to the inevitable consequences of intermingling religion and civil government.

There will be somewhat of an examination of Pope Leo's recent jubilee encyclical, which contains some things that deserve attention.

There will also be some articles especially appropriate to the month in which occurs the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The nation has departed far from the principles then announced to the world, and THE SENTINEL, true to its mission, will continue to call attention to these developments and point out the departures from fundamental principles.

And by no means the least important feature will be the news of the month in the way of Sunday agitations and enforcement. There is a great deal being done just now in this direction. THE SENTINEL will keep a close watch, and make a full report every month. We can announce now on this point for the July number that there will be a report of the action of the Presbyterian General Assembly on the Sunday question and the discussion attending it.

We hope to receive a large number of subscriptions and orders for extra copies in time to be filled with the July number. The orders for extra copies should not reach us later than the 20th of June. Extra copies will be sent, post-paid, in packages of ten or more at the special rate of 5 cents each.



CORONATION

A "Coronation Number" of the *Signs of the Times* will be issued under date of June 11.

It will give interesting information concerning Queen Victoria, King Edward VII., and Queen Alexandra, the accession of Edward, his coronation, etc.

Its great object, however, will be to use this occasion in a way that will bring to mind what the Scriptures say concerning the grander cor-

onation of the King of kings and Lord of lords.

The paper will be appropriately illustrated and beautifully printed. Price 5 cents each, or 2 cents each in lots of 25 or more.

Address, *Signs of the Times*,
Oakland, Cal.



A FEW COPIES

of the May SENTINEL can still be obtained. This is an especially good number for general circulation. A special price of five cents per copy will be made in quantities of ten or more to one address. Order *now*. But a few hundred left.



Be sure to read the announcement in this department for the July SENTINEL. We appoint you our agent in your locality to work up a

large club for this special issue. Act promptly, and let us have your order early.



GOOD HEALTH

for June will contain the following excellent articles: Sleep Producers, by J. H. Kellogg, M.D.; The Struggle for Existence, by David Paulson, M.D.; The School Girl's Summer Vacation, by Cecily Buscall; Sanitation for U. S. Troops in Foreign Lands, by an Ex-Soldier; Nerve Exhaustion, by W. H. Riley, M.D.; At Commencement Time, by Mrs. E. E. Kellogg; A Composite Creation; Rice as a Food in India; Strawberries; Beefsteak Going Higher.

Send your subscription at once and secure the June number. Price only \$1 a year.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

LIVE RATIONALLY

Stop taking drugs and patented poisons. They will not cure you. They never have. If so, why don't you stay cured? It is a positive fact that thousands of people go annually to their graves, victims of the dosing habit. Are you to be one of them? Stop and think.

Investigate the newer and saner method of curing disease. The method by which you will stay cured. The way to gain and retain robust, rugged health.

Study the needs of your body. Free your system of its accumulation of poisonous waste matter, by ejection and elimination through the skin and excretory organs.



The Battle Creek Hot Air and Medicated Vapor Baths alone Can Do this

Write at once for a free booklet on Health and Hygiene. Address

BATTLE CREEK BATH CABINET CO.,

297 Champion St., BATTLE CREEK, MICH., U. S. A.

"ROME IN PROPHECY,"

By Elder W. H. Littlejohn.

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

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



Cloth binding, postpaid, to any address in the Postal Union, 25 cents each; paper covers, 10 cents each. Direct all orders to the author at

HUME, CALHOUN CO., MICH., U. S. A.

AGENTS WANTED.

YOU SHOULD READ THESE

Miracles and Delusions.

If you wish to read something dealing with the foundation principles of true Christian Science as contrasted with the falsely called "Christian Science," secure a copy of "Miracles and Delusions." In it are discussed Divine Healing, The Perfect Mind, The Cause of Disease and other allied subjects. *Prices: Cloth, 50 cts.; paper, 15 cts.*

Pagan Counterfeits in the Christian Church.

A study of the pagan and papal rites, ceremonies and trappings still to be found in the professed Protestant churches. It contains a scathing arraignment of Free Masonry, backed up by reliable testimony. *Price, paper covers, 25 cts.*

Christian Patriotism.

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

The Great Nations of To-day.

In this the author plainly shows that the great nations of to-day are clearly mentioned in the Bible, and their destiny foretold. A most interesting historical and prophetic study, proving incidentally the inspiration of the Bible. *Paper covers, 25 cts.*

The Marshaling of the Nations.

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

Complete catalogue of publications mailed on request. For any of the above, address

Pacific Press Publishing Company

11 WEST 20TH ST., NEW YORK CITY

Or, Oakland, Cal. : : : : : Kansas City, Mo.

*All who see the
SENTINEL will read
this page. -- -- --*

*If your ad was here
it would be read in-
stead. -- -- -- --*

*\$25 a month will
buy this space. --*

*For further infor-
mation write -- --*

**THE SENTINEL
OF CHRISTIAN
LIBERTY**

*11 W. 20th St.,
New York City*





“Liberty Enlightening the World”

Symbolic of what America has been to the world, of what those few great words in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence have meant to those of every race and nation struggling for freedom is the noble Statue of Liberty which stands on Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor. "Instead of grasping in her hand thunderbolts of terror and of death, she holds aloft the light which illumines the way to man's enfranchisement." The statue proper was designed by the French sculptor, Frederic Auguste Bartholdi, and was given by the people of France to the people of the United States in honor of the completion of the first century of American independence and as "a souvenir of the unalterable friendship of two nations." It arrived at New York on a French vessel in June, 1885, and was "inaugurated" in the presence of distinguished personages representing both nations on October 28, 1886. It is said that no other statue of such large proportions has ever been erected. The height from base to torch is 151 feet, and from the foundation of pedestal to torch, 305 feet. Forty persons can stand in the head, and twelve around the torch. On the tablet in the left hand, which is 13 x 23 feet, are these characters: JULY IV. MDCCLXXVI.