

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1902

No. 9

A Dangerous Tendency

By Alonzo T. Jones

THERE is to-day in the United States a widespread and persistent tendency to a result which in theory everybody repudiates, but which in practice, in one way or another, the great mass of the people are steadily urging forward. This tendency has been in progress for years, and is now so plainly working on every hand that it is fairly startling; yet it all goes on so steadily and so smoothly as to seem so much a matter of course that very few discern it in its true meaning.

It is the tendency to a one-man power in this republic, which is professedly a government of the people, *by the people*.

The stupendous combinations of capital, in the uncontrollable greed and rush for wealth, in which one man holds the power to dictate in a whole business throughout the whole land, are tending more than to anything else to the development of a one-man power. Several years ago it was stated by one of the highest authorities on the subject that, because of the immense wealth which they controlled, it was in the power of only fourteen men to control the nation itself—not politically, but materially. And it is perfectly safe to say that to-day that

number is much less than fourteen. And when these men have already become so conspicuous as to attract the courteous attention of kings in other countries, it will not be long, under existing circumstances, before they will be deferred to to such an extent here that they can easily exercise an unwonted power. Let there occur a situation in which the general safety of capital shall be threatened, and let these combinations affiliate under one recognized head for defense, and there could easily be a manifestation of one-man power that would threaten the independence and supremacy of the very government itself. It was Crassus, the chief of the money power and head of the trusts in the Roman "government of the people by the people," who, in combination with but two other men who were strong politically, took absolute possession of the whole government in that ancient republic; which combination shortly and logically ended in the sheer absolutism of one-man in permanency.

The combinations of labor, in the unions, federations, and amalgamations that characterize labor throughout the nation to-day, are tending directly to the development of a one-man power. These

organizations, as certainly as those of capital, bind the individual members, without any sort of initiative or grievance of their own, to obey absolutely the word or even the sign of the walking delegate, or chief, or president. It is well remembered how that, in 1894, almost half the nation was for weeks held under the dictation of one man, the recognized and irresponsible head of a vast labor combination; and how that governors of great States found themselves required to consult that one man and obtain his permission to travel in the exercise of their official duties and obligations. Let these combinations become unified throughout the whole land, then let a strike occur, directed by the recognized head of all, and there will be displayed such an exercise of a one-man power as will threaten the very existence of the national government itself. It was just such violent exercise of irresponsible power by the labor combinations in the Roman Republic that forced the government into the exercise of absolute and one-man power in the complete abolition of all such labor combinations. The government was compelled to do this to save its own existence; but in the doing of this to save its existence the government was compelled to the exercise of power that was the abandonment of government by the people and was the recognition and assertion of government by one, but under legal form. By legislation Cæsar finally abolished all combinations of trades and labor.

The combinations of politicians in strict party lines, well known as "machine politics," under the direction of what is commonly termed the "boss," tend directly to the development of one-man power in government. This is, and has been for years, recognized as entirely so in far more than one of the States of the Union. Only let this system be perfected into the

headship of national politics, let such a system become so confirmed in power as to feel perfectly safe, and there will be seen such displays of one-man power as are matched only in the life and times of the great Cæsar.

And only let the head of the combinations of capital, and the head of the combinations of labor, and the head of the confirmed national politics come to terms and enter into a fixed agreement, and there would be a triumvirate as able as was that of Crassus, Pompey, and Cæsar to decide and declare that nothing should be done in the government of the republic without their consent. Does this seem to any to be fanciful? Then simply note and carefully consider how long and how subtly the combinations of labor have striven for favorable national recognition in their contest with capital, and also note and carefully consider the solicitous activity of the head of national politics in this very direction and to this very purpose for the last three years up to the very time this is being written.

And with such a triumvirate once in operation, it would be—it will be—but a mere question of time when it would be resolved into *government by one*, and there would be seen in this Republic of the United States, as there was in that Republic of Rome, a confirmed one-man power. This is as plainly and as certainly the tendency and the logic in every way of affairs in the Republic of the United States of to-day as it ever was in the Republic of Rome. History is to-day in this Republic repeating itself to the letter. So precisely is this true that all that is needed to know the future history of the Republic of the United States is to read the history of the Republic of Rome.

The people of the United States are persistently throwing away individual self-government. Not governing themselves, there must inevitably arise a power

that will govern them : first, by the many ; next, by a few ; and last, by one. The only way of escape, the only hope for the people of the United States, is in the faith

of Jesus Christ, which brings to the individual believer in Jesus, righteousness and self-government, in view of judgment to come.



Abraham Lincoln on the Declaration of Independence

[It can never be inappropriate so long as the love of freedom endures among men to present the words of Abraham Lincoln concerning the American Declaration of Independence and the immortal principles embodied therein. But this is not only appropriate in the United States to-day, but is in the highest degree necessary and important, for the crisis which now calls for such words is scarcely second to that which gave them birth. While all of these utterances are important and it is impossible to give to many of them the emphasis they deserve, we have taken the liberty to place in italics some portions that should now be given special emphasis.—EDITOR.]

At Alton, Ill., October 15, 1858.

AT Galesburg the other day I said, in answer to Judge Douglas, that three years ago there never had been a man, so far as I knew or believed, in the whole world who had said that the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes in the term "all men." I reassert it to-day. I assert that Judge Douglas and all his friends may search the whole records of the country, and it will be a matter of great astonishment to me if they shall be able to find that one human being three years ago had ever uttered the astounding sentiment that the term "all men" in the Declaration did not include the negro.

Do not let me be misunderstood. I know that more than three years ago there were men, who, finding this assertion constantly in the way of their schemes to bring about the ascendancy and perpetuation of slavery, *denied the truth of it*. I know that Mr. Calhoun and all the politicians of his school denied the truth of the Declaration. I know that it ran along in the mouth of some Southern

men for a period of years, ending at last in that shameful, though rather forcible, declaration of Pettit, of Indiana, upon the floor of the United States Senate that the Declaration of Independence was in that respect a "self-evident lie," rather than a self-evident truth.

At Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854.

If this [Pettit's declaration] had been said among Marion's men, Southerners though they were, what would have become of the man who said it? If this had been said to the men who captured Andre, the man who said it would probably have been hung sooner than Andre was. If it had been said in old Independence Hall, seventy-eight years ago, the very door-keeper would have throttled the man and thrust him into the street.

The spread of slavery, I cannot but hate. I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its just influence in the world ; enables the enemies of free institutions to taunt us as hypocrites ; causes the real friends

of freedom to doubt our sincerity; and especially because it forces so many really good men among ourselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticizing the Declaration of Independence. . . .

I say that no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. I say this is the leading principle, the sheet-anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that according to our ancient faith, the just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed. . . .

Is there no danger to liberty itself in discarding the earliest practise and first precept of our ancient faith? In our greedy chase to make profit of the negro let us beware lest we "cancel and tear to pieces" even the white man's charter of freedom.

Our republican robe is soiled and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if not in the blood, of the Revolution. . . . Let us readopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it the practises and policy which harmonize with it. Let North and South—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere—join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union, but we shall have so saved it as to make, and to keep, it forever worthy of the saving. We shall have so saved it that the succeeding millions of free, happy people, the world

over, shall rise up and call us blessed, to the latest generations.

At Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857.

In those days [of the Revolution] our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all, and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed, and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. . . .

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated; and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration not for that but for fu-

ture use. Its authors meant it to be, as thank God, it is now proving itself, a *stumbling-block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism*. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas' view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

No man can vindicate the character, motives, and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country.

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it; see what a mere wreck—mangled ruin—it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain!" Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with

white Americans, were included, to be sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are all gone to plot along with the Judge's inferior races.

I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects; but no, it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise, that, having kicked off the king and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere; but no, it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—old wadding left to rot on the battle-field after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth" to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present, and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate, and will even go so far as to read the Declaration. Suppose after you read it once in the old-fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas's version. It will run thus: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain."

And now I appeal to you—to Dem-

ocrats as well as others—are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away?—thus left no more at most than an interesting memorial of the dead past?—thus shorn of its vitality and practical value, and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?

At Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858.

Now it happens that we meet together once every year, sometime about the Fourth of July, for some reason or other. These Fourth of July gatherings, I suppose, have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them.

We are now a mighty nation; we are thirty, or about thirty, millions of people, and we own and inhabit one-fifteenth part of the dry land of the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two years, and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers, vastly inferior to what we are now, with a vastly less extent of country, with vastly less of everything we deem desirable among men; we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back as in some way or other being connected with this rise and prosperity. We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were iron men; they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understood that by what they then did it has followed that the degree of prosperity which we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time, of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves, we feel more attached the one to

the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age and race and country in which we live, for these celebrations.

But after we have done all this we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have—besides these men descended by blood from our ancestors—among us, perhaps half our people, who are not descendants at all of these men; they are men who have come from Europe—German, Irish, French, Scandinavian—men that have come from Europe themselves, or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none, they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us; but *when they look through that old Declaration of Independence*, they find that those old men say that “we hold these truths to be self-evident, that *all men are created equal*,” and then they feel that that moral sentiment, taught in that day, evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh, of the men who wrote that Declaration [loud and long-continued applause]; *and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together; that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world.* [Applause.]

Now, sirs, for the purpose of squaring things with this idea . . . that the Declaration of Independence did not

mean anything at all, we have Judge Douglas giving his exposition of what the Declaration of Independence means, and we have him saying that the people of America are equal to the people of England. According to his construction, you Germans are not connected with it. Now, I ask you in all soberness, if all these things, if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and indorsed, if taught to our children and repeated to them, do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and to transform this Government into a government of some other form?

Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? *They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world.* You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but *because the people were better off for being ridden.* That is their argument, and this argument of the Judge is the same old serpent that says: You work, and I eat; You toil, and I will enjoy the fruits of it. Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it come from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent; and I hold, if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, *it does not stop with the negro [or Filipino].* I should like to know if, taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all

men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out! [Cries of "No! No!"] *Let us stick to it, then; let us stand firmly by it, then.* . . . Let us then turn this Government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it.

At the Dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery, November 19, 1863.

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation *so conceived and so dedicated*, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take in-

creased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a

new birth of freedom; AND THAT GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, AND FOR THE PEOPLE, SHALL NOT PERISH FROM THE EARTH.



The Vital Portion of the Declaration—As It Is Now Regarded

[We had expected to accompany the quotations here given with an article on the meaning and significance of the astonishing change of sentiment which these utterances show has in a very short time come over the nation, but circumstances have prevented its preparation. But certainly these quotations are significant enough of themselves without additional emphasis. Such an article as we had in mind may be presented later.—EDITOR.]

The Declaration has no application to the present situation. It was written by self-governing men for self-governing men.—*Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, in U. S. Senate, December, 1899.*

What are the duties of the hour? . . . Resist the crazy extension of the doctrine that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.—*Whitelaw Reid, Chicago, February 14, 1899.*

This nation has become a giant who is no longer content with the nursery rhymes which were sung around his cradle.—*President Northrup, of the University of Minnesota, at the Chicago Peace Jubilee, October, 1898.*

The statement found in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" is not true. The statement that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is not true, and never has been.—*Wm. D. Foulke, of Indiana.*

The idea that all men are created equal is not the fundamental law of this country. The fathers had better sense than to put that phrase in the Constitution. They wrote it in the Declaration, which was

simply their manifesto to European powers, and is not law.—*Chicago-Times-Herald, 1899.*

These are indeed great principles [the principles of the Declaration and the Constitution]; they underlie our free institutions, but they are not capable of literal application. . . . Governments derive their just powers from the consent of SOME of the governed.—*Senator O. H. Platt, of Connecticut, in the U. S. Senate, December 19, 1898.*

The Civil War knocked the last remaining breath of humbug out of the Jeffersonian phrase against government without the consent of the governed. . . . We will govern the Filipinos with or without their consent so long as we are held responsible by the civilized world for their conduct.—*Chicago Times-Herald, January 21, 1899.*

The axiom that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is a baseless assumption. . . . We may dismiss from further consideration both the phrase "consent of the governed" and the philosophy from which it springs. . . . No man has a natural right to share in the administration of

the government under which he lives.—*Lyman Abbott, D.D., 1901*

I am not impressed with the argument that all government is by the consent of the governed. That is a proposition that, however nicely it looks theoretically, we have never adopted in practise in this country. . . . *The rule does not apply to republican representative government.—From speech in Congress by Representative Dalsell, of Pennsylvania.*

The contention in this discussion that all government rests upon the consent of the governed cannot be maintained. . . . There can be no doubt that the Declaration of Independence included the white citizens of the Colonies. . . . *It referred only to those people who were to govern as well as to be governed.—Senator Wm. M. Stewart, of Nevada, in the U. S. Senate, June 2, 1902.*

It has been erroneously taken for granted in certain quarters that the Declaration of Independence affirms, or at least implies, that the right of self-government is one of the inalienable rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator. . . . The Declaration of Independence does not affirm, nor even remotely imply, that self-government is an inalienable right.—*The Outlook, May 27, 1899.*

The Declaration of Independence was the greatest campaign document that was ever written, but when the colonial representatives argued the question that all men are created equal, *what they meant was that they were just as good as Englishmen.* They had no thought of the negro slaves who were toiling on American plantations, or of the Indians, whom they despised and detested. The application was direct to themselves, and the sweeping generalizations were gratifying because they imparted the necessary fervor

to the document.—*Chicago Times-Herald, 1900.*

It is a favorite notion now to quote the words, "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," as if these embodied a law of application to all inhabitants alike. . . . It was never the intention [of the signers of the Declaration] to assert that the negroes or the savage race must give consent before just government should be established over them. . . . The Declaration of Independence was a formal notice that the inhabitants of the Colonies consented no longer to British rule. . . . *That is precisely the meaning of the language.—New York Tribune, January 9, 1899.*

As to that hallowed document which declares that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, if that is to be literally construed *there never was a greater falsehood palmed off by the devil upon a credulous world.* . . . There never was a greater absurdity than the declaration that the people everywhere, regardless of character, regardless of advancement, of intelligence, and civilization, are not subjects for popular government. . . . There are conditions of society, there are nationalities *for the government of which the iron hand is better than the hydra-headed monster.—P. S. Henson, D.D., at a mass-meeting in Chicago, May 7, 1899.*

The Declaration of Independence was made to suit a particular existing condition of things. . . . The proposition [that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed] was general, but the application was to a particular situation. Obviously, Thomas Jefferson, the framer of the Declaration, did not intend to apply it to all people,

for the social and political conditions would have made such an application absurd. . . . The Declaration meant simply that the Colonies had become tired of the British domination, deeming it oppressive, and intended to set up a government of their own by the right of revolution. *They were not laying down a principle for anybody except themselves.*—*New York Sun, January, 1899.*

Considerably more than a century ago a certain notable declaration was made in this country to the effect that all men ought to be free and independent. This is *merely a generalization of the French school of Voltaire and the encyclopedists. It is a dictum absolutely lacking foundation in history and incapable of syllogistic justification.* It was, however, a handy phrase for us to employ when asserting our right to break away from the mother country; it suited the exigencies of our situation in 1776 admirably, though *in itself but a bit of sublimated demagogism.* . . . To bring forward this declaration in the year 1900, in connection with our treatment of the Filipinos and the Cubans, is as gross an absurdity as ever was practised.—*United States Investors' Review, Boston, 1900.*

The Declaration of Independence is not an infallible epitome of political truth. . . . It so happens, as a matter of fact, that this document says nothing whatever about self-government. Only one clause, and that a parenthetical one—the phrase, “deriving their just powers, from the consent of the governed”—can be interpreted to imply, even remotely, any doctrine of self-government, and this implication from this phrase is by no means a necessary one. . . . What the Declaration of Independence affirms is that governments exist for the benefit of the governed; and *this is different from affirming that they*

must always be administered by the governed. . . . It was against the spoliation of the governed for the benefit of the governor, *not for any abstract right of self-government* that the Declaration of Independence was a protest and the American Revolution a successful revolt.—*The Outlook, May 20, 1899.*

The framers of the American Declaration of Independence were inspired by an ardent patriotism and by lofty motives, and their statements embodied a sufficient justification of the cause to which they sought to devote their countrymen; but there was no revelation of universal and eternal truth in the “glittering generalities” with which they prefaced those statements. *On the contrary, they consecrated to perpetuity some of the most obvious fallacies that were ever promulgated to mislead men.* They proclaimed it to be a self-evident truth “that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Whatever interpretation and exegesis may do for this declaration, in the sense in which it is commonly accepted and used in the place of argument, *it is neither self-evident nor truth.* . . . All men are simply not created equal in any possible sense of the word.—*Amos K. Fiske, in North American Review for December, 1899.*

These end-of-the-century days have proved hard times for general theories and universal principles in political science. . . . One of the theories which has suffered most in these critical days is that of “natural rights.” . . . The revolt against it grows apace. . . . No society finds it possible to acknowledge an “inalienable right” to life. . . . We are hearing a great deal in these days of the “self-evident truth” that governments

derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . . It is a declaration of principle which, in the stated form, fares ill under the microscope. Examined judicially, *it is seen to be impossible*, since it violates the fundamental assumption of every state—the assumption of power to determine what is best for the continuance of its own life. Examined historically, it is seen that no people has ever acknowledged it in practise. *Even the fathers who promulgated it could not entirely have meant it.*

Viewed in the light of the Federal Constitution, the State constitutions, and contemporary statutes, they meant something very different. Had they been of an exacter turn of mind they would have written something different. . . . This absolute generalization regarding consent, disregarded by its formulators and practically disavowed by every state that has ever existed, is likely to gasp out its last breath in the pending campaign.—*The Independent, October 25, 1900.*



More Important Recent Testimony on an Important Matter

[The matter presented below should be sufficient to demonstrate that when it is said that a tremendous revolution has and is taking place in the United States that the statement is no idle and fantastic notion of shallow and partisan minds. Men of the first order of intelligence, who have no selfish interest whatever to serve in the matter, see that a grave crisis has been reached in the history of the American nation. This is something that all persons should know and recognize, and therefore we present what is given below. The italicized portions are made so by us, not by the writers or speakers.—EDITOR.]

From the "Atlantic Monthly" (Boston) for July

THERE has been a good deal said about the Declaration lately, and much more is likely to be said before the Philippine troubles are over. The past three months have thrown more light upon the essential character of our occupation of the Archipelago than the preceding three years have done. . . . We have found out something at last. The knowledge is not very pleasant, but it sticks in the memory, and all the fire-crackers and fun of the glorious Fourth will not keep American citizens from reflecting that *we are engaged, on that anniversary, in subjugating a weaker people who are struggling, however blindly and cruelly, for that independence which*

we once claimed as an "inalienable right" for ourselves.

For subjugation is the topic of the day; it is no longer a question of "expansion," or even of "imperialism." *It is plain enough now that we are holding the Philippines by physical force only*, and that the brave and unselfish men we have sent there have been assigned to a task which is not only repellant to Americans, but bitterly resented by the supposed beneficiaries of our action. . . .

Now that we have learned how the thing must be done, if it is to be done successfully, the conscience of the country is ill at ease. It is neither necessary nor desirable to dwell on the fact that some of

our soldiers have disgraced their uniform. Such men have shown the pitiable weakness of human nature under distressing conditions which they did not create; but the story is a shamefully old one; it has been told for three hundred years in the history of tropical colonization. Lincoln put the whole of it, with homely finality, into his phrase about no man being good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent. Not "strong" enough, nor "smart enough," nor "Anglo-Saxon enough;" simply "not good enough." Upon that point there is nothing more to be said.

To leave the Philippine Islands under

some amicable arrangement, to the Philippine people may be called "scuttling"—if critics like that word—but it will be a return to American modes of procedure, to that fuller measure of democracy which is the only cure for the evils of democracy. For the chief obstacle to the subjugation of an Asiatic people by Americans lies in human nature itself. The baser side of human nature may always be depended upon to strip such conquest of its tinsel and betray its essential hideousness; while *the nobler side of human nature protests against the forcible annexation of a weaker people by the countrymen of Washington.*

*Hon. George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, in Speech in U. S. Senate,
May 22, 1902*

All this cost, all these young men gone to their graves, all these wrecked lives, all this national dishonor, the repeal of the Declaration of Independence, the overthrow of the principle on which the Monroe doctrine was placed by its author, the devastation of provinces, the shooting of captives, the torture of prisoners and unarmed and peaceful citizens, the hanging men up by the thumbs, the car-loads of maniac soldiers that you bring home,—are all because you will not tell now whether you mean in the future *to stand on the principles which you and your fathers always declared in the past.*

The senator from Ohio says it is not wise to declare what we will do at some future time. Mr. President, we do not ask you to declare what you will do at some future time. We ask you to declare an eternal principle good at the present time and good at all times. . . . We ask you to declare not at what moment you will get out of the Philippine Islands, *but only on what eternal principle you*

will act, in them or out of them. Such declarations are made in all history. They are in every important treaty between nations. The Constitution of the United States is itself a declaration of what this country will do and what it will not do in all future times. The Declaration of Independence, if it have the practical meaning it has had for a hundred years, is a declaration of what this country would do through all future times. The Monroe doctrine, to which sixteen republics south of us owe their life and safety, was a declaration to mankind of what we would do in all future time. Among all the shallow pretenses of imperialism this statement that we will not say what we will do in the future is the most shallow. Was there ever such a flimsy pretext flaunted in the face of the American people as that of gentlemen who say, if any other nation on the face of the earth, or all other nations together, attempt to overthrow the independence of any people to the south of us in this

hemisphere, we will fight and prevent them, and at the same time we think it dishonorable to declare whether we will ever overthrow the independence of a weaker nation in another hemisphere?



There never was a time when, if we had declared that we only were there to keep faith with Spain, that we only were there to restore order, that we only were there to see that no friends of ours should suffer at the hands of any enemy of ours, that the war would not have ended at that moment.

You are fighting for sovereignty. You are fighting for the principle of eternal dominion over that people, and that is the only question at issue in this con-

flict. . . . You undertook in the treaty [with Spain] to acquire sovereignty over the Philippine Islands for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they regarded it as a declaration of war. . . . The President sent out an order to take forcible possession, by military power, of those islands. . . . *So you deliberately made up the issue for a fight for dominion on one side and a fight for liberty on the other.*

Professor Goldwin Smith, of Toronto, in Treatise entitled "Commonwealth or Empire: A Bystander's View of the Question," recently published by the Macmillan Company

In the last Presidential election issues were mixed. The verdict consequently was uncertain. Which issue was paramount was a question greatly debated among Americans. . . . But let the paramount issue for Americans be what it might, for the world at large it was and is that between the Commonwealth and Empire. Shall the American Republic be what it has hitherto been, follow its own destiny, and do what it can to fulfil the special hopes which humanity has founded on it; or shall it slide into an imitation of European imperialism, and be drawn, with the military powers of Europe, into a career of conquest and domination over subject races, with the political liabilities which such a career entails? This was and is the main issue for humanity. *Seldom has a nation been brought so distinctly as the American nation now is to the parting of the ways.* Never has a nation's choice been more important to mankind.

The adoption of imperialism by Americans can hardly fail to carry with it a fundamental change in the moral foundations of their own commonwealth. Other polities, such as that of England, may be based on constitutional tradition. That of the United States is based on established and almost consecrated principles. The Declaration of Independence, it is true, was a creation of the eighteenth century; its abstract doctrine of human equality belongs to the political philosophy of that era. But it has living force when it says, as in effect it does, that man shall not exercise lordship over man. When the people of the United States, after recognizing Filipinos as their allies, bought them with their land of Spain, as they would buy the contents of a cattle ranch or a sheepfold, and proceeded to shoot them down for refusing to be delivered to the purchaser, *they surely broke away from the principles on which their own polity is built, and compro-*

mised the national character formed on respect for those principles.



The American Republic was the home of democracy and the hope of labor. It promised to do something more than the Old World toward correcting the injustice of nature, equalizing the human lot, and making the community a community indeed. The eyes of the masses everywhere were turned to it. To the enemies of equality and popular government it was an object of aversion and alarm. Loud, almost frenzied, was the shout of exultation with which, at the outbreak of secession, aristocracy and plutocracy in Europe hailed its apparent fall. . . . There appeared to be the best reason, at all events, for hoping that humanity had here been finally rid of two of its greatest banes in the Old World—standing armies and state churches. . . . It seemed that peace might be preached to all nations and governments more effectually than any International Conference could preach it, by the spectacle of a mighty nation, thriving beyond the other nations by industry and living on friendly terms with all its fellows, yet respected by the world, and influencing the world by its example. If the national life which had produced and which sustained the institutions, civilization, and wealth of the United States was not "strenuous" in the way of aggression and destruction, there was another way in which it was strenuous in the highest degree. If compared with old war powers it lacked the glory of war, at least of wars of rapine, it did not lack the glory of peace and home.



Against the Commonwealth three forces, distinct but convergent, are now arrayed. They are plutocracy, militarism, and imperialism. The three instinctively conspire. To the plutocrat impe-

rialism is politically congenial, while he feels that militarism impregnates society with a spirit of conservatism, and may in case of a conflict of classes furnish a useful force of repression.



We can see how wealth might, . . . without any formal change of the American Constitution, practically possess itself of supreme power. . . . If to any one such a forecast seems visionary, let him ask himself whether a few years ago he could have dreamed that the principles of the Declaration of Independence would be discarded and derided; that dominion over other races would be forcibly assumed; and that American citizens would be heard passionately calling upon their government to shoot down as rebels people struggling for their independence against a foreign yoke.



There seems to have come over us a sort of satiety of civilization, a hankering for a return to robust barbarism with its reign of force and disregard of moral ties. Churches, most of them, are carried away by the prevailing impulse, and lend the sanction of the Gospel to the love of war. . . . Those who hold the theory of tides in human history, may point to this as a tidal wave. The chief cause of the cataclysm probably is the weakening by scepticism of our allegiance to religious principles of humanity and fraternity which hitherto have not only been formally held sacred, but retained a certain amount of real force. . . . Man, it seems, after all, must have a religion. Belief in Christianity and even in God growing faint, he is taking to worshiping the flag. . . . Be the cause good or bad, the flag must be carried on to victory, and everything done with that purpose is to be deemed right. . . .

Nobody has conspired. Nobody need

be suspected of any evil intentions. There is no design, perhaps not even a desire. But there is a tendency, against which loyal liegemen of the Commonwealth may do well to guard.



The American commonwealth had the largest population of freemen in the world, and one which was rapidly growing. Its heritage reached from Arctic regions to regions almost tropical, with a range of production embracing nearly everything needed or desired by man. The world was full of its inventions and manufactures. It was the tutelary power of this continent. It was in the van of political progress. Its influence was felt

more or less in the politics of all nations. If such a state was isolation, it was an isolation the influence of which was as wide as humanity.

But a tempter crept to the ear of the Commonwealth and whispered that all this was narrow and mean. The time, the tempter said, had come for an ampler life, for ceasing to listen to the saws of Washington's senile prudence, for doffing the trader, and claiming a seat in the grand council of aristocratic and military nations. . . .



The sun of humanity is behind a cloud. The cloud will pass away and the sun will shine forth again. The aged will not live to see it, but the younger men will.



"Insurgents" and "Insurrection"

[Although the "insurrection" has been quelled and amnesty has been proclaimed for the "insurgents," it is not too late to read the following editorial that appeared in the *Detroit News-Tribune* a few months ago. The vital facts emphasized are just as important and timely to-day as ever, and it is well to consider them in connection with the words presented elsewhere in this number that have been spoken and written in recent years concerning the vital truths of the Declaration of Independence, for there is a close and intimate connection between the attitude that has been taken with reference to the Declaration and that that has been taken with reference to the Filipinos. The one is the complement of the other.—EDITOR.]

THE definitions given by the Standard Dictionary for the words "insurgent" and "insurrection" are respectively:

One who takes part in active and forcible opposition or resistance to the constituted authorities of a place or country.

An organized and armed resistance to established authority or government.

The Century Dictionary parallels them in the following language:

One who rises in forcible opposition to lawful authority. Synonym: Traitor.

The act of rising against civil authority; specifically, the armed resistance of a number of persons to the powers of the state.

Old Noah Webster, still respected by a large number of Americans, says:

One who rises against lawful authority; guilty of exciting sedition.

Open opposition of members to lawful authority.

Present interest in these quotations rises from the fact that they have been officially applied and widely accepted as applying to the attitude of Filipinos in arms against the assumed sovereignty of a government founded on the unrestricted declaration that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is nothing in the Declaration of Independence or in the recorded debates preceding its promulgation to indicate limitations on the applicability of the statement. There is no hint

of restrictions or reservations, no exceptions of color or race. It is a pronouncement of the rights of man, not of men or of any class or grade of men. Its scientific foundation is the certainty that government will develop in proportion to the needs and capacities of those governed. Its inevitable ethical demand is that no government shall be imposed from the outside. That is the fundamental postulate on which the American Republic rests. Robbed of that it has no higher title to existence, no broader basis of stability, than any government rooted in force and the necessary accompaniment of divine right of kings, which is the only possible attempt at philosophic justification of monarchies.

Until the spring of '98 there was not one American in one hundred conscious of the existence of the Philippines. Their people were equally unaware of us. Suddenly our ships appeared on their coasts. We destroyed the power of Spain, and she ceased to attempt to exercise the authority she had claimed over the islands. The natives in arms declared a government of their own. We had not yet acquired even the lame title which we later bought from Spain, and we had made no declaration of our future purposes with regard to the country. We had not even asserted a purpose to exercise the rights of sovereignty there. We had some ships in the bay and some soldiers in Manila, but our warfare was avowedly against Spain. This was the situation when the Filipinos, justly suspecting our government of an undeclared purpose to substitute its authority for that of the Spanish crown, and being unable to obtain even so much as an outline of the manner and method of administering the islands, attacked the invading force which, after making use of them against a common enemy, had flouted them and treated them with contempt

and distrust. There was no "constituted authority," no "established government" against which they could raise an insurrection or become insurgents. They merely attempted to drive out an invader who as yet had made no claim of even a technical right to occupy their territory.

How then did they become insurgents? By what possible stretch of administrative imagination could their natural and creditable hostility become "sedition," punishable by death or long imprisonment? According to the testimony of our most advanced imperialists, the title which Spain yielded to us had long been forfeited by insufferable oppression and by demonstrated lack of might. If it had been forfeited, what did we acquire?

By calling these men insurgents, by accusing them of "treason," our administrations have sought to create, by indirect influence, the impression of rebellion, of treachery, of revolt against just authority. The conditions precedent to such a situation never existed in the case. Our right to administer the affairs of the islands was never recognized by these people. Our dominion over them was never established. The conquest has never been completed. From any rational point of view they are merely resisting attempted conquest. The intervention of Britain, of Germany, of France, of Austria, or Russia would have been quite as natural, quite as expected, quite as welcome. Resistance to the pretensions of any one of these would have been insurrection in exactly the same sense that resistance to us is insurrection, but in that case Americans would have noted the struggle only to denounce the monarchical conquistadores and praise the brave and determined islanders for their noble struggle for liberty and independence.

"Treachery" to any crown would have been quite as much treachery as to the Stars and Stripes, which, in the Philip-

pires, stand for arbitrary assumption of authority, for the torch and torture and murder, as the means to the end that we may subjugate a people whom we found committed to the ideals of independence and self-government. It is and was none of our business whether that government would have assumed the form of a republic, a constitutional monarchy, a dictatorship, an absolutism or an anarchy. Our sole responsibility was to the ideals on which our fathers had founded a new nation and which we had faithfully and

successfully followed for a century and a quarter. Nothing but the spirit of conquest ever attempted to discover another and a further responsibility in the premises. A policy which makes a "damned incendiary document" of the Declaration of Independence cannot minister to the interests of the nation that Washington created; and to classify as "insurrection" resistance to the exercise of powers derived from strength alone is a proposterous denial of our own right to a national existence.



A Consistent Sunday Bill

[At the hearing on the proposed Sunday legislation for the District of Columbia, before the District Commissioners on May 27, Gen. Wm. Birney, a lawyer of Washington, and a friend of true American principle as regards the relations of religion and government, appeared against the bills, and among other things read to the Commissioners and others present the "Sunday-rest" bill given below, which he had drawn up for the purpose of exhibiting some of the inconsistencies of such legislation. We are glad to say that it served the purpose very effectively.—EDITOR.]

A BILL

To promote rest in the District of Columbia,
on Sunday, and prohibiting business
on that day.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House
of Representatives of the United States
of America in Congress assembled,*

SEC. 1. That it shall be unlawful for any firm, corporation, voluntary association, society, official person, tradesman, landlord, boarding-house keeper, mechanic, workman, servant, professional man, or other person whatsoever, to do, on Sunday, any labor, business or work, whether of their ordinary callings, or of any kind whatsoever, or to keep open any building, office, shop, kitchen, or place of business or labor of any kind, in which money is paid, received or collected, or wages or salary earned, or for any person whatsoever to enter on that day into any such building, office, shop,

kitchen or place of business or labor, kept open as aforesaid.

If any person violates any of the provisions of this Act, he or she shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars; and for each subsequent offense, not less than fifty nor more than one hundred and fifty dollars; and if the fine is not promptly paid, the convict shall be sentenced to work in striped clothing on the chain-gang until the fine imposed shall be worked out at the rate of thirty-three and one-third cents a day, and fully paid.

SEC. 2. That it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution under this Act that the defendant is a Jew, or a Seventh-day Baptist or Adventist, or an Agnostic or a Rationalist; or that he or she has had rest enough on the other days of the week to maintain his health, or is an

employee in the Census Bureau or in some department in the United States Government, and that he acted under the orders of his superior officer; or is a member of the Senate or House of Representatives and acted under the rules of the body to which he belongs; or is a member of the Cabinet and acted under an emergency in the public business; or is a policeman, treasury watchman or District employee with duties to be performed on Sunday; or is an officer or member of a trades union which holds meetings and collects dues on Sunday; or is a preacher or physician in active practise; or is an employee of a railroad or a street railway company; or is the publisher or vendor of a Sunday newspaper; or is an employee in a store and is on duty on Saturday evenings until half past eight o'clock; or is the mother of a family who does not get her week's wages until Saturday night, too late to buy provisions for Sunday; or is a person of small means and forced to depend on the grocer's refrigerator and ice box for butter and fresh meat on Sunday, and on the milkman for milk for his or her children.

SEC. 3. And to avoid inconvenience to deserving persons who are compelled by circumstances to work, buy or sell on Sunday, the Board of Health is hereby authorized to issue Sunday exemption permits, good for the year of issue, to applicants from the following classes: Policemen, lawyers, treasury watchmen, members of labor or trades unions, managers of hotels or boarding houses, cooks, proprietors of lecture halls or theatres or barber shops and their employees, licensed preachers, exhorters from gospel wagons, teachers of schools, street railway and railroad and steamboat companies and their employees, apothecaries, physicians, undertakers, grocers and their clerks, employees in retail shops, travel-

ers, newspaper publishers and vendors, plumbers, repairers of street-railway cars and tracks, workmen and their wives and children, heads of families, all housekeepers who do not own refrigerators or ice boxes, all persons who have rested or will agree to rest in the other six days of the week for a period equal to Sunday, and all persons who, on examination by the Board of Health, shall be declared not to need physical rest on Sunday or to need recreation more than rest.

The fee for each permit so issued shall be one dollar and no more.

SEC. 4. The permit shall be carried on the person on Sunday and exhibited, on demand, to any policeman. Any person unable to show a permit, or refusing to exhibit it, shall be held to need rest, and, on conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to rest three days in the jail of the District of Columbia.

This Act shall not be construed to prevent the sale of ice-cream, soft drinks, soda-water, and refreshments other than malt or spirituous liquors, or of malt and spirituous liquors as now provided by law, or of cigars, chewing-gum, tobacco or opium, or of railway and steamboat tickets, or the collection and delivery of baggage, or the sale of anything by a dealer licensed to sell it; nor to warrant putting any woman or girl, or any boy under fifteen years of age, on the chain-gang, but every such person shall be released from arrest on promising never to enter a store or shop or do any work or buy any article of food or clothing on the first day of the week, by some called the Christian Sabbath, by others the Lord's Day, but commonly known as Sunday.

SEC. 5. That all prosecutions for violation of this Act shall be in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia by indictment, and in the name of the United States of America.

Sunday at the Presbyterian General Assembly

By the Editor

BY no means the least prominent of the matters brought before the 114th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, held in New York from May 15 to 26, was that of "Sabbath" observance. On the second day, shortly after the reading of the report of the committee on creed revision, the report of the special committee* on "Sabbath" observance was distributed, and it was decided that it should be the special order of business on the following Friday.

In the meantime the committee called a special meeting for the discussion of the question, which was held on the afternoon of Sunday, May 18, in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church. This meeting was addressed by Mr. James Yereance, the chairman of the committee; Dr. J. W. Moffatt, President of Washington and Jefferson College; Dr. R. S. Holmes, of Pittsburg, Pa.; Dr. I. W. Hathaway, Secretary of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union; and Mrs. Wellington White, Secretary of the Woman's National Sabbath (Sunday) Alliance. Isaiah 56:1-7 and 58:13, 14 were read by Dr. Hathaway at the opening of the meeting, and in the prayer offered invocation was made to "Thou who didst institute the Sabbath in the garden of Eden."

The speakers seemed to be deeply in earnest, and evidently regarded the subject as one of very great importance. It was set forth that in many ways the "Lord's day" was being "threatened and encroached upon," and it was urged that

its friends must arouse themselves to its vigorous defense. Mr. Yereance thought the question the most important that had been brought before the Assembly, not excepting that of creed revision, and in emphasizing this point, exclaimed: "Brethren of the ministry, tell me, what becomes of your vocation if the people generally cease to recognize and observe the Lord's day?" He read as a happy omen the words of Dr. Hirsch, of Chicago, declaring the Sabbath of the Jews to be dead and advising the substitution of Sunday in its stead, and rejoiced that "the Jews are going to give up their Sabbath and come over and observe the rest day with us on *the Sabbath*."

Dr. Moffatt undertook to tell why appeal was made to the law in this matter, and declared: "It is in behalf of enslaved men that we appeal to the state to give us protection for the Sabbath day." He set forth that in the complexity of present-day civilization, men, and especially laboring men, were "not, strictly speaking, individuals, because in the providence of God they are parts of the body corporate." He contended that Sunday legislation and enforcement were necessary for the protection of the "religious liberty" of laboring men, who in this matter were the helpless slaves of their employers! He drew a harrowing picture of the poor workman who, desiring with all his heart to observe the "Sabbath" and to attend church, was prevented from doing so by the greed and heartlessness of his employer! This "martyrdom," this robbery of the poor workingman of his religious liberty, he declared was widespread throughout the land, and called for action on the part of

*According to a resolution of a previous Assembly the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union "represents the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in this [Sunday observance] department of Christian work." But in addition to that it has a special committee of its own, of which the president of the Sunday Union is an honorary member.

the church. But farther on in his address, waxing earnest over what he conceived to be the desperate situation of the "Sabbath" at the present time, and evidently forgetting the point he had already made, he declared: "I sometimes think that, after all, we shall have to look to the labor unions for relief and remedy. They have demanded and won the shorter working day. When will they arise and demand the seventh day for rest, and the enforcement of the laws on the statute books?" The speaker seemed to be blissfully unconscious of the fatal bearing of this admission upon the argument which he had elaborated with regard to the helplessness of the workingman in this matter and the consequent necessity for the church to come to his assistance by demanding Sunday legislation in his behalf. Another point was that there is a great physical law requiring "seventh-day rest." But it was a law very hard to discover—so hard that it was just beginning to dawn upon men after 6,000 years' experience. And because He knew it would take the race a long time to make this discovery God wisely gave them the command of Sabbath observance in the beginning!

Dr. Holmes devoted himself chiefly to an arraignment of church people themselves for "Sabbath desecration." He condemned Sunday traveling, and declared that church people and many ministers were great offenders in this respect. They "ride miles on a street-car on Sunday, passing three or four churches of their own denomination, in order to get to one where they want to go," and they begin railway journeys on Sunday night or end them on Sunday morning and "think that they are keeping the Sabbath wholly—not holy, wholly." He had been told by railroad officials, and he believed that it was true, that if it were not for the patronage of church members and

ministers Sunday trains would not be run. He thought this was a terrible state of affairs, and vigorously denounced the use made of the words, "the Sabbath was made for man," and the passages regarding the taking the ox from the ditch on the Sabbath, to excuse these things. He declared at this point: "Christ made a hole in the Sabbath laws of his time big enough to drop a grain of barley through. We've made a hole big enough to run a railroad train through sidewise. Indeed, it is full of holes now. You could lay out golf links—eighteen holes—in it." Where absolute necessity required it he did not object to traveling or the running of trains; he was "not in favor of an ecclesiastical Sabbath, but of the Christian Sabbath."

When his time came Dr. Hathaway bounded to the front of the platform as though he were eager for the fray, and launched forth with much fervor into the subject. He thought the "Sabbath" question was the most important one that could be considered by the Assembly; that it was "the most important question before the American people to-day." "What the dike is to Holland," he declared, "that the Christian Sabbath is to our Christian civilization. Unless we can keep up the dike of the Christian Sabbath, anarchy, socialism, and every crime and vice, will come in and destroy our country." He also warmly seconded Dr. Holmes' remarks with regard to "Sabbath desecration" by ministers and church people. He asked the audience to pray for the "at least ten thousand professed Christians playing golf this very minute in the vicinity of this city," and, with what seemed to be pointed reference to members of the Assembly itself, in view of the fact that some of the clergymen were advertised to preach in city churches in the morning and at churches in neighboring cities in the evening, de-

clared that "the ministers who preach in New York in the morning and preach fifty miles away in the evening are responsible for the Sabbath neglect." But his leading point was that with which he began: unless "we conserve the Christian Sabbath" all religious effort in other directions is useless and "our Christian civilization" will go to pieces! He told of how active was the organization he represented in this work, diligently opposing all attempts "to destroy the Sabbath laws," and seeking at every opportunity to secure for the "Sabbath" greater "protection." He wound up by telling the audience to help themselves to the ample supply of literature on the subject which this organization had placed at the entrances.

Mrs. White spoke on "The Sabbath in the Home," and from her standpoint made a very praiseworthy address. She had nothing to say about legislation on the subject, but very plainly intimated that the most important step for securing good results would be for ministers and church people to examine and set themselves right in the matter. The meeting was quite well attended, but beyond the close attention given to the speakers there was nothing to indicate the feeling of the audience.

According to announcement, the report of the committee on "Sabbath" observance was taken up and "discussed" on the 23d. The report began by declaring that the opening years of the twentieth century mark an important epoch in the history of the country, and that in that fact there is "a loud call to the church to guard the foundations of faith and morality." Here is a paragraph of some significance that is worth quoting:

It has become popular with many people, and with the secular press, to characterize efforts for preserving the Christian Sabbath on religious or even moral grounds as Puri-

tanical, and as evidences of bigotry, and to denigrate laws enacted to safeguard the liberty of the day for the laborer, and in the interest of morality and religion, "blue laws" and relics of inquisitorial intolerance. False teaching concerning the origin and authority of the Christian Sabbath does much to undermine the foundations of this most vital part of the moral law, and to disturb the faith of many of the most conscientious of our people, and cause untold thousands to treat all efforts to preserve the Christian Sabbath with careless indifference.

It was claimed that it was through the efforts of the committee and other like friends of the "Sabbath" that the bills proposing a modification of the Sunday laws with regard to saloons were killed in committees of the New York legislature last winter, and this was set forth as a great victory, and as evidencing the effective work that is being done in behalf of the "Sabbath." Among the resolutions proposed were these:

That we strongly reprobate all games and sports, such as card parties, golf, ball games, Sunday photography, social functions, etc., on the Lord's day.

That we most respectfully but earnestly request all officers of public transportation companies to seriously consider the subject of Sunday excursions, to the end that they may be discontinued, in the interest of labor, morals and religion.

That we deprecate the use of the Lord's day for traveling, either for business or pleasure, by private individuals or public officials, notably such as occurred during the recent entertainment of a foreign guest.

That we deprecate political conferences on the Lord's day, a practise which has become a great and growing evil in this Republic, and which has led, in some recent campaigns, to public political meetings on this day.

That we earnestly urge the captains of industry and all corporate officials and employers of labor to safeguard their employees in their right to the day of rest.

During the discussion preceding the almost unanimous acceptance of the report, one member of the Assembly, who

was said to be a lawyer from Grand Rapids, N. Dak., moved that the reference to card-playing be stricken from the report on the ground that if left in it would "convey the idea that the General Assembly of this church approves of card parties on other days of the week." This very pertinent suggestion was approved, though not without some objection.

The chairman of the committee again spoke on the subject, but the principal speech was made by Dr. Hathaway, who was on hand with as much enthusiasm as ever. He thought the Assembly then in session would go down in history noted for its evangelism, but declared that that evangelism could not be made effective without the "Christian Sabbath." "The evangelism which does not produce obedience to the decalogue is a delusion and a snare," he declared. He volunteered the information that the civil war in England between the Roundheads and Cavaliers centered around the "Sabbath" question, and declared that the victory of the Puritans "saved the Christian Sabbath for England and America." With considerable enthusiasm he told of how, through the efforts of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union, the United States Government building had been closed on Sundays at the Paris Exposition, and rejoiced that this nation had given such an object-lesson to the other nations of the earth. This was greeted with warm applause. He announced in conclusion that the report would be given wide circulation by the organization he represented.

Dr. Hubbell, of the New York Sabbath (Sunday) Committee, and Dr. Kneeland, of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, were to have spoken at this time, but for some reason failed to appear. Later, after the report had been adopted, Dr. Hubbell

arrived, and was allowed to speak for a few minutes. He told of what his organization was doing in the way of affording legal "protection" for the "Sabbath," and with considerable satisfaction referred to the cooperation to this end it was receiving from men of prominence. "We have had friends at Cæsar's court in Mulberry Street," he said. "Even Chief Devery and Col. Murphy used to help us, and the present Commissioner gives us his assistance." It was declared that "the labor unions are with us, and a prominent labor leader is likely soon to be included in our committee," and "the Actors' Society of America has passed a resolution against Sunday performances which could not have been stronger if every member had been a presiding elder of the Methodist Church." Ex-District Attorney Philbin was named as one of the prominent men assisting and holding membership in the "Sabbath" Committee, but the fact that Mr. Philbin is a stanch Roman Catholic was not mentioned. The reference to Mr. Philbin was greeted with applause, but, be it said, the boast with regard to the cooperation of "Chief Devery" was not.

The discussion of this question before the Assembly was quite fully noted in the press, and called forth editorials from some of the leading newspapers. The admission of Dr. Moffatt that the church would, after all, have to leave to the labor unions the task of looking after the rest day for the workingman, and would even have to look to that source itself "for relief and remedy" in the matter, was not allowed to pass without some sensible comment to the effect that the anxiety of the church for the workingman in this matter was uncalled for. The *Evening Post* of this city said:

Dr. Moffatt has here got hold of a great truth, which shows how absurd are the fears

The Workman and the Clergymen



WORKMAN TO CLERGYMEN.—Thank you, gentlemen; I do not need such assistance. When it becomes necessary to take action against efforts to deprive me of a weekly rest-day, I think I shall not have to trouble the clergymen for assistance. Have you not observed that in those things in which something really needed to be done, such as shortening the length of the working day, securing better conditions in work-shops and factories, removing abuses with regard to women and child labor, and the securing and maintaining a good scale of wages, that whatever success has been attained thus far has been due almost entirely to the efforts of the workers themselves? This has made us strong, and therefore if the issue in which seems to be comprised all the interest that you have for the working people ever becomes as important as you are so anxious to have us believe it is at present, I can assure you that we will be able to attend to the matter.

CLERGYMEN TO WORKMAN.—Oh! my dear sir, you do not understand our object. Of course we are profoundly interested in improving the condition of the working people, and we are deeply pained at whatever hardships they suffer, but since you have spoken so plainly we will divulge our real purpose in this matter. While it is true that we have taken the liberty to represent you as a helpless cripple in need of the crutch of Sunday legislation, we have done it in behalf of a good cause, which we thought it best not to urge upon its own merits. My dear sir, the Sabbath is in great danger, and it must be maintained; the Fourth Commandment must be bolstered up with the power and authority of the civil law. This is our object; and now since you have accomplished so much in your own behalf, won't you lend us your aid in saving the Sabbath? Although we have represented the workingman as a helpless slave whom we were to emancipate by means of Sunday legislation, we know that he is a great deal stronger than we are, and we believe, after all, that it is only through his efforts that the Sabbath can be saved by law. Now, won't you help us, please?

WORKMAN TO CLERGYMEN.—I am sorry that you have deemed it expedient to employ some very doubtful methods in behalf of what you consider such a good cause. But your cause itself, so far as legislation is concerned, is entirely wrong. Whatever the merits of the Sabbath cause may be in itself, there can be nothing good in legislation on the subject. I do not care to lend any assistance whatever to efforts which have as their object the enforcement of a religious observance by law, for I deem such to be both un-American and un-Christian, and to have no promise whatever of good in it for the working people or any other class. Good day, gentlemen.

expressed by many Sabbatarians that the ancient rigor of Puritan observance cannot be relaxed without bringing "the Continental Sunday," and in its train a requirement that workmen shall keep at their tasks seven days a week. "Organized labor" will never permit anything of that sort. Let the mill-owners of Fall River, or the flour-millers of Minneapolis, try to make their hands work on Sunday and the Sabbatarians would speedily have evidence that there is no danger that the first day of the week will ever become a day of toil for the masses.

Of course the concern of clergymen and church people in this matter is not for the workingman at all; it is wholly

for the religious Sunday, and it is well that in this discussion at the Presbyterian General Assembly this fact was partially emphasized by an admission which goes far toward establishing the farcical and fraudulent character of the church's pretension that the workingman needs her assistance, through Sunday legislation, in securing and preserving for himself a weekly rest day. The position of the clergymen in this matter, and we hope the position of all workingmen, is emphasized in the picture and imaginary cology on the preceding page.



On the evening of June 22 Rev. Henry Belting, in the Hamilton Avenue Methodist Church, Trenton, N. J., preached a special sermon on "The Laboring Man and the Sabbath," in which, after saying that the matter "as to what day of the week is to be observed" is not the question at all, as "that has been settled by the Christian church long since," he declared that "the proper observance of this day [Sunday] is one of the great questions of the hour," and that upon its proper observance depends "the prosperity of the nation, the welfare of the community, and the peace and happiness of our homes." "The church cannot do otherwise than insist on its religious observance," he said, "for that is God's requirement," but, "like the subject of temperance, the Sabbath question is no longer merely a moral or religious one, because the enemies of the Christian Sabbath have taken it into politics." He explained that the question had been taken "into politics" by those who "work and vote for the abrogation of all laws which now protect this day of rest;" but of course he did not stop to say that the abrogation of these laws is the only way by which the question can be gotten out

of politics, and that those who secured these laws in the first place and those who are advocating and supporting them now were the ones who had taken the question "into politics" and were keeping it there. He said it was estimated that "in this country by rail and mail service alone 800,000 men are deprived of their Sabbath rest," and declared that "to compel men to work on the Sabbath, against their conscience, is destructive of virtue and morality; by so doing we compel them to rob God and then expect them to be honest in other things; we make them break the Fourth Commandment and then expect them to keep the eighth." Of course he did not point to a single specific instance where the civil and religious rights of any person were being violated by his being *compelled* to work on the "Sabbath" against his conscience. To produce one such individual, to cite one such concrete instance, would be worth more on this point than all the ministerial eloquence and assertion that can ever be brought to bear upon it. And when such an instance is found there will be needed no Sunday legislation and no ministerial agitation to secure an abatement of the outrage. If

800,000 men work on Sundays in the railway and mail service in this country they do it of their own choice, with as much freedom as they work at any time, and surrounded by all the protection for exercising their right to work or not to work that the law can extend. It is by no means certain that if those ministers who lament so over the Sunday labor of those who have no lamentations for themselves in the matter could have their way that the workers, clerks, trainmen, etc.,

would not be snatched away from the employment by which they earn their livelihood and thrown into jails and fined heavily or sent to chain-gangs and penitentiaries for engaging in "common" and "secular" labor on "the Christian Sabbath." For a more transparent piece of speciousness than the plea of the ministerial Sunday-enforcement advocate for the "enslaved" working man one would have to look far and wide.



Henry Clay declared, in his defense of the independence of the South American republics, that God never made a people incapable of self-government; that it was the doctrine of thrones and a reflection on Jehovah to say that He created people incapable of self-government and left them to the government of kings and emperors. Clay's logic is sound. Capacity for government is not a thing to be acquired or to be bestowed; it is inherent in the people. As individuals differ in wisdom, in self-restraint and in moral character, so nations differ, but it cannot be said that any nation has reached perfection in the science of government or in the art of administration; neither can it

be said that any nation is so low down in the scale of civilization that it needs a foreign master. When Jefferson was invited to suggest laws for a French colony which located in the United States early in the nineteenth century, he declined, and gave as his reason that laws were the outgrowth of the history and habits of the people and that no alien could be sufficiently in sympathy with, or sufficiently informed about, a people to make their laws for them. Self-government is in itself a developing process, and growth in capacity comes with the exercise of human rights under self-government.—*Wm. J. Bryan in Collier's Weekly.*



The American idea of the rights of man and of the right of self-government is not false. It is true. All communities, however low they may be in the scale, have the germ of self-government. Without this they could not exist; there could not be communities. . . . Whether a people are fit for self-government according to our standard is unimportant. They are fit to improve if they are permitted, and in no other way has

man improved in this domain than by experience. . . . As well try to teach a boy how to swim without his striking out for himself, as to expect a people to learn the art of governing themselves by doing the governing for them. There is nothing so enervating to a people as to relieve them of the task of looking after themselves. They deteriorate with every year of foreign control.—*Andrew Carnegie in North American Review.*



Any decent government of Filipinos by Filipinos is better than the best pos-

sible government of Filipinos by Americans.—*President J. G. Schurman.*

A MESSAGE OF THE PAST THAT IS A MESSAGE FOR THE PRESENT

Abraham Lincoln in a letter to the Republicans of Boston, April, 1859,
written for the occasion of the celebration of the
birthday of Thomas Jefferson.

But soberly, it is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this nation.

One would state with great confidence that he could convince any sane child that the simpler propositions of Euclid are true; but, nevertheless, he would fail with one who should deny the definitions and axioms. The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied and evaded with no small show of success. One dashinglly calls them "glittering generalities." Another bluntly styles them "self-evident lies." And others insidiously argue that they apply only to "superior races."

The expressions, differing in form, are identical in object and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy. They would delight a convocation of crowned heads plotting against the people. They are the vanguard, the sappers and miners of returning despotism. We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us.

This is a world of compensation; and he who would BE no slave must consent to HAVE no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

All honor to Jefferson—the man who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people had the coolness, foresight, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that to-day, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression!

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States devoted to the exposition and defense of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state. The Sentinel is not a periodical of abstractions and speculation, but it is a live magazine which discusses live issues that deeply concern every individual.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Editorial Contributors:

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

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

We believe in the religion taught and lived by Jesus Christ.

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

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

We believe that human rights are sacred, and that they indissolubly inhere in the moral nature of the individual.

We deny the right of any human authority to invade and violate these inalienable rights in any individual.

Therefore we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on matters of religion and conscience.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, free from all dictation, interference, or control on the part of civil government or any other external authority; or not to worship at all if he so chooses.

We also believe it to be our duty, and no less the duty of all others, to oppose religious legislation and all movements tending toward the same, to the end that all the people may freely enjoy the inestimable blessing of liberty, which is theirs by virtue of the unbounded wisdom and beneficence of the Author of their being.

VOL. 17. AUGUST, 1902. No. 9

All the fleets and armies in the world are weak in comparison with one sentence in the Declaration of Independence.

Not in wealth nor in might is found the power that really rules even in the affairs of men. He only is truly powerful who adheres to principle and trusts in its Author.

The proper appeal for "the friends of the Sabbath" is to the sense of duty and moral conviction in the individual, and not to the power and force of statutes and legislatures.

In order to truly respect and regard the rights of others it is not enough to see that injustice is not done them by legislation. We must say no unjust word and think no unjust thought about them.

The fact that God has ordained the rod of temporal suffering to bring men to Him is no evidence that He has ordained that human hands shall wield that rod. When it is necessary that people shall be brought to God by suffering He will attend to it without the assistance of those who imagine that it is their business to coerce people into godliness.

One trouble with the "collective conscience" idea of most of the religion-by-law advocates is that it is anything but what it pretends to be. They who advocate the rule of the "collective conscience" usually have in mind nothing else than the enactment into law of their own convictions and the suppression by law of the convictions of those who disagree with them.

The right to do a thing does not carry with it the right to compel others to do it; nor is forcing a person to do a thing that he has a right to do protecting him in the right to do it. This is why the right to observe Sunday does not carry with it the right to compel others to observe the day, and why compelling a person to observe Sunday is not protecting him in the right to observe the day.

To-day, as always in the past, those who are the quickest to deny to others

the right of self-government, and who insist most strongly that it is an art most difficult of attainment and acquirement, are the quickest to assume for themselves and others the right to govern others in addition to governing themselves. An important question for these people to explain is this: If it is so difficult to attain, and requires such long experience to develop, the capacity for self-government in a man or a nation, how is it that a man or a nation, without any previous experience, is at once ready and capable for the government of others? Is the art of governing others easier than the art of governing one's self, and does one possess a higher and better right to govern others than he does to govern himself?



In his eulogy on Lincoln, delivered in Boston on June 1, 1865, Charles Sumner declared that according to Abraham Lincoln "criticism of the Declaration of Independence was the climax of infidelity as a citizen." Then, according to Lincoln's standard, something that has been rampant throughout this country for three or four years past, and which has been engaged in by prominent men as never before in the history of the nation, is the very climax of citizen infidelity. And yet, strange to say—no, it is not strange—those who have gone the farthest in this infidelity have been the quickest and the loudest to accuse and denounce as "copperheads" and "traitors" those who have pointed out the real nature of their course.



Writing on the Declaration of Independence in the *North American Review* for July, 1896, Professor Moses Coit Tyler, of Cornell University, in referring to its "great aphorisms about the natural rights of man," said that political science

could not now smile at them "except to its own discomfiture and shame," and that they were "likely to abide in the world as the chief source and inspiration of heroic enterprises among men for self-deliverance from oppression." How little did Professor Tyler realize that within less than three years from the time he wrote these words those aphorisms would be decried by leading men and journals of the nation as "nursery rhymes," "obvious fallacies," "baseless assumptions," "sublimated demagogism," etc.



It was well declared by Macaulay that "half the logic of misgovernment lies in this one sophistical dilemma: if the people are turbulent, they are unfit for liberty; if they are quiet, they do not want liberty." The first has been the logic hitherto employed by America with regard to the Filipinos; with the proclamation of "pacification" the second has now come into vogue. It has been supposed that the world had long ago learned the shallowness of this logic. Certainly it does not require a very intimate knowledge of the history of human despotism and the story of the struggle for human freedom for one to know that such logic affords a bed too short for liberty to recline upon, and that it is a covering too narrow to hide despotism.



According to Senate Document 190 the high officials of the Roman Catholic orders in the Philippines have testified before the Philippine Commission that the moral character of the native priests was exceedingly low, but that few of the Spanish priests lived an immoral life. Now it is not to be doubted for a moment that had not an issue been raised between these two classes of priests that these very officials, who can now find

nothing too bad to say of the native priests, would have been the quickest and fiercest to resent any intimation that the native priests were what they now say they are. But whatever may be the character of the native priests, there is one thing about which there is striking unanimity of testimony, and concerning which there can be little doubt, and that is the general and intolerable corruption of the friars. And by their charges against the native clergy they but strengthen the case against themselves.



We were mistaken in saying in the June SENTINEL that the Sunday bills introduced in Congress about the 1st of May were the first measures of that sort to make their appearance in that body since 1895. The forces of "National Reform" have not allowed so long a time to elapse in recent years between their attempts in this direction. Aside from the at least three Sunday bills introduced in Congress during the session beginning December 1, 1895, there was a bill applying to the District of Columbia introduced early in 1898, but which, like the recently proposed legislation, was not reported back from the committee to which it was referred. Mr. Wilbur F. Crafts was its chief advocate, and it was claimed by him that the measure had the approval of organized labor. This bill, we think, was the last Sunday measure to appear in Congress before those of the present year, although other religious measures were proposed in the meantime.



Some one who was highly indignant over the fact that the waving of the American flag on the driveway of Central Park in this city is not allowed except by special permit, in a communication to the *Times* demanded, "Who ever heard of the American flag not being unfurled by an American anywhere on this

big round globe?" and declared: "Enforce the law for keeping a decent Sabbath and let the American flag float all over God's creation." We know little and care little of the propriety or impropriety of this rule with regard to the display of the flag on Central Park driveway, but we desire to call attention to the fact, which we think is strongly suggested in this communication, that a blustering and unthinking devotion to "the flag" goes hand in hand with "Sabbath" enforcement by law. The American flag has no business to be floating "all over God's creation," and nobody has any business to be enforcing by law the keeping of a "decent" or any other sort of a Sabbath. If on both these points more calm reflection and less inane bombast were indulged in both the flag and the "Sabbath" would be of more blessing to the world.



According to *The Independent* Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati, has sent out to the clergy of his diocese "an extraordinary petition to which two hundred thousand signatures are expected. It tells President Roosevelt that the separation of church and state under the first amendment to the Constitution was provided for conditions here, and ought not to be enforced in the Philippines, at least in schools; also that it would be an invasion of the rights of the Philippine people to tax them for a system of non-religious schools." *The Independent* observes that "this is pretty frank talk—that separation of church and state is good for a country where the Catholics are in the minority, and not for one where they are in the majority." Yes, this is somewhat frank, but it is the position of the Papacy exactly. If the Pope and "the silent and knowing prelates" of this country would be as frank as Archbishop Elder they would say exactly what he has said. The Papacy is not in

favor of the principle of separation of church and state, never mind what impression she may give so-called Protestants who refuse to look at her as she is.



The proposition to substitute Sunday observance for that of their ancient Sabbath is looked upon with very little favor by many Jews of the United States. A number of the leading Jewish papers are very outspoken in their opposition to the proposed change. The *American Israelite* says it "refuses to consider the possibility of the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath or the substitution of any other day therefor. A supplementary service and sermon on some other day may be admissible as a temporary expedient, but the Sabbath is divinely ordained and will stand forever." It is very plainly seen that this movement is inspired by considerations which might lead just as readily to an entire repudiation of Judaism, and which would prevent a steadfast adherence to anything. Neither the Jews nor any other people should forsake their religion and its institutions, whether they be true or false, simply upon grounds of expediency, for the sake of social and material advantage, and therefore we are glad to see that the recent declaration of Dr. Hirsch, of Chicago, with regard to a transfer to the observance of Sunday, meets with little approval among his coreligionists.



Church federation is being advocated in Germany by the *Summus Episcopus* of the most powerful church in the empire, which position the German Emperor holds in his capacity as King of Prussia. In a recent address the Emperor "declared it to be a consummation devoutly to be wished that the various Protestant state churches should constitute a powerful federation just as the different states

have constituted themselves into a political empire." There are about half a hundred different state churches in the country, mostly Lutheran, but in some states the Lutheran and the Reformed bodies have been united in one common establishment. It is said that there are many difficulties in the way of federation, but "no greater than those which before 1870 made a political consolidation of the twenty-five states of the Fatherland seem impossible." The confederation of the churches is "to be one rather for defense and aggressiveness *ad extra* than for the harmonizing of inner differences." All this suggests very plainly the real nature of church federation not only in Germany but elsewhere. It is merely political—union of organizations for organizational aggressiveness. There can be no real union where inner differences are not harmonized, and unless this be the purpose of church union it will be more fruitful of evil than of good.



If the political declarations and utterances which have been formulated in subversion of its immutable principles possessed a fraction of the sanity of the most faulty portions of the Declarations of Independence they would possess something to recommend them to the intelligence and conscience of mankind that they certainly do not now. It has been said that war—might—is the last and great argument of kings. It may properly be said that might is not only the last but the first and only argument of those who rest their cause upon the declaration, "Where the flag is, it will remain." It cannot be said of this declaration and many others similar to it that they are "glittering generalities," or that "they impart the necessary fervor" to the documents and speeches in which they occur. They are simply plain, blunt, bald, undisguised avowals that brute force is considered a sufficient ar-

gument for the cause in behalf of which they are asserted. They are destitute of even the redeeming feature that rhetorical elegance might impart to them. We care nothing for the politics of the matter, nor as to what political party it may be whose adherents advance such propositions. We simply want it to be known that in the United States, the government of which was dedicated to the rule of right as its highest law, the time has now come when might is the principal argument that is employed in behalf of its course in one of the gravest questions that has ever come before it.



The disasters so far during the present year have been so numerous and fatal to human life that the matter is occasioning widespread comment, and has already established for 1902 the dismal distinction of being "a year of disasters." "The elemental forces appear strangely busy in destroying human life these days," says the *Springfield Republican*, and the *Chicago Tribune* applies to the matter the words, "One woe doth tread upon another's heel, so fast they follow." The *Tribune* has carefully preserved the statistics, and finds that for the first five months of the year 50,505 human lives have been destroyed by nature's elemental disturbances alone. And it estimates that this number would be almost doubled if there were added to it the lives lost by fires, mine disasters, explosions, railroad accidents, vessel wrecks, and accidents of all sorts. "The catastrophe of to-day is a sensation for the day, and to-morrow is generally forgotten," says the *Tribune*, and it is a fact which has impressed itself upon all who are observant. It seems to argue a lack of human feeling and an utter indifference to the value of human life, but it must be largely due to the frequency of the disasters themselves, which exceeds the capacity of human nature for

horror and sympathy and necessarily produces the indifference which follows from familiarity. But no one should become indifferent to the increasing tide of calamities in the earth, for it may be significant of something that it is of the utmost importance for all to know.



We confess that when we hear of such an instance of the work of Sunday-enforcement champions as that reported from Plattsmouth, Neb., in our "Sunday Enforcement" department, and others similar to it that are frequently reported, we feel that it is a pity the true principles of law and order are not applied with vigor and strenuousness to some of these self-styled law and order organizations and their deeds. We understand and can in a degree sympathize with, even while we oppose the principle upon which they proceed, those who in their anxiety for the "protection" of the "Sabbath" are moved to appeal to the law against Sunday games, etc., which draw large crowds and are apt to be attended by noisy and rowdy demonstrations. But we can discover no excuse whatever for this pouncing upon boys who are playing ball on Sunday without any unusual noise and demonstration for their own entertainment and exercise. In fairness and justice the boys who thus play ball have as much right to have the ministers, who are the leading spirits in these organizations that frequently cause them to be arrested and fined, indicted and fined for preaching or doing whatever else they may do on Sunday, as the ministers have to interfere in this way with them when engaged in games that interfere with nobody's rights. The fact that there happens to be a law on the statute books which enables the ministers to dissemble their unscrupulous bigotry behind the shallow pretense of a zeal for "law and its enforcement" is entirely aside from the

question, for it does not affect the justice and rightfulness of the matter a particle.



"Our gifts to Liberty" was the theme of a recent editorial in *The Independent*. It is declared that what has been done for Cuba is "a great gift to Liberty," but that "the amazing, the unparalleled gift to Liberty, which will long add a new distinction to the Fourth of July," is the proclamation of "liberty and self-government" for the Philippines. "When before," it is asked, "has such a benefaction come to so many million people, oppressed for four hundred years?" "The world has never seen the parallel to this, a Malay people thus made a republic." "What the fathers declared in 1776 for themselves and achieved through seven years of brave war, their sons now, by aid of a much shorter war, have given to four times as many human beings as then dwelt and fought in these thirteen Colonies." It is declared that there is no blame for Filipinos that they at first "did not believe that our words were true," nor surprise "that Tagalogs did not at first trust our benevolent purpose." But those "in our own land that could not discern the righteous purpose of our people" "ought to be overwhelmed with shame, now that our promises are kept to both Cuba and the Philippines, and peace and liberty are established." Perhaps they should, but we would suppose that those who can make such boasts in the face of the facts as they are, who can proclaim the conquest of the Filipinos to be an amazing, an unparalleled gift to Liberty, who can pretend that a republic has been set up in the Philippines, and that the Filipinos have been given what the fathers declared in 1776 for themselves—we say in all seriousness that we would suppose that those who can thus boast have reason to be overwhelmed

with shame but are incapable of such an experience. It passes our comprehension how such things can be given forth by a rational, reflecting mind.



The indifference of the people of St. Louis to the revelations of enormous official corruption in the administration of their municipal affairs is a matter that is occasioning considerable remark, and is rightly declared to be the gravest aspect of the situation. It is evidence that corruption of one sort or another is more widespread than any grand jury has yet revealed. The people of St. Louis, says the *Springfield Republican*, "need a moral awakening more than a world's fair." And St. Louis is not the only city in America whose people need such an awakening. A most important fact to note in this connection is that when corruption and a decadence of personal integrity become widespread among the people of a republic they are being prepared not only to look with indifference upon gigantic official corruption, but upon the overturning and revolutionizing of their form of government itself. The only safety of popular government is in the jealousy of the people for its adherence to the principles of justice and liberty, and this jealousy cannot exist when the law of rectitude ceases to control the personal conduct of citizens. It is not the shame, but the glory, of a nation when any act inconsistent with justice and right which it may commit or sanction brings a cry of protest from citizens. Those who have cried out against the inhuman acts which have taken place under American authority in the Philippines have been denounced as traducers of the nation and its representatives. Had not such acts aroused a cry of protest in America it would have been to the eternal shame and dishonor of the nation. When the time comes that there is not

such a spirit in the nation, then it will have fallen too low to be traduced and will have ceased to know what honor is.



"Father" Lambert, a Catholic clergyman of Hackensack, N. J., has been commended in the press for his attitude toward Sunday ball playing and other forms of recreation. He attended a ball game himself on a recent Sunday, in which one of the competing teams was composed of young men belonging to his church, and he "endorsed Sunday ball playing generally, provided that it is never allowed to interfere with the religious duties of the participants." The significance of these last words should not be overlooked. The difference between "Father" Lambert, and nearly all other Catholic clergymen, and the advocates of strict Sunday enforcement, is simply a difference as to what constitutes an interference with religious duties. The one looks upon games at any time on Sunday as inconsistent with religious duties, while the other thinks that religious duty is amply fulfilled by attendance upon mass and other services, even though games be engaged in later in the day. As to the vital point—the employment of the law in compelling a performance of what is regarded as religious duty or a cessation of what is regarded as inconsistent with such duty—it is scarcely open to doubt that there is no difference between the attitude of the Catholic clergy and the clergy of other religious bodies who favor Sunday enforcement. And there are straws indicating that the Catholic clergy in this country are leaning toward the position which holds that religious duty requires strict Sunday observance throughout the day, rather than toward the historic Catholic position, which permits games and amusements a portion of the day.

In the inscription placed upon the triumphal column erected by the Romans in honor of the head of their armies on his return from the East in 62 B.C., it was declared that "Pompey, 'the people's general,' had in three years captured fifteen hundred cities, and had slain, taken, or reduced to submission, twelve million human beings." The American Republic through its military representatives has done almost as much in the last three years, as is witnessed by the facts of current history. We do not know whether the Romans issued any amnesty proclamations to those who were completely conquered or not, but it is not at all unlikely. The *Springfield Republican* remarks that "never before has it happened that the natal day of American independence should be celebrated by an act of pardon to men whose only crime was in following the example of those whose struggle for freedom has found in the Fourth of July a glorious memorial forever." About the principal difference between the two "triumphs" seems to be that whereas Pompey's conquests "filled the Roman treasury to overflowing, and made the annual revenue of the republic double what it had been before," the conquests of the United States have drained the national treasury to the extent of \$170,000,000, and give little indication of ever yielding anything in return. And there have been other losses that are still more irreparable, suggested by the fact that a transport recently took to the Philippines 4,000 coffins for dead soldiers. But there has been even a greater loss than money and life—a loss which deprives these other losses of the glory that might otherwise attend them—the loss which comes from a repudiation of great principles and a lowering of national ideals, the loss which comes from a reversion to the principles and practises of the nations that have worshipped ambi-

tion and power and trampled upon human liberty and human aspirations.



Notwithstanding the fact that by treaty between the United States and Russia the citizens of each country are assured equal rights and privileges in the matter of entering and sojourning in the other country, there are a goodly number of the citizens of the United States who are excluded from Russia, and who after many years of protest have been able to secure from the government to which they hold allegiance nothing more than the admission that it "has not yet been able to secure from the Russian government a promise of uniform treatment for all American travelers." This unjust discrimination is due to Russian intolerance toward the Jew, who cannot enter Russian territory without a special permit from the imperial government, which is of course about equivalent to complete exclusion. The Jewish citizens of the United States insist with considerable force that the American Government should insist upon equal treatment for all its citizens, and that especially should it not allow discriminations to be made that spring from racial and religious intolerance. They declare that not merely justice to Jewish citizens, but loyalty to fundamental, democratic principles requires that such a stand be taken, and of course their demand is just. The matter has been urged upon the State Department at different times during the last twenty years, and recently renewed efforts for relief have been made, and before its adjournment a resolution regarding the matter was introduced in Congress. But the Government replies that it is unable to remedy the matter, but will endeavor to do so as in the past, and assures the American Jews that they will not receive from Russia different treatment from that accorded to the Jews of

other countries. The Jews are a small people and Russia is a big, "Christian" nation, and she is not to be dealt with as are such "heathen" nations as Turkey and China when the treaty rights of "Christian" Americans are infringed.



According to what seems to be generally accepted as the truth there, is to-day in the United States no more conspicuous example of "one-man power" and of the working of the "trust" principle than is to be found in the National legislature itself. A prominent Senator recently remarked that "the most dangerous trust in America to-day is the legislative trust that is placed in a few hands in the House of Representatives and is breaking down all the powers and principles upon which it was builded." It was intended by the framers of the Constitution that the House of Representatives should be the popular branch of Congress, the forum where the representatives not of States nor of parts of States, but of the people themselves, should freely discuss all matters of legislation. But now this has all been changed, and almost all the power and authority of the individual members has been surrendered to the presiding officer. Under the rules which have come to control the body the speaker has absolute control of the appointment of committees, and these committees have complete control of legislation. All bills must be referred to committees, and no bill can be brought up for discussion unless the committee to which it has been referred sees fit to report it. And even after a bill is reported the speaker can prevent its consideration and discussion. Thus "legislation through committees" has taken the place of legislation upon the floor of the House. The fact of membership in the House does not by any means insure the privilege of discussing legislation; that

privilege must be secured from those in whose hands the powers of the whole body have been centered. The ordinary congressman can do little more than vote and watch the legislative machine. Ex-Senator John M. Thurston says that the methods of legislation which now obtain in the House of Representatives are "the most arbitrary of those in any legislative body in the world," and that "the theory that the people legislate on equal terms in the House of Representatives through their chosen representatives is to-day a myth." This state of affairs in the national legislature is in line with the most significant tendencies of the times.



Through the president of the New York Fidelity and Casualty Company it has been made known that while the Treaty of Paris was pending Mr. Andrew Carnegie offered to furnish the \$20,000,000 which it was proposed to pay to Spain in connection with the acquirement of the Philippines, on condition that he be allowed to go to the islands as a special commissioner, or as one of several commissioners, with authority to assure the Filipinos of the kindly disposition of this country and to promise them that the United States would recognize the independence of the islands as soon as a stable government had been established. This proposition was declined by President McKinley. The *New York Times*, and the opinion is shared by many other prominent journals, thinks that Mr. Carnegie "exhibited the understanding of a child" in this matter, and says of his offer that "it was an astoundingly foolish proposal, and, not to put too fine a point upon it, a reckless and wicked one," and adds that the President "had too deep a sense of the national honor and the national duty to give it any consideration." The dishonor to the United States, and the foolishness, recklessness

and wickedness of this proposition, according to these journals, seems to lie not in the fact that it involved the transference of governmental business to a private individual, but in that it involved the promise that the United States would recognize the independence of the Filipinos as soon as a stable government was established. The pronounced antipathy displayed from these sources toward the idea of Filipino independence is something past finding out, and therefore it is useless to attempt to divine why these journals, after what has followed the refusal of the Government to promise what Mr. Carnegie desired it to promise, and was willing to go to such length to get it to promise, fix upon the course which he proposed as the "astoundingly foolish," "reckless and wicked one." The thing goes to show that there is in the United States a remarkable, if not an astoundingly foolish, reckless and wicked, disposition to despise, cry down, and trample upon anything with regard to the Philippines that harmonizes with what were once the most cherished of American ideals. And this is a disposition which it is worth while calling attention to, even in periodicals that are not devoted to the discussion of politics.



The article elsewhere on "A Dangerous Tendency" does not present fancies of the imagination, but actual, unmistakable realities. He who runs may read and see that the centralization of governmental authority is being hastened in the United States, and that in inevitable accompaniment with that centralization comes the augmentation to unwonted extent of governmental power and authority. In striking confirmation of what is said regarding the tendency of the combinations of capital and labor in this article that was written two months ago, is a certain phase of the present coal strike and of strikes

in general that is now being emphasized in the public press as perhaps never before. Both labor and capital are being informed with increasing emphasis through the channels of public discussion that there is a "third party to the strike," a party which has rights and interests in the matter that must be maintained and respected at all hazards, and that "the public patience is beginning to be exhausted by the indifference shown to public needs and to public law." A leading periodical declares that "the anthracite mine workers and the anthracite mine owners have not only declared war upon one another, but, without any declaration of hostility, have both made war upon the public," and it is demanded, "Has it any redress?" Labor replies, and here it is endorsed by capital, which applies the principle to its side of the question, that the public has no rights whatever in the matter; that men can work or stop work whenever they please and as long as they please, and that the public can have nothing to say about it, for otherwise the freedom of the workman would be gone. This position has pretty good ground to rest upon, for it is very true that for the public to come in and compel a settlement of strikes would be to invade the rights of the parties most concerned and would mean most decidedly a restriction of individual freedom. But that is exactly what is coming, and it comes almost by necessity from the conditions produced by the combinations of labor and capital themselves. They have begun the work of trampling upon individual freedom and will continue it, and the consequence will be that in the effort of the public to rid itself of the tyranny which they have brought on, despotic measures will have to be employed and despotism in government will be the result.



The latest addition to the roll of the

scoffers at the vital principles of the Declaration of Independence is the name of the man who palms himself off upon thousands of simple and credulous people as Elijah the prophet who was to precede the coming of "the great and dreadful day of the Lord," and even as that Prophet like unto Moses whom the Lord was to raise up for His people (Deut. 18: 15, 18)—John Alexander Dowie, of Chicago and Zion City, Ill. According to press dispatches, in an address to his followers at the latter place on July 4, Mr. Dowie declared: "The reference in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal is a lie. The black men never were, nor are they now equal [*sic*]. The Declaration of Independence is therefore a lie." According to the press report, Mr. Dowie clinched these statements in this manner:

"Now, for instance, you are not my equal, are you?"

"No," was the feeble answer from his followers.

"If you were I couldn't lead you, could I?"

There are two sorts of persons who will always be convinced that the self-evident truths of the preamble of the Declaration of Independence are self-evident lies—the politician who believes that political power resides in himself and not in the people, and the religious leader who believes that he is a better guide for the consciences of men than is the Spirit of Truth itself. Both of them are possessed with the weak, vain, and fatal delusion that they are vastly superior to the rest of mankind and of vastly more consequence in God's sight. While by their antics they do not in the slightest degree disturb the truth of human equality stated in the Declaration of Independence, they do demonstrate beyond all question that the presumption which some men display is much in excess of that possessed by the average human being. The Declaration

asserted the equality of human rights, particularizing the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It did not undertake to say that all men would develop an equal capacity for mischief or go to equal lengths in absurdity. It is not astonishing that a man who proposes to establish his sway over the consciences of a goodly number of his fellows and to call it the rule of God should be persuaded that the Declaration of Independence states a lie when it declares that all men are created equal. There can be no question, however, as to which lie can best stand the wear and tear of time.



Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, has expressed the opinion that Senator Hoar "is crazy on this Philippine question." And yet we suppose that not once in the ten years that have now intervened has Senator Hawley questioned the sanity of either himself or Senator Hoar in their position and conduct with reference to that piece of legislation calling for the closing of the Chicago World's Fair on Sundays, which was passed in July, 1892, in distinct violation of a fundamental principle of the nation, and which was an ignoble surrender on the part of Congress to influences to which it had no business to yield in the slightest degree. On that occasion, when legislation "against the desecration of the Lord's day" was under discussion in the Senate, Senator Hawley took the lead in yielding to clamors for something utterly opposed to and violative of one of the first and most important amendments to the Constitution under which he held office and in accordance with which he had sworn to act. After declaring that he knew and that everybody knew that the legislation under discussion was "founded in religious belief," he declared that it would not be "wise statesmanship" to ignore the conviction

in obedience to which it was to be enacted, even though that conviction might be "a profound error," and wound up with the miserable piece of demagoguery that none of those who dared to vote against this conviction, which might be "a profound error," "would ever come back here again." Such was his sanity (?) while under this religion-by-law spell that he wished for the time being that in his capacity as senator he "were the most eloquent clergymen, the most eloquent of those stanch old sturdy divines who have honored American citizenship as well as American Christianity," and saw in the 13,000,000 church communicants in the United States "from forty-five to fifty millions" of people "of religious profession or sympathy" who were in favor of the unconstitutional legislation which he was advocating. It seems to us that on that occasion there was conduct in the Senate which needed and needs far more the charitable mantle which is afforded by a belief in the mental aberration of those responsible for it than does anything that has marked the conduct of Senator Hoar with regard to the Philippine question. It is to be regretted that it has come to pass in the United States that a stanch advocacy of principle gains for him who makes it the charge of being "crazy," while a miserable surrender and denial of principle is allowed to pass along without objection as "wise statesmanship." But such is the case, and such has been the case many times before in the world's history. But such things have never been known to weaken the cause of principle a particle.



An Unprecedented Ruling

A ruling that is without precedent so far as we know, and which if it becomes general will entirely deprive seventh-day observers of the scant protection that has

been extended to them in the exemption clauses of the Sunday statutes, has recently been made in a Virginia court. On June 23, Mr. C. P. Morse, a Seventh-day Adventist, and a jeweller by occupation and proprietor of a store known as Morse's Bazar, in Fredericksburg, Va., was brought before the mayor of that city on the charge of keeping his place of business open on Sunday. He was fined \$2 and costs, whereupon appeal was taken to the court of appeals presided over by Judge Wallace, who sustained the mayor's decision "on the ground that while the Virginia law exempted any one who religiously believed it to be his duty to keep Saturday—and actually did keep Saturday—from keeping Sunday, yet Mr. Morse could not claim the benefits of this exemption, because he closed his place of business at sunset Fridays and opened at sunset Saturdays, thus making the day he kept a part of two days, as the legal day extends from midnight to midnight."

This is not the language of the court, but it is no doubt substantially correct. Now the exemption clause in favor of seventh-day observers in the Virginia Sunday statute is entitled, "Exception as to the Jews," and while it exempts those who observe as the Sabbath "the seventh day of the week," it must have been well known to the framers of that section that the seventh day of the week to the Jews extends from sunset Friday to sunset Saturday, and therefore they must have intended the exemption to apply to those observing the time from sunset Friday to sunset Saturday as the Sabbath. Mr. Morse writes us that he asked the judge if he did not think such was the case, but no heed was given to his question.

The result is that if Mr. Morse opens his store on Saturday evening, which is his best time for trade, he must close on Sunday, or else be arrested and fined

every week. He attributes the turn of affairs to religious prejudice and ill will on the part of adherents of two of the leading religious denominations, and says that he was not treated quite so badly in a Maryland town largely populated by Catholics, in which he was located before going to Fredericksburg. But the Catholic mayor had often threatened to have him arrested, and so he moved into Virginia hoping to find a more agreeable location. But he is convinced now that he has gotten into a worse place, and if the present state of affairs continues will be obliged to go elsewhere.

This case is significant and noteworthy from the fact that it shows that where there is a disposition to do so seventh-day observers can be made to feel the full force of Sunday enforcement notwithstanding the fact that there is a law on the statute books expressly exempting them from the operations of the Sunday law.



The Papacy and the Government

Since the time up to which the matter was described in our last issue the American negotiations at the Vatican have become one of the foremost subjects of discussion in the public press, and interesting and significant developments that we cannot dwell upon in this issue have taken place. It can be said that the Papacy has conducted herself in the matter with the skill and craftiness for which she has been noted of old, and at this time (July 21) she is sending the American commission away with a present for each member and with practically nothing whatever settled with regard to the "business transaction" which, before the departure of the commission to Rome, the country was informed, through prominent non-Catholic religious journals, that the Pope was so ready and willing to consummate.

There is just one thing settled, and that is that whatever "business transaction" takes place will be arranged at Manila between the representatives of the Papacy and the Philippine government. Thus, after going to the Vatican, has the American Government learned from even the Papacy herself that the "headquarters" for transacting business connected with affairs in the Philippine Islands is not in Rome, Italy, *The Independent* and other great journals to the contrary notwithstanding. The Government has established a dangerous precedent which will be to the advantage of the Papacy always hereafter in her plainly manifested design of bringing the American Government under her sway, and in return for its pains the Government has the problems, just as they were, still on its hands, and has the satisfaction of going about their settlement in just the same way that it could have done without taking any such step.

Whatever may have been the delusion that obtained and was so assiduously propagated for a time as to the work of this commission, or "mission," to the Vatican not being a work of diplomacy, it has been quite thoroughly dissipated by the occurrences of the past few weeks. With the President and Secretary of War staying up nearly all night and spending most of one Sunday in arranging answers to propositions from the papal Secretary of State, the idea that diplomatic negotiations were not in progress vanished into thin air.

We will consider this matter further in the September SENTINEL, and present here in conclusion this keenly discerning editorial note from the New York *Evening Post* of July 14:

Again the Vatican diplomatists smile demurely, and say they wish those American negotiators were not so slow. It is a kind of malicious satisfaction, apparently, which indo-

lent Rome takes in showing itself swifter than rushing America. Our cocksure press was telling us how Governor Taft would open the eyes of the sleepy prelates of the Curia, and show them an example of Yankee dispatch in business; but now, for the second time, it is the Vatican which has come promptly to time with its answer, while Governor Taft has to ask for fresh delays until Secretary Root and President Roosevelt can put their heads together and make up their minds whether they really want to send the Holy See an ultimatum. It is a thorny question, this of the Philippine friars, and our light-hearted graspers of it are likely to prick their hands before they get through. Catholic diplomacy was not born yesterday. Nor is the whole religious situation in the archipelago one which it is easy for our enthusiastic Protestants to reconcile with their belief that Providence took us to the Philippines for the express purpose of opening a new Catholic country to Protestant missionaries. With their own government sternly rebuking all attempts to interfere with the religious preferences of the natives—an attitude which will seem to ultra-Protestants as a going over bodily to the Scarlet Woman—they will be disposed to be less sure that it was "the hand of God" which signed the treaty annexing the Philippines.



Washington Sunday Law Pronounced Valid.

About a year ago a Sunday-enforcement campaign was inaugurated in the city and county of Walla Walla, Wash. It began with saloons, but as is usually the case soon extended to business of all kinds, and the effects of it were soon felt in the Seventh-day Adventist community located in the little suburb of College Place. The Adventists had been accustomed for years to engaging in their ordinary occupations on Sunday, and in fact had never been molested since establishing a college, sanitarium and other enterprises there some twelve or fifteen years ago.

A complaint was filed against Nichols & Son, merchants, and Mr. Dorsey Nich-

ols was arraigned on the charge of keeping open store and selling general merchandise on Sunday. The case came before Judge Brents, of the superior court for the county of Walla Walla, who rendered a decision that attracted considerable attention at the time, in which he pronounced the statute under which the action was brought unconstitutional on the ground that it made an unwarranted discrimination between businesses that were essentially alike in their relation to the morals, health and general welfare of a community, prohibiting some on Sunday and permitting others. The principle was laid down that a court had nothing to do but to enforce a law, however unwise and impolitic it might be, so long as in enacting it the legislature acted within its constitutional powers, but it was held that in passing a law which made such discriminations as were found in the Sunday law the legislature had transcended its powers.

The prosecuting attorney appealed to the State supreme court, and that court rendered its decision in the matter a few weeks ago. The judgment of the lower court was reversed and the case remanded for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion rendered, the supreme court declaring that "it is concluded upon principle and authority that the statute under consideration is a valid exercise of legislative power, and here is the limit of judicial inquiry."

We have not been able to obtain a copy of the decision yet, and so do not know upon just what "principle and authority" it has been concluded in this instance that a Sunday statute is "a valid exercise of legislative power." We shall hope to be able to present the matter more fully in our next issue.

It seems to be an exceedingly rare thing for a higher court to take an adverse position with regard to Sunday

legislation, notwithstanding that it is often declared that the days of the "blue-laws" are past, and that there seems to be developing among the people quite a strong trend away from the restrictions of such-legislation. In this Washington case it would seem that the position of Judge Brents was perfectly sound, for even granting that the legislature had the right to enact a Sunday law it would seem that fairness and justice would require that it should operate upon all citizens and businesses alike. But the fact is that a Sunday statute is itself an unfair and unjust discrimination, a discrimination so gigantic that its very greatness serves somewhat to hide its real character. It is therefore not at all strange that discriminations are made, permitted and sanctioned in the law itself.



The Attitude of the Archbishop

For several years the great Catholic prelate of the Northwest, Archbishop Ireland, has been distinctly and notoriously *en rapport* with the leaders of the political party that has been in control of the Government in recent years. So intimate has been this relation that he has on a number of occasions been able to speak with authority concerning the attitude of the Government with regard to matters about which the general public knew practically nothing. This relation has now brought him into what appears to be an anomalous position. In the matter of the policy of the Government in its relations to the Catholic Church in the Philippines he seems to be directly at odds with the great body of his coreligionists in this country. He takes his stand with the Administration in the matter, and characterizes as "unguarded," "reckless" and "reprehensible" much that has been said by Catholic newspapers on this question. This has gained

for the Archbishop high praise from non-Catholic, "imperialistic" sources, where his attitude is characterized as "frank and manly," and is considered "a striking proof of the soundness and efficacy of the American principle of absolute independence of church and state," and an "unqualified tribute of a devout churchman and an eminent prelate to the justice and the wisdom of the policy based on and built up from that principle."

Now, whatever may appear upon the surface, it is by no means certain that, so far as the vital thing in this matter is concerned, the Archbishop differs much from his rather out-spoken coreligionists. He is no more adverse to, and is no less eager for, special favor and deference to be shown the Papacy by the American authorities, either in this country or in the Philippines, than are his coreligionists. He is as eager as they for the advancement of the prestige of the Papacy as respects the American Government. But he is wiser than some of them are. He knows that the prestige of the Papacy cannot be advanced in this country by "main force and awkwardness," by bluster and ignorant vapors about "the rights of the Church." He knows that one of the very worst things that could happen for the purposes of the Papacy regarding America would be for just such antagonism to be aroused between Protestants and Catholics as a serious controversy over this Philippine religious question would engender. Therefore it is not strange that he is attempting to conciliate matters, and that he is taking sharply to task some of his own churchmen for their attitude in the matter.

In view of the Archbishop's approval and endorsement of the attitude of the Administration in this matter, certain statements that he made some time ago seem a little strange. In an interview

in New York early in 1899 he declared that "all the civilization that the people of the Philippines have has been received from the priests," and that they "are the representatives of social and civil order in the islands." And further that "the priests will uphold this Government as they upheld the government of Spain," and "this Government will have to depend upon the priests to a large extent for their moral influence in the interests of law and order." Now the position of the Government is that these priests will not uphold its authority, that they are the very opposite of being the representatives of social and civil order on the islands, and that instead of its having to depend upon them for their influence in the interests of law and order, it must drive them from the islands in the interests of law and order. And the Archbishop says, "Amen." Well, favors cannot go one way always, and since he has so long enjoyed the confidence and favor of political leaders, he no doubt realizes that now it is his business to stand by them, even though it seems to place him at odds with his fellow-religionists. But let no one suppose that the Archbishop is taking any step backward as regards the dearest hope of the Papacy, which he understands so well, or that through any loyalty to the principle of separation of church and state he is opposing or retarding the aim and purpose of the Papacy regarding the American nation, which is not in accord with that principle by any means.



A Chapter of Present-Day Sunday Enforcement

In the June SENTINEL, page 461, attention was called to the Sunday enforcement crusade set on foot in May by the clerks and some of the retail grocers in Lynn, Mass., and to the despicable method that was being employed to se-

cure the arrest and conviction of merchants who refused to heed the dictates of the clerks and grocers in this matter. The crusade was continued in the same fashion, the clerks' association taking the lead, and the grocers interested in Sunday closing urging them on. As will be seen from the following interesting account from the *North Eastern Grocer* (Boston), of June 13, which we deem it worth while to present entire, the clerks soon "jumped over the head of the police department and employed outside talent" in their work of inducing people to violate the law which they were so desirous of having obeyed and enforced:

Five of the fourteen grocery keepers who were summoned into the Lynn police court Monday morning, June 2, charged with violating the Sunday law by selling groceries on the Lord's day, pleaded guilty and were ordered to pay a fine of \$5 each. The cases of the others, with one exception, were continued to Saturday, June 7, for trial. In the meantime they were given an opportunity to withdraw their plea of not guilty and pay a fine of \$5, when the charge against them will be dismissed. The exception is that of Benjamin Goldberg, who was in court November 9, 1900, charged with the same offense, and who has pleaded guilty both times.

All of the defendants are grocers who do a retail business on a small scale, and who were summoned into court on complaints made by William F. Tasker, a private detective of Boston, who secured evidence against them at the instigation of the Lynn Grocery and Retail Clerks' Association. The police department knew nothing of this move on the part of the clerks' association until Sunday night, when Mr. Tasker applied for the warrants. It is understood that the movement to close all the grocery stores which have hitherto been open on Sundays originated at the last meeting of the clerks' association and that other arrests are to follow.

Tasker, who was hired by the association to procure evidence necessary to secure the conviction of the violators of the law, came to Lynn early Sunday morning, and, accompanied by Thomas Caldwell, another detective, visited eighteen or twenty stores, at each of which

they purchased lemons, sugar, and in two instances peaches and mustard. The storekeepers said that they sold the articles on the supposition that they were badly needed, and had no intention of violating the law.

All of the accused appeared in court, but the judge only heard those represented by counsel. Detective Tasker was the first witness to take the stand. He testified to making purchases of sugar and peaches at the store of Annie Zeramy, at 146 Blossom Street. Cross-examined by Attorney Sisk he said that he had been a detective for seven years, and had been hired by a Mr. Hatch and a Mr. Crowell to procure evidence against the defendants. He was to be paid \$30 for his work, together with his expenses. The money with which he purchased the various articles was provided by those two gentlemen. His assistant, Thomas Caldwell, also testified to the sales being made, and said that he was to receive \$2.50 a day for his part of the work.

The case of Daniel Welch, of 59 Essex Street, was next called, and both Mr. Tasker and Mr. Caldwell testified to the sales being made by Mr. Welch. The proprietor of the store took the stand and testified that his place of business was locked when the men called at his house, and that he was getting ready for church. They represented that they were going on a picnic, and he finally decided to accommodate them. Going to the store he found the two men there, and one of them took a mug of mustard from the shelf, wrapped it up in a paper bag, and after purchasing sugar and lemons left the store. The side door was locked, and he was certain that the front door had been locked by him early in the forenoon.

On cross examination by Counsel Newcomb, Tasker said he was licensed a detective by the city of Somerville. The former characterized the testimony of the detectives as "poor quality spotter evidence," and asked that the cases be placed on file. The judge said that warning had been sent out to these small dealers that they must not sell groceries on Sundays, and in view of that he would impose a fine; the only question was on the size of the fine. Attorney Shaw stated that he would be satisfied with a small fine, except in the case of Goldberg, who had been in court before for the same offense, and those who pleaded guilty were fined \$5, with the understanding that after this any dealer brought into court for a similar offense would be liable to a

fine of \$50. The other cases were continued to Saturday morning.

In addition to what is given above the same deception and falsehood was practised upon Mr. Welch to get him to go to his store and sell something as had been practised upon other merchants at other times. The man who came for him declared that his wife was sick, that company had unexpectedly arrived, and he was therefore badly in need of the articles desired! Such deception and falsehood, however, is consistent with the cause in which it is employed. The moral level of the legal and enforced "Sabbath" scarcely rises above that point, and whatever the pretensions that may be made for it, like all things it will sooner or later seek and reach its proper level.



"National Reform" and the Washington Sunday Agitation

While ostensibly the retail clerks, butchers and grocers were the originators and leaders in the recent agitation for Sunday legislation for the District of Columbia, it is not at all unlikely that the "National Reform" forces, the ancient and inveterate champions of such legislation, were really at the bottom of it and chiefly interested in it. As nearly as can be discovered the agitation had its beginning at certain meetings in April of the Presbyterian ministers of the city, at which meetings Mr. Samuel Gompers, of the Federation of Labor, was present. Now it is a fact that a certain wing of Presbyterianism in this country is practically identical with "National Reform," and there is no section of Presbyterianism that does not sanction it in some degree. This church-and-state propaganda that has been before the country with its "God-in-the-Constitution," "Sabbath" legislation, and other specious and

fallacious reforms for so long, seems to have had its principal backing in the various Presbyterian bodies, but it must be said, in justice to the rest, chiefly from one of the most narrow and conservative.

So the fact that this agitation began at meetings of Presbyterian ministers tends strongly to connect it with the "National Reform" element, whose lobby in Washington has for some time gone under the name of the "International Reform Bureau."

Very shortly after the Sunday bills had been introduced in Congress there appeared in a number of religious papers throughout the country an article on the subject, which in each paper purported to be a Washington letter "from our regular correspondent," and which bore every evidence of having emanated from the office of the above bureau. The article was condensed in some papers, but in every paper in which it was published entire it was exactly the same. In this article the proposed Sunday legislation was described, and it was declared that "the National Reform Bureau is doing its best to get the bill passed, and there are strong hopes of success." An attempt was made to show that the legislation was badly needed, and to answer some of the objections that had been urged against it. The principal reason given for its enactment was that a law closing "all places of business on Sunday," causing "every industry" to come "to a full stop," and preventing "the Sunday trade in flowers, candies, soda-water, and the early open hours of groceries and other places of domestic supply," would "make the National Capital the ideal Sunday city of the country"—"would make Washington a model Sabbath city and a good example to the rest of the country."

And of course this was an object dear to the heart of "National Reform," for it would hasten that consummation for

which it so devoutly wishes—the securing throughout the whole nation, in every city, village and hamlet, the same “model Sabbath” and “legal Sunday” enforcement which it was hoped to fasten upon Washington by this legislation. But fortunately there were two District commissioners who would not approve of the legislation, and so the scheme fell through this time. But it is given out that the agitation will be renewed when Congress reassembles.

There was another point in the article referred to which gave it a distinctly “National Reform” flavor. It was lamented that in other cities, particularly New York and Boston, “the work of the reformers is being stultified” and made “obnoxious” to “the poor voter,” who, in consequence, “when he gets a chance will go against the reform movement” and “vote to change” the Sunday laws. It was calmly observed in this connection that this difficulty would not menace “the reform movement” in Washington when once the legislation desired was secured, for “Washington, on the other hand, has no strictly voting class, as there is no suffrage here whatever.” And thus it was that the National Capital could be made “the ideal Sunday city of the country.” When all cities become ideal after the “National Reform” standard there will be no suffrage in any of them, at least not with regard to the “reforms” which it proposes to impose by means of the statute book and the policeman’s club. The “reformers” will simply be supreme autocrats in such matters, or, in other words, popes, whose decrees will be enforced by the civil authorities. Of course, as it is declared would be the case in Washington if strict Sunday legislation could be secured, “the law will be tempered with justice and equity in its enforcement,” but it will be justice and equity after the ideas of those who will

not be disposed to do much tempering themselves and who will never permit the people to have anything to say in the matter.



In an editorial on “The New Sabbath” the *World’s Work* for June declares that whatever may be the evidence back of Dr. Lorimer’s recent prophecy that “in fifty years we shall have no Sabbath,” “there is no doubt that the character of the American Sunday is changing.” This change “has been largely from strait-laced religiosity to recreation,” and in the opinion of the magazine mentioned is evidenced by recent attempts at Sunday enforcement:

Boston suffered this spring from one of the violent reactionary applications of the “blue-laws” which the old Puritanical spirit of the city makes periodically necessary—a confession of the feeling that the sale of ice cream, soda water, candy, and tobacco on the Lord’s day is a degenerate modern desecration. In New York the arrest of Sunday baseball players and cross-country runners, coupled with a spasmodic effort on a few successive Sundays to close the easily entered saloons, indicated a weak—and, as events proved, futile—attempt to restore an earlier condition of Sabbath hush.

The *World’s Work* says that it is the part of wisdom to take note cheerfully of this changed attitude toward Sunday, and to discover in it “a really helpful influence toward social well-being.” It is very true that such a change as is here pointed out is taking place, but it is not being accompanied to any great extent by the repeal of Sunday laws themselves. A movement in that direction we would note with much cheerfulness, and we are sure that if done on principle would prove “a really helpful influence toward social well-being.” A careful study of the history of Sunday legislation does not lead one to the conclusion that the causes which now seem to be chiefly instrumental in bringing about a relaxed observ-

ance of the day by the masses, mean an overthrow of Sunday legislation itself. It was in just such conditions that Sunday legislation was born.



"Very strict" was the characterization of the Des Moines (Ia.) *Capital* of the following resolution which it reported to have been adopted at a district conference (Methodist, probably) meeting at Bedford, Iowa, on July 6:

That it is the duty of all Christians to heed, not only the statutory, but also the divine law relating to the Sabbath, by refraining from participation in and attendance upon Sunday games and amusements, from riding on Sunday trains for secular purposes or pleasure, from taking mail from the postoffice on the Sabbath, and so to deport themselves by word and deed as to inspire a general respect for the law and the Sabbath.

Yes, this is somewhat strict, but it has this virtue: it remains well within the bounds that is proper for such matters. It is a resolution by church members for church members—a declaration by professing Christians of what they believe the duty of Christians to be in the matter; and is in the nature of an appeal to the sense of duty rather than of a command to be carried out by coercion and compulsion. But it is evident that those who adopted this resolution are not entirely free from the common error in this matter. Can Christians have any further duty with regard to the Sabbath than that required by the divine law? If not, why should they concern themselves about the "statutory" phase of the matter. Sabbath observance is not a statutory matter, and of all people Christians should be most alive to this fact. The statutory "Sabbath" is a perversion of the divine law of Sabbath observance, chiefly in that it introduces force into a matter which God has left to the conscience.



If correctly reported in the press Gen.

Thomas J. Morgan, Corresponding Secretary of the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and formerly Commissioner of Indian Affairs, made these statements in an address at St. Paul, Minn., on May 24:

Archbishop Ireland wields a tremendous power in politics, which he is using for the Roman Church. I cannot prove it absolutely, but I am morally certain that in the last election Mark Hanna, representing the Republican party, of which I am a member, formally agreed with Archbishop Ireland, representing a great mass of voters, that, in consideration of turning over these votes to the Republican party, the Roman Church would be given concessions in the Indian schools. And when issues arose thereafter, and Indian officials were inclined to oppose the claims of the Romanist with regard to the Indians, they were told by higher authority that the bargain had been made and must be carried out.

It is not likely that Mr. Morgan would have made such statements unless he had strong reason for believing them to be true. Those who have been obliged to form their opinions from what has appeared upon the surface, and without the aid of information which Mr. Morgan doubtless received, have no difficulty whatever in believing these statements. What he stated is of course significant under any circumstances, but especially so in view of the prominent part that has been and is being played by Archbishop Ireland in the matter of the American negotiations with the Vatican.



The London (Ontario) *News*, of June 18, contained the following interesting and suggestive dispatch from Woodstock, Ont.:

Several residents of Finkle Street have joined the Seventh-day Adventist faith, and accordingly keep Sabbath on Saturday and use Sunday as the first day of the week. On Sunday last churchgoers viewed the unusual sight of a father and two sons in the field with arms bared, hoeing potatoes. The day before they had on their "biled shirts," and went to service at a Finkle Street house. The men

were seen at work at their "tater" patch a week ago Sunday, too. It is against the Sabbath Observance law, and the neighbors are thinking of going to the police.

"Arms bared, hoeing potatoes"! "Neighbors are thinking of going to the police"! Comment here is superfluous. It is enough almost to make one ashamed of religion when he realizes that from no other cause than that of religious zeal and bigotry could the minds of men have become so irrational as to entertain as a matter of course the idea that the cultivation of a garden is a thing for the prevention of which it is proper to summon the agents of civil order, or as to have made it possible to fix in legislation a law which makes such a deed a thing to be proceeded against as a crime against society.



The city council of North Yakima, Wash., was recently petitioned to take some action toward the night closing of saloons and the Sunday closing of saloons and "other places of business." The council passed an ordinance requiring the closing of saloons during certain hours of the night, but refused to incorporate a Sunday-closing section. As might have been expected this fell very far short of satisfying the "law and order league members," who will continue an agitation "to have all places of business closed on Sundays." The council no doubt perceived that the demand for Sunday closing had its source in something else than a desire for civic peace and order. This is shown very clearly in the fact that it was demanded that not only saloons but all places of business be closed. Of course there is nothing detrimental to peace and order in the opening of a grocery or dry goods store and the selling of goods on Sunday, any more than on any other day of the week, and a demand for their closing by law on that

day necessarily springs from some other source than that of considerations for the maintenance of civil order.



"Negotiations with the Pope of Rome are very dangerous to the peace of the country," says the *New York Christian Advocate*. And after declaring that such negotiations "need close watching," it says very sensibly: "Sometimes people say the Constitution will never be changed, church and state will never be united. The Constitution may never be changed, but the great point is to see that its spirit is not infringed; for there can be tyranny in free governments . . . where the operation is contrary to the spirit of the government, if not to the letter of the law." And, by the way, this point is just as applicable to Methodists and Sunday legislation as it is to the Papacy and governmental negotiations with the Pope.



The storekeepers of Sauk Rapids, Minn., "have signed an agreement to keep their places of business closed on Sunday." "Rev. Gear, of the Methodist Church, is back of the movement." It would be well if all the ministers would substitute this method for that usually employed by them for securing Sunday closing, and in employing this method they should be careful to inform all who sign such an agreement that they have no right to seek to compel those who do not sign it to conform to it.



The "benevolent disposition toward this country," shown by the Vatican, is mentioned by *The Independent*. This "benevolent disposition" is closely akin to that which prompted the famous invitation of the spider to the fly.



The patriot is a man of principle, not of policy.

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.

[The synoptical statement given here each month includes everything of this nature reported in the issue of the magazine in which it is printed. Some of the matter will occasionally be found outside of this department. *Synopsis.*—Arrests under Sunday laws: For keeping open store and selling, 66; for ball playing, 24; for barbering, 22; for conducting "worldly amusements," 14; for card playing, 4; for selling newspapers, 3; total, 133. Persons fined: For keeping open store or shop and selling, 28; for ball playing, 6; for card playing, 4; for barbering, 4; total, 42. Sunday-enforcement agitations: Against open stores or shops and selling, 21; against games and amusements, principally baseball, 15; against barbering, 4; against common labor, 1; against mail service, 1; general, 5; total, 47. One city ordinance passed prohibiting barbering; another passed prohibiting games and fishing. One New Jersey police justice declares Sunday ball playing to be no crime; another rules that Sunday selling by merchants and shopkeepers at their usual places of business is no offense under the laws of New Jersey. Two juries refuse to convict Sunday ball players. Six lads indicted, convicted and fined for ball playing. One Hebrew merchant, claiming to be an observer of the seventh day, heavily fined for Sunday selling. One Seventh-day Adventist merchant convicted and fined for Sunday selling, and utterly denied the benefits of exemption clause.]

An agitation for Sunday enforcement against all stores and business places was reported from Fontanelle, Iowa, recently.



The city council of Yankton, S. Dak., recently passed an ordinance "prohibiting the keeping open of barber shops on Sunday."



Three men were fined for "gaming on the Sabbath day" at Campello, Mass., recently, and another was fined for being present when the card playing was in progress.



"Williston women have organized a Sabbath observance society, and propose to have business places closed on the first day of the week," says the Grand Forks (N. D.) *Herald*.



The Janesville (Minn.) *Argus* reports that at the neighboring town of Waseca "the burning question is how to get rid of Sunday baseball games, which desecrate alike every sentiment of home as well as of the sacred day."

Soloman Cohen, a clothing merchant, was convicted by a jury in a police court at Buffalo, N. Y., on June 17, on the charge of "violating the Sunday closing law." Sentence was suspended.



Some residents of Willmar, Minn., have "entered a loud protest against Sunday games at Athletic Park," and "steps are to be taken to prevent the holding of games in the future."



The police board of Noblesville, Ind., recently refused to order the Sunday closing of cigar stores in response to a demand of the ministerial association. The ministers thereupon decided "to hold union services to discuss the question of Sunday observance."



The retail clerks' association of Duluth, Minn., recently caused the arrest of three Hebrew clothing merchants for selling goods on Sunday, and is said to be securing evidence against "a number of other clothing men who keep their places open on the first day of the week."

It is reported from Gloucester, Mass., that "the newly-inaugurated Sunday closing is working finely." Since the clerks have prevailed upon the city authorities to act in the matter many stores display the sign: "This is a union store—Closed Sundays."



In the police court in Springfield, Mass., on June 23, three young men pleaded guilty to "the charge of playing ball on the Sabbath," the preceding day. Sentence was postponed. The *News* of that city remarks that "they were caught red-handed at their nefarious work."



It is reported from Youngstown, Ohio, that "the agitation relative to the matter of Sunday closing continues." Early in June a fruit dealer was arrested for Sunday selling and held for trial under \$200 bond. Information as to the outcome of the trial has not reached us.



Notwithstanding that they had been ordered by the burgess to close on Sundays, and had been notified by the chief of police that every one of them would be arrested if they did not obey the order, fifteen storekeepers of Carnegie, Pa., decided on June 19 that they would continue to sell goods on Sundays.



"Wholesale arrests of Sabbath-breakers," due to "the determined efforts of the police officers to put a stop to this way of spending the day here," were reported to have taken place on the evening of June 22 at resorts adjacent to Woodbury, N. J. It was stated that the arrested persons "come from Philadelphia."



The ministerial association of Terre Haute, Ind., recently, "in the name of both religion and morality," protested

against "the common desecration of the Sabbath in our midst" by "Sunday picnics, baseball," etc., and called upon the mayor of the city "to faithfully enforce the laws against them as far as the law may apply."



It was reported in the New York papers on July 12 that 'the Citizens' Union is now to take up the question of Sunday-law enforcement. A committee of members has been selected to study the facts and present them to the Commissioner of Police.' Sunday enforcement against saloons is of course what is here especially referred to.



The retail grocers' association of Madison, Wis., recently adopted a resolution deploring "the idea of keeping grocery stores open on Sunday," and asking "all proprietors of such stores to keep their respective places of business closed on the Sabbath day." It was thought that nothing could be gained at present "by taking drastic measures."



At a Presbyterian convention at Jackson, Miss., in the latter part of May, it was lamented in a report on the subject that "the Sabbath is gradually losing its hold on the heart and conscience of the people in general," and that "while the State laws are sufficient to break up the Sabbath desecration, public sentiment is against their enforcement."



The proprietors of the various stores in the village of Bridgton, Me., were recently visited by a deputy sheriff and "warned not to sell anything on Sunday until further notice." The order included the sale of ice-cream, soda-water, tobacco and cigars, and newspapers. "An unusual commotion" in the village is said to have been the immediate result.

The Bridgeport (Conn.) *Union* reports that the Hebrew merchants of that city "have been instructed that hereafter they must observe the Sunday law, except where they keep open as a matter of conscience." And even though they keep open "as a matter of conscience," they "are cautioned not to disturb the adherents of other denominations."



Fourteen proprietors of various amusement enterprises in Woodside Park, Philadelphia, appeared before a magistrate at the city hall in that city on June 24, "charged with violating the act of Assembly of 1794 by performing worldly employment on Sunday." The warrants were sworn out against them by a special police officer. A continuance of the cases was granted.



The president of the Duluth & Iron Range Railroad, running in and out of Ely, Minn., has given notice that "only excursions gotten up by societies of religious denominations" will be run by that railroad on Sundays. It is thought this determination is due to church influences, and is intended especially to break up Sunday ball playing by preventing attendance from neighboring towns.



On July 7 the council of the township of Shefford, P. Q., Canada, passed "a by-law to secure a proper observance of the Sabbath." The *Waterloo (P. Q.) Advertiser* says "it is aimed at Sunday games and Sunday shooting and fishing," and that "sportsmen who in future venture to hunt, fish or play golf or baseball in the limits of the municipality on Sunday will be snaffled by the minions of the law."



At the instance of a member of the local butcher workmen's union, two butchers of Ottumwa, Iowa, were ar-

rested late in May "on the charge of breaking the Sabbath by selling meat on that day." At the trial of one of them, on June 4, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty, the opinion seeming to prevail that "the statute permits the sale of meat whenever it is done to meet the necessities of the people."



What a despatch states to have been "a jury trial of unusual importance" took place in the county court of Creighton, Neb., on June 14, in which "the Good Citizens' League, the Protestant Ministers' Association, and the State of Nebraska were plaintiffs, and the local ball team was defendant." The charge was playing ball on Sunday. After twenty minutes deliberation the jury returned a verdict of not guilty, and the defendants were discharged.



On June 16 a delegation of five ministers, representing as many different churches, waited on the mayor of Geneva, N. Y., and "called for a general enforcement of the Sunday laws," complaining particularly of "the sale of papers on the streets, the music of a piano in a certain candy store, the Sunday ball game at Preëmption Park, and the alleged violations of the excise law." The mayor said he would order the law enforced against Sunday ball playing.



On June 26 a local branch of the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association was organized in Mankato, Minn., and about the first action taken was the appointment of "committees to see the merchants and ask them to close their stores on Sunday as provided by law." Further than this it is said that "Sunday closing is the only point that the clerks are going to stand for at present." In this they are to have the support of all labor organizations in the city.

In response to complaints from the retail grocers' association the marshal of Haverhill, Mass., "is going to enforce the blue-laws on Sunday," and "the result will be that only he who has a legal right to do business will be allowed to exchange his wares for coin of the realm." Druggists, bakers, regular newsdealers and licensed victualers are the only ones having "a legal right to do business," and the bakers are limited to two hours in the morning and the same length of time in the evening.



According to the Milwaukee (Wis.) *Sentinel*, of July 6, "the Milwaukee Retail Shoe Dealers' Association, composed of a majority of the leading shoe dealers of Milwaukee, an organization fast becoming a power among retailers, has at last brought about universal Sunday closing among the leading retail shoe merchants." This result has been accomplished by voluntary agreement. Letters have been received "from citizens and clergy" strongly approving and endorsing the movement for Sunday closing.



Under date of June 16 it was reported from Millville, N. J., that "for the first time in its history Millville observed the 'old blue-laws' yesterday." By order of the mayor all the ice-cream and oyster saloons, grocery, cigar and confectionery stores and restaurants were closed, and the drug stores were allowed to open only for the filling of prescriptions. It was stated that "the people are very indignant over the mayor's ukase," and that it was the intention of some to keep open and "test the law" on following Sundays.



Young men and boys of Woodstock, Ontario, who engage in ball playing and

other sports on Sundays on the smooth flats of the Thames just outside the city limits, have been complained of to the police, and now orders have been given "to arrest all persons continuing the practise." That there is any reason for this action aside from the fact that the games are played on Sunday does not appear from the item regarding the matter in the *Woodstock Review*, in which the young men and boys are spoken of as "miscreants."



C. J. Johnson and August Hoppe, grocers of Minneapolis, Minn., were arraigned in the police court of that city on June 28 for selling goods on Sunday, the offense of the first being "selling a bar of soap and a can of sardines on Sunday contrary to law." The cases were continued to the following week, when Hoppe pleaded guilty and was fined \$5 and costs. It is said that the action against the grocers was brought "to test the Sunday law which compels such places of business to remain closed on the Sabbath day."



Sunday ball playing and the failure of the city authorities to prohibit it, were the occasion of a vigorous sermon by the pastor of the Chapel Street Methodist Church, Waterbury, Conn., on June 15. It was declared that by virtue of "the law of God and the law of the State of Connecticut a peaceful Sabbath is the birthright of every citizen," and that to yield up this birthright was to follow the example of Esau. It is reported that "Catholic clergymen have also been sounding a note of warning" against Sunday ball playing.



On June 18 the ministerial alliance of Jamestown, N. Y., held "a special and very important meeting to take action on

Sunday ball playing." "A number of prominent divines of the city took part in the conference, discussing at length the subject of the desecration of the Sabbath and violation of State statutes." A committee was appointed "to take proper action," the first step being "to communicate to Governor Odell the request that Sheriff Cooper be removed from office for inactivity in enforcing the law relative to the playing of baseball on Sunday."



Three newsboys were recently arrested in Syracuse, N. Y., on complaint of "a citizen who alleged that the selling of newspapers by the boys on the streets Sunday morning interfered with his comfort." The justice mildly reprimanded the boys and allowed them to go. The *Syracuse Standard* says "it would seem to be a poor and unworthy policy which seeks to prohibit newsboys from plying their honorable and commendable vocation on any day in the week." A number of clergymen were asked to express an opinion on the matter, but in each case "wished to be excused from making any statement."



If reports are correct there is very scant mail service on Sundays at Morristown, N. J., and this will continue if the zealous friends of the Sunday institution in that place can have their way. A short time ago it was announced by the postmaster that Sunday mail service between Morristown and New York would be instituted, and that there would be one collection on that day by local carriers. This aroused "ministers and other church people," who "sent telegrams to Washington protesting against what they called a desecration of the Sabbath." The result was that an order was soon posted rescinding the previous order for Sunday mail service.

Under the inspiration and leadership of "Rev. O. R. Miller, of the Pennsylvania Reform Bureau," representatives of the local churches of Homestead, Pa., met at the Methodist church on the evening of June 30 and discussed "the question of obtaining a better Sabbath observance." Of course Mr. Miller made the principal speech, and "spoke strongly in favor of it [better "Sabbath" observance]." A committee was appointed to visit the mayor and "have him put a stop to the selling of soda-water, candy, fruits, cigars, and the crying of newspapers on Sunday." What great and soul-stirring "reforms" this "Reform" Bureau does set on foot!



On June 30 the Monroe (Wis.) County Fair Association adopted a resolution "strictly forbidding Sunday baseball playing on the fair grounds" in Tomah. On the preceding Sunday a game was in progress on the grounds, which the president of the association made an unsuccessful attempt to stop. His action was unanimously endorsed by the association. Of course the owners or managers of grounds have a perfect right to refuse to allow them to be used for Sunday ball playing or any other purpose, and it is strange that the ball people were able to commence a game on them at all in view of the evident strong opposition to anything of the kind by the fair association.



A new mayor of New Castle, Pa., has signalized his entrance into office by the inauguration of a Sunday-enforcement régime, and it is said that everything will be stopped and closed on Sundays but street-cars, churches and restaurants, and a paper in a neighboring city remarks that "it behooves all persons with open countenances to give New Castle a wide

berth on Sundays in the future." Dealers who have been accustomed to keeping open on Sundays have been notified to "refrain from selling any unnecessary articles," including tobacco and cigars, on Sundays. On June 24 it was reported that warrants had been issued for the arrest of several soda-water dispensers and fruit-store proprietors who had transacted business on the previous Sunday.



The *Marcus (Ia.) News* reports that "the Marcus tonsorial artists are having an entertaining time over the question of Sunday closing." One barber who persists in disregarding the mandate of the other barbers in the matter has been taken before a justice and fined three times. The *News*, in a very common sense fashion, declares that if one line of business should suspend that all lines should suspend, and concludes that as the post-office is a business institution, it, too, should be closed along with the rest:

We do not believe that the existing Sunday law was framed to prohibit one person from transacting business on Sunday and allowing another to do so. If one business place must be closed let the order be general, including the postoffice. No partiality should be shown in this matter. A large majority of the citizens are of the same opinion.



The officials and some of the citizens of Asbury Park, N. J., are becoming restive under the condition of affairs whereby that city is prevented from having any train service on Sundays. By an agreement between the Ocean Grove Camp-meeting Association and the New York and Long Branch Railroad Company, no trains can stop at Asbury Park on Sundays. The city council and board of trade recently asked the camp-meeting officials to permit the rescinding of the contract, or to allow it to be so construed as to permit trains to stop on Sundays, but

they refused, saying that was their final decision in the matter. The city attorney of Asbury Park was then instructed by the council to take legal action to secure the stopping of all regular passenger trains at that place on Sundays.



George A. Bingham, a druggist of Toronto, Ont., was arraigned in the police court of that city on June 21, "charged with selling ice-cream soda on Sunday." The constable who made the arrest testified that, in company with two other policemen, he went into Mr. Bingham's store and bought ice-cream sodas, answering in the affirmative when asked if they "needed them as medicine." Other persons were being served at the same time. The case was continued. We suppose this is one of the first results of the agitation by the Lord's-day (Sunday) Alliance with regard to the sale of refreshments on Sunday in Toronto, noted last month. The method by which evidence was here obtained bears evidence that it had the genuine Sunday-enforcement spirit and inspiration behind it.



According to the *Des Moines (Iowa) Register*, of June 27, Mr. C. Panor, Hebrew clothing merchant of that city, who claimed to be an observer of the seventh day of the week, was convicted on the previous day of "violation of the Sunday closing law" and sentenced to pay a fine of \$100 and costs. The intimation was that the heavy fine was imposed because Mr. Panor had misrepresented the matter when he said he observed the seventh day, the evidence showing, it is said, that his store was open every day in the week. Mr. Panor at once gave notice that he would appeal to the district court, and the bond on his appeal was fixed at \$200. The arrest and prosecution

were due to the efforts of the retail clerks' union, the president of which announced that this case was but a forerunner of a number that are to follow.



One of the eighteen persons arrested at Flint, Mich., on May 25, for playing ball on Sunday, was tried in a justice's court on June 17. Considerable interest was felt in the trial, as it was expected that it would determine the future of Sunday ball playing in that city. But the jury was unable to come to an agreement, and all the cases were continued. The attorneys on both sides made vigorous speeches, the one arguing against the propriety of force in connection with Sunday observance and calling attention to the evils that would result if the Sunday law were rigidly enforced, and the other declaring that he would express no opinion as to the merits of Sunday ball or the Sunday law, but rest upon the one point that "so long as the law remains upon the statute books it is the business of sheriffs, prosecutors and juries to enforce it."



On June 16 the ministerial association of Duluth, Minn., unanimously adopted and sent to the mayor of the city resolutions "warning the city administration that Sunday baseball must not be permitted in Duluth." And it was declared that unless "this attempt to fasten on our city this open lawlessness" was prevented by the authorities proceedings would be instituted against them in the courts. The Duluth *Herald* notes that this demand was inspired by the ministers of the larger churches of the city, the leader being Rev. H. G. Knowles, Methodist, and chaplain of the lower house of the Minnesota legislature, and says that it "comes from a source that is not likely to be ignored." On June 29 about the

only Sunday game that has been attempted in the city for two months was promptly suppressed by the police. A dispatch states that "Sunday ball has been an important issue for two months."



A vigorous Sunday enforcement crusade, inaugurated by the local W. C. T. U., has been waged recently in Berwick, Pa. Most of the merchants of the place have been arrested and fined for Sunday selling, and so many of the agents of the dairymen's association have been arrested and fined that it has discontinued entirely the delivery of milk between Saturday evening and Monday morning. Two druggists were arrested three times for selling soda-water, and each time waived a hearing and appealed to a higher court. It is said that even the local agent for the Philadelphia *Enquirer* and other Sunday papers came very near being landed in the borough jail for handling his papers on Sundays as had long been his custom. The latest report that we have says that the infection has spread to the neighboring town of Catawissa, where "the authorities intend to inaugurate a similar Sunday-closing movement."



It was reported from Detroit, Mich., under date of June 18, that the Methodist ministers' association had decided to appeal to the governor of the State for the impeachment of Sheriff Dickson, of that county, who had refused to stop Sunday ball playing at grounds adjacent to Detroit. The sheriff declared that he would not recede from his determination, and said he had informed the ministers that there were other things going on without hindrance or complaint that were "as much of a violation of Sabbath observance as an exhibition that draws working people out into the open air for

a few hours on Sunday, giving them a thoroughly healthful and harmless afternoon." But evidently the ministers came out best, for the report was sent out on July 2 that the sheriff had on that day "announced that there will be no more Sunday ball in this locality," and that he would swear in deputies to stop a game that was announced for the following Sunday.



As intimated last month the new ordinance passed in Montreal, Canada, permitting the sale of fruits, cigars, confectionery and temperance beverages on Sunday under certain restrictions, is really a step in the direction of more strict Sunday enforcement, and already many arrests have occurred. On July 6 twenty persons were arraigned in the recorder's court on the charge of having sold goods on Sunday contrary to the provisions of the new ordinance. Policemen testified that they had purchased from these persons articles which the law allowed to be sold only on condition that the other articles specified were also kept for sale. Most of the persons arrested were tobacco dealers, and it was testified that they had no fruit, beverages, etc., for sale in their places. The recorder reserved his judgment for a few days. The tobacco dealers have organized and employed counsel, and in case of conviction will have the question of the validity of the by-law passed upon by the higher courts.



As a result of an agitation against Sunday ball playing begun by a local newspaper and the "law and order league," which, of course, stands for the clergymen of the place, six boys were arrested recently at Plattsmouth, Neb., on the charge of playing ball on Sunday. They were tried under the State law in

the county court on June 16. The boys had no one to defend them, and pleaded guilty. The prosecuting attorney stated that it was not so much his purpose to have them punished as to have ball playing on Sunday stopped, and recommended that on consideration of a promise on their part not to violate the law in the future that merely a nominal fine be imposed. Two were fined \$1 and costs each, and the other four were fined \$2 and costs each. This made the cost to each not less than \$5. However nominal the fines may have been, it seems to us that there is something decidedly wrong when boys can be hauled to court on a criminal indictment and compelled to pay a sum which to them is no doubt quite large for nothing more than engaging in the common game of baseball.



Police Justice Murphy, of Jersey City, N. J., declared on June 16 that under ordinary circumstances ball playing on Sunday did not constitute a crime, and served notice on the police that it would be useless to bring such offenders before him. At the instance of members of the Epworth League of the Simpson Methodist Church, which is said to have been some distance from where the playing was in progress, six young men had been arrested and brought before him as disorderly persons for participating in a game of baseball on a vacant lot on Sunday. In discharging the young men the magistrate made these sensible remarks:

Where ball games are played in open or isolated lots on Sunday, and the comfort and peace of the community are not broken, my opinion is that arrests should not be made. The young men are benefited by the exercise, especially those who have been confined in the factories and shops all the week. It is better for them to enjoy such healthful recreation than to congregate on street corners or gather

in places where they might be subjected to temptation. Unless there is proof that the boys are committing a nuisance this court will promptly discharge all who are brought here on this charge. The recreation engaged in by these young men is no more of a violation of the law than is walking the streets for pleasure on a Sunday.



An agitation against Sunday ball playing was recently set on foot by the ministers of Albert Lea, Minn. First a meeting "to consider the question of having the law regarding Sunday observance more generally enforced" was held at the Presbyterian church, at which "the law was read" and addresses were made by the ministers and others. This was followed by a mass-meeting in the city park, attended by several hundred people and addressed by some half dozen clergymen and others, at which a long set of resolutions was adopted appealing to "our fellow citizens, especially the members of the baseball association, to regard our feelings and refrain from baseball games and kindred sports on the Lord's day." Among the reasons given for this request were these "incontrovertible propositions":

A restful Sabbath is a hygienic necessity.

A quiet Sabbath is the greatest moral force in the world.

A worshipful Sabbath is indispensable to religion.

A sacred Sabbath is the mightiest police force in the land.

A civic Sabbath is the strongest pillar in the temple of liberty.

A secular Sabbath is destructive of all good.

It was also declared that "besides all this, games of baseball and other such sports upon the Christian Sabbath are contrary to the laws of the State."



Sunday enforcement seems to have been a matter of considerable interest and agitation in Trenton, N. J., of late. Some

of the ministers have been preaching "special" sermons on the subject, about fifty of the general merchandise dealers are reported to have formed an organization "for the purpose of securing the enforcement of the Sunday-closing law" and have petitioned the mayor for "impartial enforcement," and, as noted in these columns last month, the retail clerks have begun an active campaign for Sunday closing by law. One report also says that the superintendent of the First Baptist Sunday school "has asked the police what can be done to compel the keeper of a confectionery store near the church to suspend business Sundays." He complains that the children spend in this store "the pennies they should have taken to Sunday school." As a result of the efforts of the retail clerks' association, twelve merchants were tried in the police court on June 12 for Sunday selling. Eight were convicted and fined \$2 and costs each, and the rest were discharged. Through their counsel the convicted merchants gave notice that they would appeal the cases, and declared very properly that the clerks who had bought goods in obtaining evidence were just as much violators of the Sunday law as those who sold them the goods.



In the borough court in Wallingford, Conn., on June 23, Henry Jacobs, a barber, was tried on the charge of "keeping his barber shop open and doing secular work on Sunday, June 15," and was compelled to pay costs to the amount of \$13.50. The prosecution was due to the efforts of the barbers' union, and the trial attracted considerable attention, the court room being crowded. A number of witnesses testified to seeing the shop open and barbering going on as alleged, and the prosecuting attorney, who had another attorney to assist him in the case,

took the stand and testified that he had gone to the shop of the defendant a few days before and notified him that he would be prosecuted if he did not close on Sundays, and at the same time "read the law to him." The attorney for the defendant asked that judgment be suspended, but this the court refused to do because of the facts testified to by the prosecuting attorney. The judge declared that there was "a deplorable condition of things in town as to places being wide open on Sunday, and it was a matter to be ashamed of," but he did not wish to enter a criminal record against the defendant, and would therefore nolle pros. the case on payment of costs. But he said that in doing so he established no precedent for future cases, and that his action did "not mean any license for violation of the statutes."



The retail clerks and the journeymen, barbers and butchers of Jersey City, N. J., have been carrying on a Sunday-closing crusade of late. The clerks' association has issued a statement to the public appealing for its coöperation in their efforts to abolish all Sunday opening and to shorten the hours of service on week days. The public is asked to coöperate "by refraining from patronizing those dealers who refuse to give us our just rights as American citizens." The barbers and butchers have appealed directly to the law in their campaign for Sunday closing, one section of what is known as the "Vice and Immorality Act" affording them the necessary legal leverage. On July 6 and 13 the organizations of both met at seven in the morning and sent out numerous "pickets" to watch for open shops, and "whenever they found an open shop they hunted up the nearest policeman and had the proprietor arrested." On the first date it was re-

ported that "a score of boss barbers" were arrested, and complaints were lodged against several butchers. On the following Sunday eight barbers and two butchers were arrested. Many "boss" barbers who had determined to stand out against the Sunday closing movement did business openly without drawing their curtains, by keeping their doors fastened on the inside and admitting only regular customers. At one of these shops the Sunday crusaders tried for several hours to secure an entrance, but were completely foiled. The proprietor kept his door latched on the inside, and stopped while shaving customers to smile through his window at the baffled "pickets" and the policemen with them, who seemed to rather enjoy the affair and who did not dare to enter the shop forcibly without a warrant. The crusaders vowed that they would have a warrant for the arrest of that barber on the following morning. An effort was made by the journeymen barbers' union to get the chief of police to order the Sunday closing of the barber shops, but without success.



What promises to be quite a vigorous Sunday-enforcement campaign has been launched at Chillicothe, Ohio. On Sunday afternoon, July 6, "a mass-meeting of citizens," growing out of a previous meeting of representatives of the various churches at which "ways and means of curbing the tendency of some classes of citizens to violate the Sunday laws" had been discussed, was held in Memorial Hall, and a strong sentiment for "enforcing the law and keeping the Sabbath as a day of rest" was manifested. Although it was hoped to make it "a representative meeting of all the churches, Protestant and Catholic, and of all citizens who believe in the rule of

law and public order," less than 200 persons were present. But the slim attendance did not dampen the ardor of the speakers. The ministers, of course, did most of the talking, but several prominent citizens also spoke, and a judge acted as chairman. An organization was formed to be known as the "Sunday League," and its object, according to the *Chillicothe Advertiser*, is "the enforcement of laws against Sunday desecration." Cash and pledges for furthering this object were given to the amount of \$350. The agitation seems to have had its origin over Sunday ball playing and other forms of amusement. One of the speakers at this mass-meeting declared that it was "disregard of law that made the future of our Republic uncertain," and that "the severest test would come when the clash came between the law on one hand and aggregated capital, called trusts, on the other." A minister who followed seized upon this point and declared that "if law could be violated with impunity by baseball players it certainly could be by trusts," and that if either "could violate the law they could do away with Sunday altogether." Evidently the friends of the religious Sunday rely absolutely upon the support it receives from the law, and believe that without that support it would at once perish from the earth. While of course this institution has nothing but human support and authority behind it, their faith in its vitality is even lower than it needs to be.



Under date of July 9 it was reported from Newton, Iowa, that the most familiar and widely read portion of "The Annotated Code of Iowa" in that place was section 5,040, of the edition of 1897, reading:

BREACH OF THE SABBATH.—If any person be found on the first day of the week, com-

monly called Sunday, engaged in carrying firearms, dancing, hunting, shooting, horse racing, or in any manner disturbing a worshipping assembly, or private family, or in buying or selling property of any kind, or in any labor except that of necessity or charity, he shall be fined not more than five nor less than one dollar, and be imprisoned in the county jail until the fine, with costs of prosecution, shall be paid; but nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, or to prevent persons traveling or families emigrating from pursuing their journey, or keepers of toll bridges, toll gates and ferrymen from attending the same.

It seems that some weeks ago Mr. A. C. Randolph, the head of the Randolph Stacker Company of that city, was arrested and fined for riding a bicycle on a sidewalk. This made him indignant, and he decided that he would do something by way of retaliation, and, of course, the Sunday statute afforded the most ready means for making trouble "legally." He notified the business men of the place that in future he would see that the Sunday law was "enforced to the letter." The churches of the city at once caught a whiff of the breeze that had begun to blow, and determined to make the most of the opportunity. At a meeting of representatives of the different churches a petition to the city council was prepared asking that at its next session it enact a Sunday-closing ordinance. The council considered the matter for a while and then decided not to pass the ordinance, stating through a committee that the State law was deemed sufficient. So the State law was invoked, and the marshal notified the business men "that any infraction of the law would elicit prompt action on the part of the authorities to enforce the prescribed penalty." "On July 6, with three or four exceptions, the business houses accustomed to doing a Sunday business were closed as per order, but much ill-feeling was created."

Messrs. Neel & Dowling, bakers, and Mr. Wertz, restaurant keeper, expressed "the determination to fight the closing of their places," and will be seconded by others.



On July 9 the Sunday-closing-by-law campaign that had been vigorously pushed for some weeks in Trenton, N. J., by the retail clerks and journeymen butchers was brought to a sudden halt. The clergymen of the city had given their support to the movement by speaking on the subject from their pulpits and urging the members of their congregations to refrain from purchasing at places keeping open on Sunday and to use their influence with their friends and acquaintances in the same direction. Monsignor Doane, of St. Patrick's Catholic Church, had made a special appeal, and declared that he was "heartily in accord with all movements opposed to the desecration of the Sabbath." On some Sundays pickets to the number of 250, both men and women, had been placed throughout the city, and quite a number of arrests had been made and at least nine retail butchers and two merchants had been fined. Hoping to satisfy the demands of their clerks, the butchers had offered to let them off all day Sunday and to give them a half-holiday during the week, if they would not interfere with the selling of meat on Sundays by the proprietors themselves. This proposition the journeymen refused to listen to. But on the date mentioned above, in the case of three merchants who had been brought before him on the charge of Sunday selling and had pleaded guilty, Police Judge Lambert declared that he would entertain no more complaints against merchants and shopkeepers for Sunday selling, and would remit the fines and costs already imposed upon those who had been before him on that charge. He pointed the aston-

ished Sunday-closing crusaders to section 12 of the "Vice and Immorality Act" of 1874, under which law the prosecutions had been made, which reads:

That nothing in this act contained shall be taken or construed so as to affect any licensed tavernkeeper in his or her ordinary and lawful business, at his or her usual place of residence, specified in his or her license, or shall it be so taken and construed as to affect any merchant, shopkeeper, farmer, mechanic or other person in the usual and lawful transaction of his or their ordinary concerns and business in their usual places of doing such business.

Judge Lambert declared that it was evident from this section that there was no law in New Jersey "to prevent the sale of merchandise by merchants and shopkeepers in their usual places of business on Sundays." This opinion has created some stir, and although lawyers and other judges have expressed the opinion that it certainly rests upon a misapprehension of the law, inasmuch as other sections of the act expressly forbid all traffic on Sunday, it is admitted that if the section cited was correctly printed in the last edition of the General Statutes, that the opinion has pretty good ground upon which to rest. Until the matter is straightened out the clerks and butchers will doubtless have to get along without the aid of the law in their efforts for Sunday closing. The journeymen barbers' union of Trenton has also been working for several weeks to bring about strict Sunday closing of barber shops. No arrests as yet are reported, though the journeymen have been collecting evidence which it is said they will present to the grand jury. And "if the enforcement of the old blue laws proves impossible, a well-known lawyer will be retained to draw up a bill to be presented to the legislature next winter." Few of the employing barbers sympathize with the movement, and most of them will strongly oppose it.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 WEST 20TH ST., NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

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

CLUBBING RATE.

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

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

TO OUR PATRONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Let all whose subscriptions expire with the August number see to it that their renewals are sent in promptly. Future issues will be too important to miss. We would appreciate the favor if each one would try to send in another subscription with their renewal.



Read our special offer on another page. The remaining numbers of 1902 will be mailed to anyone not now a subscriber for 25 cents. This is an excellent opportunity to do missionary work among your friends; not only by sending THE SENTINEL to them, but by inducing them to subscribe for themselves. There will be found four coupons in connection with the announcement. Let every subscriber make an earnest endeavor to see that the four in his or her SENTINEL are used.

The *Life Boat*, Chicago, reports that their anti-cigarette number was the means of accomplishing much good; that many who have been slaves of tobacco for years have written them to know how they can secure deliverance from the bondage of this habit.

They now intend to have the August number deal almost exclusively with the Temperance question. Contributions have been received from prominent temperance workers, and this issue promises to be as strong for temperance as the June number was against the tobacco evil.

One hundred copies, one and one-half cents each; smaller quantities, two cents each. Order of *The Life Boat*, 28 33rd Place, Chicago, Ills.



An old-time subscriber in renewing says: "Find enclosed \$1 to renew my subscription to THE SENTINEL. I have taken the paper ever since it was published, and cannot part with it now. It is worth its weight in gold."

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 Champlon St., BATTLE CREEK, MICH., U. S. A.

\$10!

This sum will be paid to any one who can
prove that there is any injurious substance in
E-Z WASHING TABLETS

We guarantee they contain no acids, no potash, or any
such ingredient.

YOUR CLOTHES WILL LAST LONGER if you use E-Z Washing Tablets because they require no
rubbing. No other preparation can make such a claim without injury to the clothes.

You can do your washing in half the time with half the labor.

A FEW POINTERS

I had one trial of your E-Z Washing Tablets and am much pleased with them. Will not do without them. I enclose postal order for one dozen bars. MRS. S. BROCK, Sprague, Wash.

The Tablets are slowly but surely making friends. Those who have used it are loud in its praise. After a little I am sure I shall have a good sale for it.

M. BRANCH, Keene, N. Y.

I consider the Tablets an article of great merit and will be a good seller when introduced.

N. BLOUGH, Onaway, Mich.

I received the samples of Washing Tablets and find them the best thing I ever used.

B. FLEWELLING, Caribou, Me.

Enclosed please find stamps for two bars of E-Z Washing Tablets. I have used samples you sent me and am delighted with results.

MRS. C. MCCORKLE, Barre, Vt.

Your samples of E-Z Washing Tablets received, and am well pleased with them. Find enclosed postage stamps for more. I find no fault whatever with your Tablets.

Mrs. S. HEATHCOTE, Orland, Cal.

We could print many more such testimonials, but these are sufficient to prove to any one the merits of E-Z Washing Tablets. **TRY THEM AND BE CONVINCED.**

3 Sample Tablets by mail, - - 10 cents.

Agents!

If you are looking for a staple article that sells rapidly at a large profit, send for terms and exclusive territory and give it a trial.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE.

Address, **ALFRED MALLETT, Nyack, N. Y.**

\$1

**THE SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER
and medicine for \$1.**

Regular Price, \$1.50.

We offer it at the above low price in order to more thoroughly introduce it and to secure agents.

THE SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER converts fluids into a fine visible vapor which reaches every nook and crevice of the nasal cavity, throat and lungs, destroying the germs and healing the diseased parts. It is a practical home treatment for

CATARRH, COUGHS, COLDS, SORE THROAT,
and all diseases of the Head, Throat and Lungs.

The Simplicity is all that its name implies—a simple, practical instrument that any child can use, and is just as good for home treatment as an expensive one.

Many of the SENTINEL readers are acquainted with the Simplicity, and we have numerous testimonials telling of the benefit they have received from its use.

Send One Dollar now and secure one.

AGENTS WANTED.

Address, **ALFRED MALLETT, Nyack, N. Y.**



AN INVALUABLE HELP IN THE STUDY OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

JULY-DECEMBER, 1902.

For the last six months of 1902, the International Sunday School Lessons are "Studies in the Old Testament."

The lesson topics selected by the Committee cover only a portion of the Bible history from the "Giving of the Manna" (the subject of the first lesson) to the time of Samuel.

The subjects considered contain lessons of great importance, and yet they must of necessity be somewhat fragmentary, since they are oftentimes widely separated chronologically. On this account some "help" covering this portion of the Bible connectedly will be most valuable.

Such a "help" is to be had in "PATRIARCHS AND PROPHETS." It covers the whole period, not as a Bible history, but in a topical study of the most important subjects, from the entrance of sin to the time of David. It shows "Why Sin Was Permitted" and portrays in pleasing language and in a most interesting manner the controversy between the forces of good and evil, as illustrated in the lives of "holy men of old."

Nearly every lesson topic for the last half of the year is treated in this book and truths are brought out and such spiritual lessons drawn from the Scriptures, as are to be found in no other publication.

Teachers or pupils who desire to really get the most good out of this series of lessons cannot afford to deprive themselves of this "help." Each one will do well to read the book through by course during the study, thus getting a connected view of the events.

A leaflet giving references from the lesson to the pages in the book which treat on the same subject will be furnished with each copy of "Patriarchs and Prophets."

762 PAGES. \$2.25 IN CLOTH.

ADDRESS:

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



A LITTLE DICTIONARY.

You will not require a reading rack to hold this library, for all this information and more, is in a little book that will fit into the vest pocket.

THE NEW WEBSTER VEST POCKET DICTIONARY
is a compendium of five books.

FIRST, THE DICTIONARY.

45,800 words are spelled, defined, pronounced, formation of plurals shown, also a list of 1,450 proper names and adjectives.

SECOND, THE GAZETTEER.

Under the title of each continent is given its countries, their area, population and capital. Every name is pronounced, and those in the postal union indicated.

THIRD, THE PARLIAMENTARY MANUAL.

One of the most complete compendiums of parliamentary practice ever compiled. So arranged that a momentary glance will make clear any question.

FOURTH, THE RAPID CALCULATOR.

Short cuts in calculations, interest, weights and measures, forms for notes, bills, receipts. Yet farther a section on general deportment, dress, conversation, etc.

FIFTH, THE LITERARY GUIDE.

A few simple and sensible rules about letter-writing, capital letters, punctuation, postal regulations, etc.

Morocco Bound, with stamp holder, 60c
Leather 50c
Cloth 25c.

All styles with thumb index.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

11 West 20th Street, New York.

Tell Your Friends—

Those who are *not* subscribers to THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY—that they can obtain the four remaining numbers of this year—September, October, November, and December—**FOR 25 CENTS.**

Here is a favorable opportunity for those who have expressed a desire to help THE SENTINEL obtain a larger subscription list to do some practical work. A great many people can be induced to pay a quarter for a short-term subscription who would not pay \$1 for a full year. After becoming acquainted with the journal through a short-term subscription we, of course, expect that large numbers will continue their subscriptions, and thus THE SENTINEL'S circulation be permanently increased.

This is also an excellent opportunity to send THE SENTINEL to some of your friends whom you are anxious should know the correct principles of religious liberty. Just think! You can send the journal to 20 different addresses, four months, for only \$5.00.

By reading the announcement in another column you will see that THE SENTINEL has some specially good articles in store for its readers for the remainder of the year.

Below are four coupons. Cut them out and use them, and if you wish more we will be glad to supply them. Send orders to THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, 11 West 20th Street, New York City.

**The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,
11 West 20th Street, New York City**

Enclosed find 25 cents for which please send the September, October, November and December issues of 1902 to

.....
.....
.....

**The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,
11 West 20th Street, New York City**

Enclosed find 25 cents for which please send the September, October, November and December issues of 1902 to

.....
.....
.....

**The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,
11 West 20th Street, New York City**

Enclosed find 25 cents for which please send the September, October, November and December issues of 1902 to

.....
.....
.....

**The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,
11 West 20th Street, New York City**

Enclosed find 25 cents for which please send the September, October, November and December issues of 1902 to

.....
.....
.....





Courtesy of *The Independent*.

The First American "Mission" to the Vatican.

From left to right: Judge Smith, Governor Taft, Major Porter, Bishop O'Gorman.

The above is a picture of the now famous "mission" to the Vatican. It was taken immediately after an audience with the Pope during the late negotiations. This picture, for what it represents, has a tremendous significance that can hardly be realized as yet, but of which the people of the United States and the world will become more and more aware as time proceeds. The United States has not gone to Canossa, but it has taken a long step in that direction. It has shown that it no longer has that prudent jealousy for the maintenance of its strictly secular character and an entire separation between things civil and things ecclesiastical, which so justly distinguished its early history, and that it has forgotten the real nature of the power that has for fourteen centuries courted the nations from the Seven Hills of Rome. It is of ill omen for the world when the great Republic of the West, the classic land of religious and civil liberty, begins to have relations with the Sorceress beside the Tiber—when it enters upon the pathway which has led other nations to their undoing. Learning the lesson by hard and bitter experience the world at last rebelled against the rule of Rome, and the most noble blossoming of that rebellion has been free, republican America. Alas, and shall it happen unto the nations according to the true proverb, "The dog is turned to his vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire"?