

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1902

No. 11

### The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

#### II

THE PAPACY—THE VERY SAME PAPACY THAT THE WORLD KNEW IN THE TENTH CENTURY—IS TO-DAY AIMING TO SECURE TO HERSELF A RECOGNIZED SUPREMACY IN WORLD AFFAIRS. SHE HAD THIS ONCE. THE ARTICLES THAT ARE APPEARING UNDER THE ABOVE HEADING ARE A STUDY OF HOW SHE USED IT. SINCE IT IS HER OWN BOAST THAT "ROME NEVER CHANGES," TO KNOW WHAT SHE DID WITH SUCH SUPREMACY WHEN SHE HAD IT IS TO KNOW WHAT SHE WILL DO WITH IT WHEN SHE SECURES IT AGAIN.

IN Boniface VIII. the Papacy had attained the pinnacle of worldly power and glory. All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them were hers. And in the worship of him who had given it all to her she entered diligently upon the enjoyment of it all to the full. And the conduct of the popes in the enjoyment of this sum of worldly power and glory was exactly after the order of that of the emperors of ancient Rome at the similar point of earthly grandeur; the same spirit of pride and arrogance, of luxury, vice, and cruelty was not only indulged but was even intensified.

However, we are not now studying the personal character of individual popes, but the public character of the Papacy—what it did for the world, for nations, and for the people when it held the acknowledged supremacy of the world.

The immediate successor of Boniface VIII. reigned less than a year, from October 27, 1303, to July 6, 1304. No opportunity offered in this time for him to display especially the characteristics of a pope or of the Papacy. He attempted a reform of the Roman ecclesiastics, which excited against him such hatred as to cause his reign to end as soon as it did by poison. At his death there were rival parties for possession of the papal throne which were so evenly matched that the election was delayed about a year. Finally the archbishop of Bordeaux was chosen, and was installed in the papal honors in the city of Lyons, France, and took the name of Clement V. (November 14, 1305, to April 20, 1314).

"During his sojourn at Lyons, the pontiff extorted enormous sums from the bishops and abbots of France who came

to his court; and when he perceived that a fear of being mulcted prevented the clergy from visiting him, he determined to make a tour through the dioceses. He passed through a great number of cities, and everywhere carried off treasures from the churches and monasteries. It is related that he took five whole days to carry away from the rich abbey of Cluny the gold and silver that he found in the cellars of the monks. He compelled Giles, the archbishop of Bourges, to pay so large a fine for not having visited him that the unfortunate prelate was compelled forever after to live on alms. Not content with his own extortions, on his return to Bordeaux he sent three legates—Gentil de Montésiore, Nicholas de Fréauville, and Thomas de Jorz, to squeeze the lower clergy of the Gallic church. They imposed such onerous contributions on the priests, and exacted the payment so rigorously, that the latter, in their despair, complained to the monarch.

“Philip instructed Milon de Noyers, the marshal of France, to complain to the holy father against his extortioners, and to obtain their recall. But this embassy, instead of arresting the evil, increased it. The pope, fearing lest energetic measures would be taken to shackle his financiering expedition, urged the receipt of the money, and ordered his legates to increase their severity and set all ecclesiastical dignities up at auction. He also resolved to use the tribunals of the Inquisition, with which Blanche of Castile and St. Louis had endowed France, so as to avail himself of the decrees of the fourth council of the Lateran, which provided that the property of heretics and their accomplices belonged to the Holy See, without the children or relatives of the condemned being able to claim the least part.”—*De Cormenin*.

Pope Clement V. established the papal see at Avignon in France, which thus became and remained for more than a hundred years a papal residence, which gave rise to a double and even a triple-headed Papacy, and which in turn involved all Europe in papal anarchy.

The papal seat was thus in Avignon. Henry VII. was to be crowned emperor. The imperial crown itself could be conferred and received only in Rome. The pope “commissioned five cardinals to proceed, in his place, to the coronation of the emperor, and sent a bull in which all the pontifical audacity was exhibited to the light of day.” In the bull Clement V. said to Henry VII.:

Know, prince, that Jesus Christ, the King of kings, having given to His Church all the kingdoms upon earth, emperors and kings should serve on their knees, us, who are the representatives and vicars of God.

When Clement died “his treasures were pillaged. The cardinals seized on enormous sums of coined money. Bernard, Count de Lomagne, nephew and minion of the dead pope, carried off chalices and ornaments worth more than a hundred thousand florins. The Countess de Foix stole as her share all the jewels of the holy father. And there were no minions nor mistresses of the cardinals who were not enriched by the spoils of the sovereign pontiff. . . . When there was nothing more left in the treasury of the Church, the cardinals, twenty-three in number, went to Carpentras and shut themselves up in the episcopal palace, to proceed to the election of a new pope. Scarcely had they done so when a dreadful tumult broke out in the city; the priests of the court of Clement, and the domestics of the cardinals who had not formed a part of the cortège of the pope, and who consequently had not had part in the plunder, arrived at Carpentras,

furious at having been deprived of such rich booty. As they knew the impossibility of their masters opposing their designs, they traversed the streets with lighted torches and set fire to the houses, that they might more easily rob the inhabitants in the general alarm. Fortunately, these soon gained the ascendance, and laid strong hands on the stranger priests. In consequence of this outbreak a panic seized the cardinals; they left Carpentras furtively, to escape the popular vengeance, and retired to their magnificent palaces at Avignon, or to their country houses, without caring otherwise for Christianity than to spend with their mistresses the money which the faithful had given to Clement V., and which they had divided amongst themselves."—*Id.*

Two full years passed without the election of a pope. At last the king of France "went to the city of Lyons, from whence he wrote to the cardinals to come to him secretly, promising the tiara to each one of them. On the appointed day they arrived, mysteriously, in the city, and went to the monastery of Preaching Brothers, where Philip was. As soon as they appeared at the convent they were arrested and confined in a large hall. Philip then informed them that he should keep them prisoners until they had named a pontiff." The king commanded that they be fed only on bread and water. At the end of forty days, having not yet come to an agreement on the choice of a pope, they did agree "to commission the cardinal James d'Ossa to choose the worthiest among them as sovereign pontiff." The worthy cardinal "placed the tiara on his own head." And since it was the unanimous choice of the cardinals that James d'Ossa choose the pope, and he had chosen himself, his election was counted unanimous, and he was pro-

claimed Pope John XXII. (Sept. 21, 1316, to Dec. 4, 1334).

#### MONSTROUS SPECULATION IN HUMAN CORRUPTION

John was seventy years old. From the fact that the cardinals could unite in trusting him to choose the worthiest amongst them to be pope, it is evident that he had some claims to their confidence. But if this be so, and whatever claims to worthiness he might have had, after he became pope "he became prouder, more deceitful, and greedier than his predecessors. He was not content with the ordinary revenues of the Church and with the enormous sums the inquisitors paid him as his share of the confiscations, but he increased them by speculation in human corruption, and publicly sold absolution for parricide, murder, robbery, incest, adultery, sodomy, and bestiality. He himself reduced to writing this tax of the apostolic chancery, that Pactolus which flowed over all the vices of humanity, changed into livres tournois or handsome golden pennies—and which rolled into the pontifical treasury, the true ocean in which the wealth of nations was engulfed."

The list of taxes drawn up by John XXII. as levied upon the licentious practices of ecclesiastics, priests, nuns, and the laity, on murder and other enormities, as well as on lesser crimes and breaches of monastic rules and church requirements, is sufficient to cover almost every sin that mankind could commit. Yet all these sins were regularly taxed at a certain rate, to the single "sou" (cent), and even to the "denier." So that it is literally true that no inconsiderable portion of the revenues of the Papacy were derived from a regularly assessed tax upon the sins of men. Well

did the abbot of Usperg exclaim: "O Vatican, rejoice now, all treasuries are open to thee—thou canst draw in with full hands! Rejoice in the crimes of the children of men, since thy wealth depends on their abandonment and iniquity! Urge on to debauchery, excite to rape, incest, even parricide; for, the greater the crime, the more gold it will bring thee. Rejoice thou! Shout forth songs of gladness! Now the human race is subjected to thy laws! Now thou reignest through depravity of morals and the inundation of ignoble thoughts. The children of men can now commit with impunity every crime, since they know that thou wilt absolve them for a little gold. Provided he brings thee gold, let him be soiled with blood and lust; thou wilt open the kingdom of heaven to debauchees, sodomites, assassins, parricides. What do I say? Thou wilt sell God himself for gold!"—*Id.*

#### TWO POPES AT ONE TIME

The emperor Louis of Bavaria was under the displeasure of John. The city of Rome was exceedingly jealous of the city of Avignon because Avignon had the glory, the pomp, and the expenditures of the papal court. Rome called upon Pope John to come with his court to Rome. John still remained in Avignon. Rome notified him that if he did not respond to their call, they would receive his enemy, Louis of Bavaria; for "a court they would have: if not the pope's, that of the emperor." There was more than this in their threat. For, if the emperor came to Rome to be crowned, being at war with Pope John, and it being essential that he should have a pope to crown him, he could do as many emperors had done before—create a pope—and then they would have both an emperor's and a pope's court. By ambiguous sen-

tences, implying half-promises or not, John replied to the Romans as to his going to Rome with his court; but as to their receiving the emperor, he sought to dissuade them from joining with the enemy of the Church. But, since John did not comply with their call, Rome did welcome the emperor, and fought for him against his opponents in Italy.

Sunday, January 17, 1328, the Emperor Louis was crowned in Rome. May 12 he accomplished by the Roman populace the election of a certain friar, Peter di Corvara, as pope, who took the name of Nicholas V. (May 12, 1328, to Aug. 24, 1329). A law had already been proclaimed by the emperor "that the pope about to be named, and all future popes," should reside in Rome.

The emperor had himself crowned again by the new pope. The new pope immediately created seven cardinals, and thus formed a papal court; and he who had been proclaimed as the representative of apostolic poverty began, immediately to display all the style of a court. His cardinals rode forth "on stately steeds, the gift of the emperor, with servants, even knights and squires;" they enjoyed splendid and costly banquets. And the new pope, like the popes at Avignon, maintained these extravagances of his court by the sale of ecclesiastical privileges and benefices, and confiscating the wealth, even the lamps, of churches. The contest between the two popes "divided all Christendom. In the remotest parts were wandering friars who denounced the heresy of Pope John," and advocated the cause of the emperor and Pope Nicholas. "In the University of Paris were men of profound thought who held the same views, and whom the ruling powers of the university were constrained to tolerate." The whole of Europe seemed about to be divided. Two men were burned in

Rome for denying that Nicholas V. was lawful pope, and Pope John was burned in effigy. Pope Nicholas "threatened all who should adhere to his adversary, not merely with excommunication, but with the stake."

In October the emperor and Nicholas went first to Viterbo, and then to Pisa, Nicholas on every occasion issuing edicts anathematizing the "so-called pope," John XXII. The emperor retired to Trent, in the Tyrol. Pisa repudiated Pope Nicholas V. He fled; then stole back and took refuge in the palace of a nobleman who was his friend. To the nobleman Pope John XXII. wrote a letter, urging him to "surrender the child of hell, the pupil of malediction." Pope Nicholas V. surrendered, and threw himself upon the mercy of Pope John XXII. To Pope John he wrote thus:

I heard brought against you and your court accusations of heresy, exactions, simony, debaucheries, and murders, which rendered you, in my eyes, the most execrable of pontiffs. I then thought it my duty not to refuse the tiara, in order to deliver the Church from a pope who was drawing the faithful into an abyss. I have since learned, from my own experience, how difficult it is to live a holy life in the chair of the apostle, and I avow that no one is more worthy of the Papacy than yourself. I thus renounce this dignity, and I will abdicate solemnly in your presence, in such place as you shall please to designate.—*Id.*

The nobleman under whose protection Nicholas was required of John XXII. that the life of Nicholas V. should be spared, and that he should be absolved of the crime of having been pope. Pope John XXII. commissioned the archbishop of Pisa to receive the submission of Pope Nicholas V. In the great cathedral of Pisa Pope Nicholas V. renounced the popedom, and condemned as heretical and impious all his acts as pope. He was then conveyed to Avignon, to Pope John XXII. "The day after his arrival

at Avignon he was introduced into the full consistory with a halter around his neck. He threw himself at the pope's feet, imploring mercy and execrating his own impiety." A few days afterward he appeared again before the pope and cardinals, read a long confession, and renounced and condemned the emperor Louis as heretical and schismatical. He was allowed to live in the papal palace; but was "closely watched and secluded from intercourse with the world, yet allowed the use of books and all the services of the Church."

IMMENSE REVENUES THROUGH CORRUPTION AND SUPREME POWER THROUGH  
"DIVINE RIGHT"

A section of the Franciscan monks were wandering everywhere, preaching absolute poverty as the perfection of Christianity. They denounced the luxury of the popes, and even denounced the Papacy itself as "the great harlot of Revelation." Clement V. had persecuted many of them to death, and John XXII. followed it up. "Wherever they were, John pursued them with his persecuting edicts. The Inquisition was instructed to search them out in their remotest sanctuaries; the clergy were directed to denounce them on every Sunday and on every festival."

The claims of the Papacy were by no means slackened. Pope John XXII., in one of his edicts, declared: "He [the pope] alone promulgates law; he alone is absolved from all law. He alone sits in the chair of St. Peter, not as mere man, but as man and God. . . . His will is law; what he pleases has the force of law."—*Milman*. He published a treatise in which he set forth the claims of the Papacy as follows:

As Jesus Christ is recognized as the Pontiff, King and Lord of the universe, so His vicar

upon earth can have no equal. And since the whole world belongs to God, it should equally appertain to the pope. Emperors, kings, and princes cannot then be recognized as lawful unless they have received their states as fiefs from the chief of the Church, who possesses this immense power, not by the right of the sword, but by divine right. For Jesus gave to St. Peter the keys, not the *key* of the kingdom of *heaven* only, that is one for spiritual and another for temporal things. The faithful should obey only God and the pope. And when kings refuse obedience to the Holy See they place themselves without the bosom of the Church; they condemn themselves with their own mouths as heretics; and should consequently be handed over to the inquisitors to be burned for the edification of the faithful.—*De Cormenin.*

Pope John XXII. died in 1334, at nearly the age of ninety years. "After his death they found in his treasury eighteen millions of florins [about forty-three and a half millions of dollars] in coined money, besides his vessels, crosses, miters, and precious stones, which were valued at seven millions of florins [about seventeen millions of dollars]. Cardinal Villani declares: 'I can render certain testimony to this, because my brother, a man worthy of belief, who was one of the purveyors of the pontifical court was at Avignon when the treasurers made their report to the cardinals. This immense wealth, and the still greater which the holy father had expended, were the proceeds of his industry, that is, of the sale of indulgences, benefices, dispensations, reserves, expectatives, and annates. But what contributed the most to increase his treasures was the tax

from the apostolic chancellors for the absolution of all crimes!'"—*Id.* This same writer well remarks: "The good man had forgotten that saying, 'Lay not up your treasures upon earth.'" And this vast sum that was found in the coffers of John XXII. after his death was that which was left over "beyond and above the lavish expenditure on the Italian wars, the maintenance of his martial son or nephew, the cardinal legate, at the head of a great army, his profuse provision for other relatives," and the enormous expenditures of the papal court at Avignon. From all of this it may be conjectured as to what was the immensity of the papal revenues.

"One large source of his wealth was notorious to Christendom. Under the pretext of discouraging simony he seized into his own power all the collegiate benefices throughout Christendom. Besides this, by the system of papal reserves, he never confirmed the direct promotion of any prelate, but by his skilful promotion of each bishop to a richer bishopric or archbishopric, and so on to a patriarchate, as on each vacancy the annates or first fruits were paid, six or more fines would accrue to the treasury. Yet this pope—though besides his great rapacity, he was harsh, relentless, a cruel persecutor, and betrayed his joy not only at the discomfiture, but at the slaughter of his enemies—had great fame for piety as well as learning, arose every night to pray and to study, and every morning attended mass."—*Milman.*



Though long deprived of "temporal power," and therefore of formal recognition as a ruler, the Pope of Rome and his friends have never ceased to insist that he is a ruler by right. Late developments in connection with the question of

the lands belonging to the religious orders in the Philippines have led the United States to send a representative to Rome, and evidence is not wanting—as it has not been for some years past—that the Roman Church intends to secure per-

manent diplomatic relations between the Vatican and Washington. It is too early to prophesy as to results or the ulterior purpose of the papal power in this matter. But it is not too early to see that influence and prestige are accumulating in favor of that power in the United States, and that our new territories in

the West Indies and in Asia have opened and will yet open many new avenues along which Rome will add to the influence and power already possessed. Beyond that one may not now determine as to final results. But that Rome means to secure temporal power in some way, there can be no doubt.—*Sabbath Recorder*.



## Some Thoughts on Religious Freedom

By the Editor

RELIGIOUS freedom is not simply a matter of the separation of church and state. Religious freedom is the free action of the conscience of the individual in matters of religion, and the individual has a natural and absolute right to this freedom so long as he does not invade the rights of others. Religious freedom is denied and trampled upon whenever the conscience is intimidated in any manner whatever; whenever any influence swerves it from the course of free choice and action. The power of government is by no means the only influence which can abridge the freedom of conscience and trample upon religious liberty, although it is of course the most natural and effectual means to that end, and has always been the great instrument of persecution.

But to get at just what religious intolerance and tyranny is we must go back to that from which springs legislative and governmental intolerance. Its source is the intolerant *spirit*—the disposition which refuses to freely accord to others, not simply in law but in thought, the right to think and act as they choose in matters of conscience and religion. Although this spirit no longer manifests itself as formerly in the legislation of the nations of the world, it is not dead,

and it never will die so long as this world is inhabited by the race to which Cain and Abel belonged.

This spirit can manifest itself in many ways. Originally it deliberately slew its victim without form or ceremony; for then there was no government to sanction the deed and make it "legal." But since that time, in abundant instances, as the world is wofully aware, have such deeds been sanctioned in the name of law and religion. But, thank Heaven, at present that is chiefly a thing of the past; and there are those who tell us that it is forever in the past. So may it be.

But until the spirit which seeks to injure men, which seeks to ostracise them, which seeks to intimidate them in any manner whatever, because of their opinions, is dead, we cannot be certain that religious freedom is safe so far as government is concerned, for it is from this very thing that governmental tyranny in religion springs. We heard the statement made the other day that the Inquisition still existed; that while men were no longer burned with fagots in the public squares, they were burned with misrepresentation in the public press. There is truth in this, though of course there is also exaggeration. The spirit of intolerance can manifest itself in burning sen-

tences; religious liberty can be trampled upon in an article. We believe that even in a journal devoted to the defense of religious liberty such sentences, such articles, may appear. But while THE SENTINEL desires that many of its words shall be burning words of truth, it sincerely desires that what is published may be entirely free from any spirit of intolerance toward others, however different their views may be from its own.

But of course the influence of the press in this matter, and this is but one of many influences which to-day operate without any connection with government, is due to its influence upon public opinion. People are sensitive to and are affected by the opinions of others, and therefore they are hurt by that which places them in a disagreeable light before others.

But after all, so far as government is concerned, so far as its power can extend in the matter, religious freedom is simply a matter of neutrality toward religion by the government. It should protect all in their rights, but further than that it cannot protect them in religious freedom. A man cannot say to government: "Here, I want my religious liberty protected. I have changed my religious views and my employer has discharged me because of it"; or, "I want to observe a certain day as a holy day, to use it for religious purposes and exercises, but my employer says I must either work on that day or lose my position. This is an interference with my religious liberty; I want the law to protect me."

That may be an interference with his religious liberty, but it is no such interference as government can rightfully take cognizance of. As long as the employer remains within his civil and legal rights the state has no right to interfere with him in requiring his employee to work on a certain day or in discharging

him because he will not work. He may do a mean and even a wrong thing in doing so, and it may be somewhat of an interference with the religious liberty of another, but it is not a matter for which the law can afford a remedy.

But this is exactly what has been attempted in this country, and it is on this very ground that Sunday legislation is defended to-day. It is assumed that a man is not protected in his religious liberty, so far as Sunday observance is concerned, unless the law steps in and, by prohibiting all labor and business on that day, removes the possibility of any pressure being brought to bear upon him by his employer to have him work on that day. Unless this is done it is held that the man is not protected in his right to rest. Of course this is a sort of protection that it is not the business of government to give, else it would be the business of government to protect not only the Sunday observer, but the observer of any other day in like manner. And the matter would not stop there. It is the business of government to protect men in their right to work. It would therefore follow from the above reasoning that government should compel those who were able to furnish employment for all who are idle. If the protection of the right to do a thing means the removal of every possible impediment and difficulty that lies in the way of its being done, there would be no end to the absurdity and injustice in which government would become involved in the attempt to fulfil its purpose.

That it is not the business of government to undertake any such task is demonstrated by the fact that it works against the very fundamental purpose of government. When government attempts to give men the sort of protection mentioned above it invariably denies to other men rights which it was instituted



to maintain. Government must legislate with due regard to the rights of all citizens, and it cannot do this when special favor is shown to a class of citizens, as is done in the matter of Sunday legislation. The religious liberty of the Sunday observer, so far as government is concerned, is amply protected when he is not interfered with in the observance of the day nor denied any civil right because of such observance; when he has the privilege of refusing to work on that day and is protected against all violence and intimidation in the matter. To be told that he cannot continue in his position unless he works on Sunday does not constitute such an interference. There are some things that government cannot enter into, some things that must be left to adjust themselves, and this is one of them. Government cannot insure people against all hardship and difficulty in life, and certainly not in the matter of religious profession and practise.

would be a sorry thing for the human race and for religion if it could.

The fact is government cannot insure *religious* liberty at all; religious liberty is something entirely beyond its sphere. It can only protect men in their rights as between man and man—in their natural, civil rights. It has no business to take cognizance of *religious* rights. If citizens are equally protected in their rights as between man and man, their religious liberty must be left to take care of itself. Church-and-state-union has always been for the avowed purpose of protecting what were supposed to be the religious rights of men, and even the Inquisition itself was operated with this object in view. The result was that men were ruthlessly despoiled of their natural, human rights. Fortunately it has been learned that government has only to do with *civil* things, and that no alleged religious right must be "protected" at the cost of civil freedom.



On September 15 the hearing of the first case to be submitted to the International Court of Arbitration since the institution of that tribunal twenty-one months ago, began at The Hague. The dispute is a very trifling matter so far as its international importance is concerned, and curiously enough this first case is for the purpose of determining a dispute with regard to certain funds claimed by the Catholic Church, and Catholic ecclesiastics are the parties chiefly interested in it. But as it comes before the Court of Arbitration it is a dispute between Mexico and the United States. It is known as the "Pious Fund" case or dispute. It seems that in 1697 certain persons in Mexico made valuable contributions to the Jesuit and other orders for the purpose of establishing and

supporting Roman Catholic missions in the Californias. A portion of this was given in trust to afford a permanent revenue for the same purpose. In 1767 the Spanish government expelled the Jesuits, and the revenue from the fund thereafter went to the Franciscans. After securing her independence in 1821 Mexico took charge of the fund, and in 1842 sold the properties of the fund and guaranteed 6 per cent. on it in perpetuity to the church authorities of the diocese of California. When California was ceded to the United States in 1848 Mexico stopped paying interest, but in 1873, in accordance with an award that had been made in favor of the church authorities by an arbitrator, paid the interest up to 1869, the sum amounting to more than \$900,000. Since that time nothing has been

paid, and the church authorities in California some time ago got the Government to take the matter up, and now it has come before The Hague tribunal. The pleadings in the case were begun in behalf of the United States by Senator Wm. M. Stewart, of Nevada, who contended that the proceeds of the "Pious Fund" were always intended for promoting "the civilization of the natives of

California and the propagation of the Catholic religion in those regions." Archbishop Riordan, of San Francisco, is in attendance with special counsel, who will also participate in the legal discussion before the tribunal. It is interesting to note that while the sum originally set aside was \$10,000, the fund is now claimed to amount to nearly \$2,000,000, and the amount claimed as interest is \$990,000.



## The "National Reform" "Christian" Lobbying Machine.

[Owing to the fact that in late years its efforts have not been centered so much upon measures so utterly mischievous and opposed to the principle and practise of church-and-state separation as was the case formerly, THE SENTINEL has not had occasion to say as much in late years concerning the "National Reform" organization and its work as formerly. But this organization is still very much alive as far as its activities for national legislation are concerned, and it has by no means given up the "Sabbath" and other measures which it urged upon Congress so persistently some years ago. It was never better prepared to work for the accomplishment of its ends than to-day, and when the time is deemed ripe it will no doubt strike again for the passage of those measures that have been allowed to fall into the background temporarily. Believing that it will be of interest to the readers of THE SENTINEL we present herewith the greater portion of a two-column dispatch sent to the New York *Evening Post* by its special Washington correspondent on September 5, and published in that paper on the following day under the heading, "A Christian Lobbyist," in quotations. Although the "present aims" of this "Christian" lobbying bureau may be very praiseworthy in themselves, it must be evident to anyone who will read this account carefully that there is being built up, if there has not already been fully established, a powerful religio-political machine whereby the religious element of the nation that is in sympathy with this thing can bring to bear upon Congress in favor of legislation that is desired a pressure wholly out of proportion to the power and influence to which it is entitled when considered with reference to the number of citizens represented. And thus, while this power to which congressmen now so readily yield may now be exerted in behalf of measures that in themselves are proper enough, it is as certain as anything can be that sooner or later this power will be used in compelling the enactment of religious legislation. When the religious element constitutes itself into a political force and becomes powerful as a political machine it will never fail to use that power sooner or later for strictly religious ends, and that will mean religious legislation and religious persecution.—EDITOR.]

WHATEVER opinion individuals may have concerning any or all of the legislative measures for which the National Reform Bureau, of which Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts is the superintendent, may be working, its importance as a factor in the life of this capital cannot safely be disregarded. Dr. Crafts calls himself "A Christian Lobbyist." He deserves the credit of having discovered, as it were, the latent power of the religious

people in this country, chiefly the membership of the evangelical churches, and of devising means of applying that power to the wheels of current legislation, with results which have been striking. These show the power of organization and of method, and they incidentally reveal some of the facilities which Uncle Sam offers to anyone skilful enough to utilize them.

"I can reach a thousand persons for a

dollar, with a letter having the autograph in a facsimile of a senator or a representative in the upper left-hand corner, and so likely to attract attention," said Dr. Crafts to your correspondent one day, in explaining his method. Envelopes of the ordinary letter size are selected, and of white paper whenever possible. These Dr. Crafts gets by the thousand, free of charge, from the various congressmen whose names they bear. They go through the mails under the franking privilege. The only requisite is that their contents shall be "Government matter," but that is easily enough secured either by having whatever the Bureau desires to circulate made a part of somebody's speech, or otherwise brought into the official records. Reports of hearings may be franked. So many special articles are prepared for the instruction of a committee on any topic whenever the committee votes to print them. The Reform Bureau thus gets not only its envelopes and postage free, but a certain large number of copies of the leaflet which it desires to distribute. Sometimes Congress does not authorize the printing of enough copies to meet the Bureau's needs, and then Dr. Crafts has to pay out of his own fund the cost, aside from the typesetting, of striking off some more. But this is not large.

The importance of this plan is not so much in the pecuniary saving for a bureau depending on voluntary contributions, as in the impression that it makes on the mind of the recipient. "I read this document through three times," said a prominent Massachusetts business man, "in order to discover why Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, was sending it to me." At last, unable to unravel the mystery, he wrote to the Senator, thanking him for the document, but expressing surprise on the recipient's part that

the cause involved should have reached the attention of the eminent statesman. This was a document on divorce reform. One may well imagine the feeling which wells up in the breast of the Maine farmer, on a rural delivery route, when he finds a letter in an ordinary white paper envelope from Senator Penrose, of Pennsylvania, containing choice excerpts from congressional proceedings on the importance of observing the Sabbath. Every such line from the devout Penrose is naturally pondered with admiring gratitude.

Dr. Crafts also prints a little quarterly, which is distributed widely under the ordinary second-class rates, carrying prominently pictures of statesmen who have helped in his work. Almost any public man welcomes such a notice. In doubtful districts and close States the commendation of the Reform Bureau as a political force is not to be disregarded. Hence it happens that no matter how severely congressmen in private conversation may berate the activities of Dr. Crafts, they appear very promptly at the door when his card is sent in to them, nor do they hold any grudges long. Even though Dr. Crafts most vigorously fought Senator Hawley, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, on the canteen question, the Connecticut statesman did not hesitate to give him 35,000 franked envelopes at the close of the last session for the distribution of Sunday-closing matter apropos of the St. Louis Fair.

But "making an impression" on the constituents with leaflets and pamphlets, through the congressional frank, is only one side of the work of the Bureau. To make an impression on the congressman is the more important thing. It is estimated at the Capitol post-offices that this Bureau alone has doubled the volume of congressional mail. The members of the

organization, of whom there are 5,000 paying annual dues, the clergymen of all the churches and many others who may be interested, receive information from time to time during the session of the measures in which the Bureau is interested. Thus informed as to the legislative outlook, these constituents write to their senators or representatives, or telegraph to them, as the situation may demand, and this is what swells the mail. Just at present the Bureau is bending its energies along a new line, toward having the constituent see in person the members of Congress when they are at home during the congressional vacation. This, it is believed, will be still more effective.

#### A RELIGIOUS MERCANTILE AGENCY

In order to know whom to communicate with the Bureau has established what corresponds to a mercantile agency concerning the leading people in every town in the United States, except that their religious status instead of their financial capital and resources is the subject of the work. Old telephone books have been secured of every town in the United States having a telephone system, and these books have a large share of the people of prominence on their rolls. This is the nucleus of the index. Then, through trusted confidential helpers in each town, the names are checked off with signs showing what each individual can be depended on to do. Perhaps one man will be decidedly irreligious, and not interested in these reforms, but, for personal or family concerns, may be greatly agitated over the question of temperance. The same may be true with divorce legislation, and with Sunday questions of all kinds. The Bureau has twelve lines of work, but it does not limit its requests for assistance

to persons who happen to sympathize with it in all of its lines. Of course, the records show a large number of names as in favor of everything.

#### BRINGING PRESSURE UPON CONGRESSMEN

Now what use does Dr. Crafts make of these names and this index? Suddenly, he has a bill before a committee of the House and learns that a representative from Ohio on that committee is "shaky" and is liable to be greatly influenced by some of the commercial interests on the other side. "That will never do," says the Christian lobbyist. He goes to his office, where he has these telephone books and information in similar forms arranged by congressional districts, and pulls down the district represented by the shaky statesman. Those of his constituents who can be depended upon are then communicated with. Dr. Crafts employs sometimes as many as ten clerks in this work. A few of the more prominent men in that district will get personal letters asking them to take positive steps, like writing the congressman an emphatic message. Others will be asked to sign and circulate petitions. It should be noted that this directory contains a hint as to the political party and activity of each man, although with very slight exceptions the Northern allies of the Bureau are Republicans and the Southern allies Democrats.

The shaky congressman finds himself deluged in the next forty-eight hours with communications. Perhaps the churches in his district on the following Sunday adopt resolutions which are forwarded to him. Petitions from the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions are hastily transmitted. And there is no overestimating the influence of such things on the congressional mind. The man who writes a letter seems to the congressman to be speaking for 100 others

who remain silent. "I do not believe in this anti-canteen law," said Gen. Grosvenor one day on the floor of the House, "but I am going to vote for it just the same. I have become convinced that my constituents want it." Many others who did not make so open a confession felt about the same way. Senator Blackburn, of Kentucky, once said to Dr. Crafts: "Why, you have put my whole State in a turmoil over this matter. I would wager that I have got as many as twenty letters about it." Since twenty votes would not be a large percentage in Kentucky, the impression which a few letters make cannot be better illustrated.

#### ROBERTS HAD TO GO

A few years ago during the congressional recess all of the wise men of this latitude were habitually ridiculing the idea that Congress could take any action regarding the duly elected representative from the State of Utah. These wise men went into discussions of the constitutional phases of the question, and of how impossible it would be to do anything consistent with our fundamental law and the rights under it of a sovereign State. Any man who ventured to dissent from this prediction had but one argument: "Do not forget Southern Presbyterianism. Brigham H. Roberts must look to his Democratic associates of the South for support, if he is to have any, but they cannot forget the rugged Presbyterianism of a large share of their constituents." The prediction was entirely sound. There was little constitutional ground for throwing Mr. Roberts out, but he had to go, and this very Reform Bureau played no small part in bringing that result to pass.

#### PRESENT AIMS

The Bureau will work during the coming short session for only three legis-

lative measures. The first will be the immigration bill. The feature in which the Bureau is primarily interested is the section for the suppression of the sale of liquor at immigrant stations, but in general the Bureau favors the further restriction of immigration. A second bill aims to prohibit the sale of liquor in all Government buildings, particularly the soldiers' homes. A third measure, as yet inchoate, will be something to lessen in some way the practice of selling liquor by means of the interstate commerce privilege in towns which have prohibition through local option.

#### A GLANCE AT THE PAST

Dr. Crafts first came here fourteen years ago, when a settled clergyman in New York, to appear before a congressional committee in favor of a bill looking to the reduction of Sunday work in the postal and military services. He came afterwards from time to time when temperance and anti-lottery measures were up, but found that working from a distance, without local acquaintances or printing facilities was a great disadvantage, and so in 1895 he moved to town, and established his Reform Bureau. It now occupies a house near the Capitol, which has been turned into a workshop, where an immense mass of newspaper clippings have been gathered, bearing on the questions with which the Bureau concerns itself. These supplies are available to other workers in similar lines. Recently a field secretary, the Rev. O. R. Miller, has been added to the staff, and in other ways the work of the Bureau is growing.

The Bureau claims to have secured forty-nine acts of government during its existence. Seven bills have been passed as drawn up by the Bureau and introduced at its request, including the new

and drastic divorce law of the District of Columbia. Others are the new divorce law in the Territories, the anti-canteen law, the resolution proposing a treaty to

prevent the sale of intoxicants and opium to native races of the South Seas, and the Sunday-closing amendment to the St. Louis Fair bill.



## The Gibson "Lord's Day" Trial

[In last month's SENTINEL was presented a brief account of the case of Mr. W. T. Gibson, a seventh-day observer of Everett, Mass., who was tried in the County Court at Malden, on August 14, for having labored on Sunday. The more detailed account of the trial given herewith is condensed from reports furnished by Mr. Gibson and a stenographer.—EDITOR.]

MR. GIBSON was not arrested, but was summoned to appear for trial, the summons reading as follows:

Commonwealth of Massachusetts,  
First District Court of Eastern Middlesex,  
Malden.

To the Sheriff, etc., Greeting:

We command you in the name of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts forthwith to summon Wayne T. Gibson, of Everett, in the County of Middlesex, if he be found in your precinct, that he appear before the justice of the First District Court of Eastern Middlesex, at Malden, within and for our Court of Middlesex, on Thursday, the seventh day of August, nineteen hundred and two, at nine o'clock in the forenoon, to answer to the said Commonwealth on complaint of Edward F. Pendergast, of Everett, in the County of Middlesex, this day on oath before our said Court. Wherein said Pendergast complains that the said Gibson at Everett, in the County of Middlesex, on the third day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and two, that day being the Lord's Day, unlawfully did labor and work, the same not being a work of necessity or charity, and against the peace of said Commonwealth, and the form of the statute in such case made and provided. Hereof fail not at your peril.

Witness, John W. Pettingill, Esq., at Malden, the fifth day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and two.

MILFORD B. TYLER, Clerk.

Attest, Edward F. Pendergast, Police Officer.

The defendant appeared in court on the day specified and pleaded not guilty, and at his request the case was postponed

until August 14. On this date the trial took place, Judge John W. Pettin-gill presiding. The first witness was Patrolman Harry Hosmer, who testified substantially as follows:

About 10 o'clock on August 3rd, as I was walking along Robin Street in front of Mr. Gibson's house, No. 58, I saw him on a ladder with a brush in his hand painting his barn. I went to the box and telephoned to the chief about it, and then went to Mr. Gibson and told him complaints had been made to me of his working on Sunday. He replied that he was busy five days in the week on his team and was not able to hire the painting done, and so he was doing it himself on Sunday. He said he had a right to do it as it was not a disturbance of the peace. I telephoned to the chief again, and then returned to Mr. Gibson and told him the chief said he had better stop work, as the work was not a work of necessity or charity, and that he would be obliged to arrest him and take him to court on Monday if he did not stop. Mr. Gibson replied that I could arrest him if I wanted to, but that he would not stop; that he had the right under the Bill of Rights to do that work, and that it was a matter of principle with him as well as of necessity, and that the work was in a sense a work of charity. I told him I did not want to arrest him, but as complaint had been made I was obliged to report him to the chief. He then went on with the work, and I returned to the box and reported to the chief, who said, "All right."

The witness was then cross-examined by Mr. Gibson, who conducted his own defense. He said he had known the de-

fendant eight or nine years, and had never seen anything that would indicate that he had a wilful desire to violate any civil statute or to show disregard for his neighbors' feelings, except that two or three years ago some men in Mr. Gibson's employ complained to him that they had to work on Sunday or lose their jobs.

for him on Sunday as to work for the New England Gas and Coke Company or the West End Railroad.

The witness said he could not say that all work done on Sunday by the New England Gas and Coke Company, the West End Street Railway, or the Everett city watering carts was work of neces-



WAYNE T. GIBSON.

He said he went to Mr. Gibson at the time and told him that he had the right to work on Sunday, but that his men did not, as they did not keep Saturday. Mr. Gibson had replied that the men had said what they had because they were afraid they were to be arrested; that he did not and would not require his men to work on Sunday against their wills, but that they had as good a right to work

city or charity. He had never heard of any corporation or rich man being prosecuted for breaking the "Lord's Day" statute. He admitted that one J. K. Leather had demanded the arrest of the defendant.

In reply to questions from the judge the witness said that the defendant was a dealer in coke; that he did not think the work performed on the 3rd day of

August was a nuisance to private individuals, or objectionable to anybody in the immediate neighborhood.

Chief of Police Pendergast was the next witness. He said that about one o'clock on the third day of August the defendant called him up over the telephone and said he was not able to hire the painting done and must do it on Sunday if he did it himself, and claimed that he had the right to do the work on that day. The chief replied that he did not think so, but that he had no feeling in the matter; that he would consult the judge the next day, and if the judge agreed that Mr. Gibson had the right to do the work, he would drop the case, but if not he would be obliged to summon him to court. He said the defendant asked him not to push the case himself, but to let whoever had made the complaint in the first place go to Malden and get the summons. The witness said he had known the defendant about five years, and that from personal observation he would say that Mr. Gibson was as law-abiding as the average citizen. In reply to questions as to why he did not have the defendant arrested, and as to why the summons was not issued until the 5th, the witness said that he had much respect for Mr. Gibson and did not like to arrest him, and that in order to serve a summons he had to wait twenty-four hours, and thus the matter was held over until Tuesday.

The next witness was Hon. Francis Batcheller, ex-mayor of Everett, who had been summoned by the defendant, and who was mayor of Everett at the time Mr. Gibson was tried and fined for keeping open his shop on Sunday some seven or eight years ago. He testified that he had lived in Everett thirty-two years, and had known the defendant eight or ten years; had known him well, had met him often, had transacted busi-

ness with him, and had assisted him much in a business way. Mr. Gibson expressed himself as glad to publicly acknowledge the last fact stated. The witness stated that he was conscientious in proceeding, in his capacity as mayor, against the defendant eight years ago for keeping open his shop on Sunday. He thought it his duty to enforce the law impartially. He did not know whether the corporations named—the New England Gas and Coke Company and the West End Street Railway Company—did any unnecessary work on Sunday or not, but he presumed the street railway company did do what the "Lord's Day" statute defined to be unnecessary work. The judge here declared that he objected to the questions being put to the witness regarding the Sunday work of these corporations, but that he would say, "Yes, these corporations do have work done on Sunday that they have no right to have done."

In reply to further questions the witness said he could not say that it was a work of necessity for the city sprinkling wagon to run up and down Robin Street past the defendant's house on the "Lord's Day"; that as a magistrate he had never known of a large corporation, copartnership, or rich man being prosecuted or fined for violating the "Lord's Day" statute; that he believed in enforcing the law as long as it was on the statute books, but could not say that it could be enforced without abridging the rights of some. He volunteered the statement that he thought the defendant had acted conscientiously and in accordance with his religious belief in doing that for which he had been arraigned, adding: "You have always given me the idea that your Sabbath was Saturday, and that Sunday was a secular day to you. This was brought out in the former case, eight years ago, when you were prosecuted for



keeping your shop open on Sunday." The examination of the witness concluded thus:

Q. Is it your opinion that the defendant would maliciously, on account of his religious belief, openly rebel against the statute relative to the so-called Lord's Day, or any other statute?

A. It is not; but the statute provides only one Lord's Day, and as magistrate eight years ago I had to go according to the statute.

Q. Let us suppose a case: Here is a person living in this Commonwealth who has no religious belief, who does not believe in a Supreme Being. He works seven days in the week, as he has not only an inalienable right to do, but as he has a right to do under the Bill of Rights of this Commonwealth. Can the "Lord's Day" statute be enforced on that man without abridging his rights?

A. If that man opened his shop on Sunday I should think the law should be enforced against him. I think an individual having a different belief from the community would necessarily have his rights abridged somewhat.

Q. You have no doubt heard the saying, "When in Rome do as the Romans do." If you had lived in the Roman Empire would you have obeyed the Roman law in all things?

A. Yes, I think I would have.

Q. The Saviour was crucified under that law. Is it not true that the Saviour, while living under Roman rule, did not worship the deities which the Roman law required all to worship, and that He did not observe the festival days which the Romans had instituted and which they observed in honor of their gods? And is it not a fact that the Jews sought to have the Saviour killed because He disregarded their laws regarding Sabbath observance?

A. I had not thought much about that, but presume it is true.

Q. Then would you have done as the Romans did had you lived in those days?

A. I have not thought about that as much as you have, perhaps. If the Romans did wrong I would not.

Mr. Chambers, a member of the Everett city council and a near neighbor of Mr. Gibson's, was next called to the stand. He said he had always considered the defendant a law-abiding citizen, and

had never heard any one complain about his Sunday work. He was asked if he thought the painting done by the defendant on the third day of August was any more of a disturbance than was the repairing and laying of tracks on the West End Street Railway. He replied that if the repairing and laying of tracks was not an absolute necessity he did not see how the painting of a house could be any more objectionable. The judge again objected to questions along this line.

The testimony of witnesses ended with the following examination by the defense of Mr. John K. Leather, a man whom it was understood had been the originator of the prosecution:

Q. Mr. Leather, how near do you live to the defendant?

A. Well, pretty near, sir.

Q. Is it not a fact that you live about one-eighth of a mile from the defendant?

A. I should say it was just about one-eighth of a mile.

Q. Did you see the defendant painting on the third day of August?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Did you hear him painting on the third day of August?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Were you so near that the smell of the paint disturbed you on the third day of August, the day you are pleased to call the "Lord's Day"?

A. No, I was not.

Q. You believe in enforcing the law?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Have you any interest in that store on Broadway run by your son?

A. No, I have not, and I don't approve of my son keeping that store open on Sunday.

Q. Were you out driving on Broadway last Sunday?

A. Yes, I was. My wife is sick and I took her out to ride for her health.

Q. That is all right. Do you belong to the Congregational Chapel on Courtland Street, Everett?

A. Yes, I do, and I believe in conforming to the laws of the United States.

Q. Are you a member of the Washburn Associates?

A. No, I am not. I have often been asked

to join but have absolutely refused to join the Washburn Associates as long as your name is on their books as a charter member.

Mr. Gibson here announced that he was through. The judge said to the witness: "Wait a moment," and then enquired: "Mr. Leather, have you any personal spite against the defendant?" The witness answered in the negative, but with flushed face and evident agitation attempted twice to say something more, but the court refused to let him speak, ordering him to sit down.

#### THE DEFENDANT'S PLEA

Mr. Gibson then addressed the court in his defense as follows:

Your honor, in pleading my own case I feel somewhat the solemnity of such an occasion as this. Eight years ago, the third day of this month, I was summoned before your honor, and at that time pleaded my own case. I then felt my lack of ability, not having had the privilege of even a common school education. At the present time I feel the same.

The summons in 1894 accused me of disturbing the public peace by selling a half-pound of candy and a glass of soda in an open shop on Sunday. The complaint was brought about by a conscientious magistrate, ex-Mayor Batcheller, an honest citizen and a man whom I respect and honor, who is also a professed Christian. Your honor, the defendant is again summoned, accused of disturbing the public peace, to answer to the Commonwealth on complaint of Edward Pendergast, chief of police of Everett, that "said Gibson, at Eeverett, in the County of Middlesex, on the third day of August, 1902, that day being the Lord's Day, unlawfully did labor and work, the same not being a work of necessity or charity, and against the peace of said Commonwealth and the form of the statute in such case made and provided." To which, as in 1894, the defendant pleads not guilty.

The complaint this time was forced by a competitor in the coke business. It is not pleasant to a liberty-loving, law-abiding citizen to be summoned into court, accused of disturbing the peace, and branded as a criminal for exercising an inalienable right. But the

defendant has no ill-will toward any one, nor does he doubt the honesty of those who caused his prosecution in 1894, or question your honor's sincerity at that time when you fined me \$50 and costs. I bear no ill-will even against John K. Leather or his son. Although I have gathered evidence which would show greater disregard of the Sunday law than that of which I was accused eight years ago, I would abhor, I would detest myself were I to use it in retaliation.

Your honor, I want it distinctly understood that I am not posing as a martyr, but I am here is a man and a citizen having certain inalienable rights based upon the law of God and recognized by the Bill of Rights of this Commonwealth. I was fifty years old the fourth day of August. My mind runs back to the time when I stood at my mother's knee at about the age of seven. That mother taught her son what the Stars and Stripes meant; what it cost to defend the principles they represent. She told him of the Declaration of Independence; of Madison and Jefferson, of Roger Williams, of Washington and Abraham Lincoln. My parents taught me the principles of liberty-loving old New England, and to lay down my life for them if need be. Your honor, father and mother are now at rest, but those principles well up in my heart and mind to-day. The command, "Honor thy father and thy mother," is one that the civil law has a right to enforce as far as it can, but the enforcement of religious laws are retrograde steps back toward the oppression of the Dark Ages.

The judge here interposed the remark that the commandment quoted was one that "may be broken frequently with much common sense in the breaking," and then adjourned court. When court reassembled for the afternoon session Mr. Gibson continued substantially as given below. There were a number of interruptions by the judge, some of which are included:

Your honor, I was about to speak of my ancestors, many of whom were born in Vermont, a State which has as good a reputation for law-abiding people and which has produced men and women of as high character and ability as any State in New England. Two of my mother's uncles, William Shafter

and Oscar L. Shafter, were judges, one in Vermont and the other in California. I learned when young to respect magistrates, but I deny the right of a civil magistrate to enforce a law against transgression of the Lord's day, to which I plead not guilty.

The State has failed to prove that the defendant disturbed the public peace, or that he infringed on the equal rights of his neighbors. Therefore, the defense claims that there is no cause for action; that there is nothing which can of right come within the jurisdiction of a civil magistrate. The summons accuses the defendant of performing labor and work on the "Lord's Day." Therefore, it is an ecclesiastical matter, and this trial, like that of 1894, must necessarily be of an ecclesiastical nature, and this court, in trying the case, must have, or assume to have, as back there, an ecclesiastical character of some sort.

I challenge the State to prove that the third day of August was the Lord's day. The statute is silent as to what day is the Lord's day, and nowhere does it intimate that that day would fall on the third day of August. Even if the third day of August was the Lord's day, the defendant would be accountable alone to his God, to the Lord Himself, as to how he observed it or failed to observe it. Eight years ago in this court we learned from Mark 2: 27, 28—"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: Therefore, the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath"—from the words of the Lord Himself, who the Lord of the Lord's day is, and what day is the Lord's day. We learned from Luke 23: 54-56; and 24: 1, that the day of the crucifixion was the day of preparation for the Sabbath day. "And the Sabbath drew on," and "they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Then "upon the first day of the week," the next day after the Sabbath, they came to the sepulchre. Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath day, according to the first scripture that I quoted, because "all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." The Bill of Rights of this State declares truly that God is "the great Creator and Preserver of the Universe." But God created all things and preserves all things by and through His Son, Christ Jesus (Col. 1: 15-17), who is therefore truly the Lord of the Sabbath day, the Author of the Lord's day. The scriptures quoted show that those who followed Jesus and belived on Him rested according to the commandment which says, "Six

days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Thus the Lord's day is defined in the Lord's book as the seventh day. And He by whom the great Creator and Preserver of the universe created all things, and by whom He spake His law, in the work of redemption did not depart in this matter from the example which He had set in creation. In redemption He finished His work on the sixth day as in creation. On the Sabbath He rested in the grave, not as Creator, but as a criminal condemned by Roman authority, as a sacrifice not only for the sins of the defendant, but for the sins of the whole world. According to the Scriptures, He arose on the first day of the week, the first working day of the week, the first memorial day of His creative power, the day on which the defendant claims the right to labor and work. And he follows the example of his Creator in this in order that he may be a better citizen and neighbor. That work done on the third day of August was to improve the property so there would be a possibility, first, to pay off obligations, in accordance with the injunction to "owe no man anything," and, second, that the defendant might be able to bestow charity.

The defendant claims that he has the divine right of dissent in this matter of observing the Lord's day, and in all religious matters. The very same question that has been discussed here relative to obeying magistrates, was raised by the Pharisees who persecuted the humble Man of Calvary. The defendant does not claim to be persecuted here, and he feels that he is unworthy to be likened in any way unto his Lord. But he feels that the principle that the Lord taught applies in this case. The enemies of Jesus went about seeking to get hold of something by which He might be condemned to death. They brought him a penny, and asked, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not," thinking "to catch Him in His words." Hear the answer: "Whose is this image and superscription?" And they answered, "Cæsar's." Listen to His words: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In other words, render to the government and magistrates of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who are eager to use their powers in having all citizens of the State impartially dealt with, the things that belong to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and render unto God, not to the Commonwealth, the things that belong alone

to God, the Lord of the Sabbath, the Author of liberty, who has taught that the authority of civil government is limited to civil things.

Your honor rules that this is a Christian commonwealth, does he not?

*Judge Pettingill*—Yes, sir, I do.

Then, I say, God pity the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The great Teacher of Christianity said, "I came not to condemn the world, but to save the world," and also, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone." The Lord of the Sabbath, the Author of Christianity, came into the world not to employ force, but to uplift and save people by the power of truth and love. The gospel of Christianity is a gospel of persuasion, not of coercion. A Christian commonwealth cannot use force and carnal weapons. It must follow the methods of Christ.

When the three Hebrew children in Babylon were commanded to bow down to the great image that had been set up for all the people to worship, they said to the king: "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter. . . . Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." They claimed the divine right of dissent. We have here another image that has been set up by law, to which all the people are commanded to bow down. *Dies Solis*, the day of the sun, the day that tries to supplant the Sabbath of the Lord, which is the true Lord's day. The defendant cannot bow down to this image, for he regards it as the mark of apostasy.

The defendant is not alone in the opinion that he has the inalienable right of dissent in matters of religion. I wish to read from the Declaration of Independence.

*Judge*.—I know all about that; you need not read.

*Gibson*.—Will you allow me to read opinions of Madison and Jefferson?

*Judge*.—No, sir. I care nothing for the opinions or dogmas of "Tom" Jefferson—not even for his Declaration of Independence—for Jefferson was the author of more false doctrines than even St. Paul himself.

*Gibson*.—Well, my defense is based upon the Bill of Rights, from the Revised Statutes of 1892, part first, article first and second.

*Judge*.—You need not read it, sir.

*Gibson*.—Then I understand your honor refuses to let me read the Bill of Rights, then?

*Judge*.—Yes, sir, I do.

*Gibson*.—Will you let me read from an ad-

dress by a magistrate in Eastern Middlesex on this very question, relative to the "Lord's Day"?

*Judge*.—Who is it by, sir? By whom was that address made?

*Gibson*.—By your honor, and this copy is typewritten by your stenographer, Mary E. Pennock, as dictated by you, even to the punctuation.

*Judge*.—I presume that address was given in the Baptist or Methodist church at a temperance rally.

*Gibson*.—Yes, sir. December 11th, 1894.

*Judge*.—You may read it, sir. I am not going back on anything I have said.

Mr. Gibson then read several typewritten pages of this address, and since it throws considerable light upon the attitude of the judge respecting this question, it is perhaps well to present these pertinent extracts:

My friends, this discussion now brings me to another matter of importance immediately concerning the peace, order, law and preservation of the Sabbath day. And this sacred day is one which it is hoped will forever be sacredly observed in New England. . . . Not to keep it holy is a violation of all Christian sentiment and of the letter and spirit of the statute law, enacted by our representatives in General Court convened, under the solemnity of their oath of office.

We must remember that Massachusetts is a Christian commonwealth; not a heathen nor a pagan one. Massachusetts declared in 1780 that the "happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality," and that "these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instruction in piety, religion and morality."

Speaking for myself as a man and as a parent, whose observation and experience has not been wholly limited "in seeing and hearing these things," I must insist that the Christian Sabbath shall be maintained. It has stood the shock and trial of the ages; the sins of the world and the ravings of devils against it from the beginning of time to this day, have not shaken it; and it must be preserved as the great and holy landmark around which centers

our moral life, and in which is embraced our Christ-love and hope of salvation. No person who has obeyed its observance has ever come to punishment under any law; none for keeping its commandment have ever been brought to judgment. The violators of law, of the common peace and order of the community, and the morals of society, have been the persons who have violated the spirit of the Constitution of our Commonwealth, and have trampled our Sunday laws under their profane feet. . . . And these persons have all justly deserved the pains and penalties which have been imposed upon them.

The Lord's Day statutes have been framed to protect every charity; to guard every necessity, and to regard every right duty and conscientious act which involve our citizens in any civil or religious responsibility; and in accordance with the moral and intellectual demands and progress of our secular and Christian life. All good and moral-minded men and women should be anxious that these laws should be observed and enforced; and should be solicitous that gaming, rum-selling, general merchandise business, and all matters which tend to cause violence, disorders and disturbances of the public peace and breaking of the law, should be handed over to judgment. The time has come when all good, law-abiding persons must stand together in the defense of good government against the attacks of that horde who are, at all times, attacking the moral laws of the State and reviling the institutes of Christianity.

There were several interesting tilts between the judge and Mr. Gibson while this paper was being read, at one point the judge declaring that he was not too old to learn from the defendant, and Mr. Gibson replying that he was not there to instruct his honor, but to plead for justice. When he came to that point Mr. Gibson asked if it were true that Massachusetts was a Christian and not an heathen or pagan commonwealth, since it was enforcing as the Lord's day an observance that was of heathen and pagan origin? and if it was not true that all the bloody persecutions of the past were carried on by governments that professed to be Christian commonwealths, or representatives and defenders of true religion,

and which undertook, for that reason, to enforce what they denominated the law of God? When he came to another point, Mr. Gibson raised his voice and solemnly asked the judge why, if it were true that the "Christian Sabbath" "has stood the shock and trial of the ages," if it were true that "the sins of the world and the ravings of devils against it from the beginning of time to this day, have not shaken it," should civil magistrates be called upon to maintain it? Why should government not let it alone, since it was so secure? Why not let the Sabbath alone and let men render to God that which is God's, and which He is abundantly able to maintain? At another point Mr. Gibson inquired if it were true that none who have kept the Sabbath commandment have ever come to punishment under any law? if it were true that all who had suffered under the Sunday laws had justly deserved all the pains and penalties imposed upon them? It seems that the judge offered no replies to any of these interrogatories. Mr. Gibson continued from this point as follows:

Is it true, your honor, that a poor man who observes the Lord's day as he sees it, the seventh day according to the Scriptures, deserves to be deprived of one-sixth of the time he needs and should have for earning a livelihood, while at the same time wealthy corporations can carry on operations upon any and all days without hindrance? Is it true that I have deserved what I have suffered under the Sunday laws? I came into this court-room eight years ago with a sad heart. By the doctor's order I left my wife in an ante-room back of the hall at the Titeston Street Mission, that she might not undergo the strain of coming to court with me. And there I left her, ill and almost alone, to await my return. And the nervous strain had a sad outcome that I will not relate here. The anxiety on account of that trial, the boycotting of my business as a mason and contractor and my store, the profits from which went to carry on a mission, soon discouraged our hearts, and I lost the small equity in the mission property.

Roger Williams was banished from this

State, or from Massachusetts Colony, because he denied the right of magistrates to punish for a breach of the first table of the decalogue, on which is found the Sabbath commandment. The Bill of Rights of this Commonwealth, in guaranteeing that no one "shall be hurt, molested or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship," is in harmony with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I deny the right of the legislature to make a law that is not in harmony with the Bill of Rights, or the right of officials and magistrates to enforce such a law. An act that is not in harmony with the Bill of Rights is not constitutional, and is void. If you throw away the Bill of Rights, your honor, where is your foundation for a civil state? A democratic and republican form of government is a government by the people and for the people—a government in which the people's will, expressed in the supreme law, should be obeyed by magistrates and all, until the people have changed it. When these boundaries which forbid legislation respecting matters of religion are broken over, and the attempt is made to enforce the "Lord's Day," a retrograde movement toward church-and-state despotism is under way.

When a man like John K. Leather, with a grudge in his heart so big that he could hardly keep his seat, a member of a Christian church, can force officers to prosecute a man they do not want to, it shows the danger of having on the statute books this relic of the days when dissenters were whipped and burned and hanged. The testimony of the chief of police, if I had carried my questions a little further, would have shown that he deferred making his complaint until he had first consulted your honor, and that you told him I had no right to work on the third day of August.

Now, your honor, I told the chief I did not want him to prosecute me, but if he did I would make a test case of it, but I have changed my mind. I am sick and tired of contention of all kinds and of litigation in relation to this matter. I have one case on file at Cambridge now. I don't want another, and if you declare me guilty, knowing all you do, I shall not appeal. If you fine me, I shall not pay the fine. I cannot, even to that extent, bow down to the day that has been substi-

tuted for the Sabbath—the Lord's day. Your honor, you and I are accountable to God for our motives and acts. They will all come up before the great Supreme Court appointed for that day in the which He will judge the thoughts and intents of the hearts of men, and from which there can be no appeal. A solemn responsibility rests upon you, sir, as you perhaps realize. But I want you to know what the result or your decision will be. What I have done I have done from principle, not for notoriety, and if you choose to pronounce me guilty, I cannot, I will not, pay the fine.

In rendering his decision the judge said in substance:

The Commonwealth seeks to establish the guilt of the defendant, inasmuch as he violated the third day of August wilfully, that day being the Lord's Day. The evidence of Officer Hosmer showed that he warned the defendant before talking with the chief of police. Then again, after his conversation with the chief and his official message requesting the defendant to stop work, showing leniency both times. But with all that Mr. Gibson refused, and deliberately went up the ladder and continued his work until he had finished it. The labor of which the defendant is accused was that of painting his barn on that day, and there is no evidence in the case that there was any necessity for it, so that I cannot find that my friend is exempt from the penalty of the statute.

If the defendant had given direct evidence that he did not work on the second day of August, that day being Saturday, and that he kept that day conscientiously as his Sabbath, then, according to the Revised Statutes of 1892, article "Lord's Day," sec. 78, he would have been exempt, as no one was disturbed. But in the absence of such evidence, and in accordance with the rules of the statutes, I pronounce the defendant guilty.

I endeavor to bear in mind, as you suggest, that we have to be tried before a higher Judge. I always try to bear that in mind in all my decisions. Do you wish to appeal, Mr Gibson?

*Gibson.*—I do not.

*Judge.*—Then I will impose a fine of \$10. Are you prepared to pay a fine?

*Gibson.*—No sir, I am not. From principle I could not pay a fine, your honor.

*Judge.*—I thought as much.

The court then adjourned, and the court crier came forward and told Mr.

Gibson he supposed he would have to take him in charge. The clerk of the court, who had previously remarked to Mr. Gibson, "If you are declared guilty legally, you will not be morally," stepped forward and offered to aid in paying the fine, and asked if there were others who would help to make up the amount of the fine. No one responded. The crier remarked to Mr. Gibson that he should have proved that he kept Saturday, August 2. Mr. Gibson replied that the matter of the exemption clause had not been in his mind; that he thought it was so well understood that he observed the seventh day of the week that it did not occur to him to offer any proof concerning the matter, but that he thought that in the testimony of one or two of the witnesses the fact had been brought out, indirectly at least, that he observed the

seventh day of the week, and that of course the judge, who presided at his former trial, was perfectly aware of that fact. The crier repeated this to the judge, who had already left the court room. The judge at once came back and re-opened court and revoked the sentence, giving Mr. Gibson an opportunity for a re-hearing before the Superior Court at Cambridge. Mr. Gibson thought it best to let things take that course, and, through the kindness of a gentleman who had gone on his bond to the amount of \$500 in 1894, he furnished bonds as required to the amount of \$100 to appear at the opening of the Superior Court at Cambridge, which was to convene on September 16. The case was not taken up at the opening of court, and it is not known now (September 19) how soon it will be heard.



## *A Spanish [Papal] Victory at Rome*

[From *Leslie's Weekly*, a Republican paper in sympathy with the Administration.]

WHEN Judge Taft was sent on his special mission to Rome we pointed out the impolicy, not to say the impropriety, of the precedent established by President Roosevelt in this formal recognition, for the first time, by the United States, of the temporal status of the Roman See. In view of the peculiar relations, more or less hostile, existing between the Vatican and the government of Italy—a government most friendly toward the United States—we questioned the wisdom of the President's action and remarked that the outcome would be awaited "with a considerable degree of anxiety." The outcome has been a humiliating failure. No other could have been expected. Anxiety over the future on the part of Republican politicians, however, hardly warranted

Archbishop Ireland's well-meant but gratuitous intrusion of his explanation of, or apology for, the real situation.

We have suffered a defeat, and the victory, curiously enough, belongs to Spain. The objectionable friars are mostly Spanish subjects, and therefore claim that they come within the provisions of Article IX. of the Paris Treaty of Peace, which says: "Spanish subjects, natives of the peninsula, residing in the territory over which Spain by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such territory or may remove there, retaining in either event all the rights of property, etc. . . . In case they remain in the territory, they may preserve their allegiance to the crown of Spain by making before a court of record within a year from the

date of the exchange of ratification of this treaty, a declaration of their decision to preserve such allegiance."

Retaining their allegiance to Spain and also retaining ecclesiastical domination over the Filipino parishes where they resided but where they were heartily detested by the natives, the friars had a monopoly of religion and hence exercised a potential influence in municipal affairs. Before Dewey's victory they were the government, and they used all their powers after the fall of Manila to defeat the purposes of the United States. We shall not enter into a discussion of the moral influence of many of these friars. That is left to others or to another time. Devoted Roman Catholics as the Filipinos are, they drove these friars from their parishes by force, putting to death by torture some who would not be driven, and seizing and retaining possession of much of the valuable property owned by the four orders of the Church against which this enmity was chiefly directed. One of the purposes of Aguinaldo's insurrection was the confiscation of the friars' lands; and if he had succeeded, there would have been no question for this Government to settle at Rome.

President Roosevelt's desire to be fair and honorable in his dealings with the Church led to the unfortunate mission of Judge Taft to Rome, and to the very generous offer to purchase the lands of the disposed friars at a handsome price, provided that Rome would send the objectionable clergymen to other parishes where they would be more acceptable. Most of the friars are now seeking refuge in Manila. They dare not return to their parishes, though under the treaty of Paris they are entitled to peaceful possession of their property, and the army certainly could not be employed to reinstate them. What remains to be done

but to pay for their property and ask them, in the interests of peace, to retire?

The Administration had received assurances, we are told, that the proposals of the United States would be favorably regarded at Rome, realizing, as the Church did, that our attitude was not one of hostility to Rome, but that it was due entirely to the undying hatred of the Filipinos toward the friars. It was necessary to relieve this unfortunate situation or prejudice the establishment of American civil government in the islands. The commission of cardinals which conducted the negotiations on behalf of his Holiness showed by its very organization that an unfavorable outcome was expected. We have it on the high authority of that distinguished churchman, the Rev. Dr. Rooker, that two of the members of the sub-committee belonged to the mendicant order which the Washington Government would drive out of the Philippines and that a third member was a Spaniard. The last mentioned is Cardinal Vives y Tutor, a Spaniard by birth, one of the youngest members of the sacred college and a special representative of all the Roman Catholic orders in Spain. With his appointment on the commission by the Pope, the last hope of a successful result of Judge Taft's mission vanished.

We have, therefore, as the result of an honest, well-meant but misconceived effort to conciliate the Roman See and to settle the question of the friars in the Philippines, only a promise that Rome will send an apostolic delegate to Manila to continue the negotiations with the Philippine authorities. The result will probably be a demand for a still further diplomatic recognition of the Vatican at Washington as well as at Manila.

And the anti-imperialists continue to smile.



# *Religious Legislation*

*By Mrs. Stella Archer Maloney*

[From an address delivered on Easter Sunday last in Berkeley Hall, Boston.]

JESUS CHRIST came into the world to proclaim true liberty, to set men free, to make known to the world the true principles of freedom; above all, religious freedom. He instructed His disciples in His heavenly doctrine, gave them that soul freedom, and sent them out to preach that divine liberty. His command, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's," was a declaration of the principle of the total separation of religion and the state. In that empire, proud of its conquests and jealous of its claim of right to rule in all things human and divine, the lowly disciples went everywhere preaching the gospel and calling upon men to be saved—to accept the soul-freedom of Christ's salvation.

This was contrary to Roman principle. It was actually forbidden by laws and principles established long before Jesus was born. The great iron empire of Rome filled the world, one government ruling over all, in which religion and the state were held to be one and indivisible. Every religion was held to be subordinate to the Roman religion, and though "all forms of religion might come to Rome, and take their places in the Pantheon [which was dedicated to Cybele and the other Roman gods], they must come as servants of the state." In the legislation of pagan Rome it was declared:

Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death.

The preaching of the gospel was an issue between Christianity and the Roman Empire; an issue between the principle of the freedom of the individual conscience, and therefore the principle of the separation of religion and state, as against the principle of the union of religion and the state, and the principle, therefore, of the absolute subjection and enslavement of the individual conscience.

Rome refused to recognize the principle of Christianity, and Christianity would not yield the principle. The result was two hundred and fifty years of Christian martyrdom, streams of blood and untold sufferings. Then, by an imperial edict, Rome recognized the justice of the Christian principle and the right of every man to worship whatever god he wished without state interference. This was a triumph for the principle of Christianity. But soon paganized bishops, through a dark intrigue with the Emperor Constantine, succeeded in establishing a union of the papal Catholic religion with the Roman Empire, thus perverting to the interests of the Papacy the victory which had been so nobly won. Again Christianity had to take up the contest in behalf of the rights of conscience and of the separation of religion and the state; again there were torrents of blood and untold agony and suffering, and for more than a thousand years the Papacy held the place of supreme authority in the world. Then came the Reformation, declaring anew to humanity the Christian principle of the absolute separation of church and state and the rights of the individual conscience, and

by an unswerving exercise of the divine right of dissent established Protestantism.

But a review of history reveals the sad fact that even Protestantism was perverted, and the Christian principle violated which gave it its name in the world. Then the contest had still to go on, through blood and suffering, by the Christian's exercise of soul-freedom, and by a protest against a false Protestantism in Geneva, in Scotland, England, New England, Virginia, and all American colonies except Rhode Island.

These are but echoes from history. Religion and the state have ever made a persecuting power when united.

We wonder why there was so much persecution after the Reformation. It was because the papal, "saintly" theory of a great church "father" and "saint" has been passed down through the ages for Roman Catholic and Protestant church polity. Augustine wrote:

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

Neander, the church historian, remarks: "It was by Augustine that a theory was proposed and founded which contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."

The establishment of a theocracy was the aim of the church leaders of the fourth century, as well as the exaltation of themselves. Neander says:

This theocratic theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine, and the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes and by their de-

termination to make use of the power of the state for the furtherance of their aims.

Constantine did much to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions final in disputed cases. But the one thing above all others in which the church managers secured the power of the state was in the matter of Sunday legislation. The famous edict of Constantine, issued March 7, 321, prohibiting certain kinds of work on "the venerable day of the sun," was one of the very first outgrowths of the theocratic theory of the church leaders, and it was in this Sunday legislation of Constantine and his immediate successors that power was secured by the church to compel those who did not belong to the church to act as if they did.

But the unspiritual church of the times could not stand the competition of popular amusements which came with Sunday idleness. The people went to the circus and the theater instead of to church, and the church, following the method by which she had already been shorn of her power, demanded that the state should give her a complete monopoly of the day. Many church members were employed in the circuses and theaters, and rather than give up their work they would labor on Sunday. The bishops complained that those who worked were "obliged to work," called it "persecution," and demanded a law, presumably to protect the workingman, but really to compel him to go to church. They declared that "the devotion of the faithful" was disturbed by these amusements, and demanded legislation so that "the day [Sunday] might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." And such legislation was obtained. And Neander says: "In this way the church received help from the state for the furtherance of her ends." And thus, too, the church

became filled with a mass of unconverted people who cared more for the world than the church.

But this is not all. The bishops had secured state power to remove all excuse for not being religious; but from the first of this scheme the people hadn't the spirit of devotion in their hearts. The state had forbidden them to work, had closed the places of amusement; still the people would not be religious. The next step in the logic of the situation was to compel them, and the bishops were equal to the occasion. Here the saintly theory of Augustine, with its inquisitorial spirit, met the demands of the case, and the rod of temporal suffering was not spared. The church induced the state to compel all to be idle for their own good. Then it was found that they were inclined to wickedness. Then to save them from going to the devil, they tried to compel all to go to heaven. The work of the Inquisition was always for love of men's souls, and to save them from the devil. The first step logically and inevitably led to the last, and the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step to the last, illustrated in the history of the Inquisition.

It is by the searchlight of history that we read the perils of the future. The history of religious legislation certainly should not induce us to favor such legislation in our advanced age. Religious legislation creates a theocracy, and in all history there has been but one theocracy which was not an absolute failure as an ideal government, viz., the Jewish theocracy, governed by God. And until God Himself comes to govern, we deny the justice, the righteousness, of religious legislation. I care not whether the religious laws enacted are the popular Sundays laws or any other legislation relating to the soul and God—with or without the humanitarian cloak placed upon

them, they are wholly and solely religious, and, traced back to their origin, we find persecution, and followed to their logical conclusion, we find a modern papal Inquisition. I care not whether or not these laws are enacted by the state, at the dictation of a union of churches—Roman Catholic among others—or at the demand of popular religious societies in the name of civic righteousness. The theory of persecution is only the logical following-out of the theory upon which Sunday laws have always been founded. Let history display the origin and results of the first Sunday laws, and then ask yourselves if you desire religious laws, even though they appear to you as angels of light.

The Lord's day is to be rendered to the Lord, not to Cæsar. When Cæsar demands it of us he is exacting what does not belong to him. When the civil power legally adopts a religious custom and enforces its observance it puts itself in the place of God. Wherever such a thing is done, he who regards God the most will respect such action the least.

"The true principle and the right assertion of the rights of conscience is our assertion of *every other man's* right to believe and worship as *he* chooses, or not to worship at all if *he* chooses. This at once sweeps away every excuse and every argument that might be offered for the restriction or the invasion of the rights of conscience by any person or any power. This is the Christian doctrine. This is the Roger Williams doctrine. This is the genuine Protestant doctrine, for it is 'the logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers.' (Bancroft.)"

In the promulgation of the principles of Protestantism, and in the work of the Reformation, the names of Martin Lu-

ther and Roger Williams can never be rightly separated. Williams completed what Luther began, and together they gave anew to the world and for all time the principles originally announced by Jesus Christ in the words: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

The nation arising out of the American Revolution overturned all papal principles and established for the enlightenment of all nations the first national government ever established upon the earth in accord with the principle announced by Christ for mankind and civil government. We have seen our nation come up like a plant, then grow into a beautiful, majestic tree, spreading its branches

wide, inviting the oppressed to shelter. We have tasted the living fruits of American institutions springing from the mother roots of the Declaration and the Constitution—our two arms of national existence and power. The Goddess of Liberty has held aloft the torch of freedom more than a century.

"How far that little candle throws its beams!" Our sound went throughout the earth; the Orient and Occident answered with their teeming millions of oppressed souls.

But we have reached a crisis in religious and political history. We have met and passed it, and the majority of the people are apathetic because they do not realize it.



And still the deadlock in the great anthracite coal strike continues. The strike has now been on for four months. Hard coal is now (Sept. 24) retailing at \$15 per ton, and soft coal has also advanced to more than double its normal price. The outlook for the coming winter is very serious; a severe coal famine is almost a certainty, which will entail great suffering upon the poor and will probably produce "coal riots" in the cities. A dealer says: "No coal for heating purposes in dwellings has been delivered since the strike began. The situation is much graver than most persons understand. From Portland to Chicago there is no coal, and when the increased demand comes I don't know where the people will get fuel." The *Springfield Republican* says: "Were the United States at war, with a blockade around us and prices soaring as they did in the Confederacy, we could not be in a worse plight." Public sentiment is

almost unanimous in placing the responsibility for this condition of things upon the heads of the coal trust, or in other words upon the heads of the railroad companies owning the principal lines in the coal regions, for these companies are in illegal control of the coal mining business. These magnates have refused from the beginning to take any step toward settling the matter, evidently content to let the public suffer. The whole thing has given a great impetus to the idea of governmental control of great public industries, at least of coal mining. Great journals that scout at Socialism are asking why it is any more necessary for the coal supply to be in the hands of irresponsible private parties than for the supply of light, air, or water to be. It is another of the big battles in the war between capital and labor, a war which grows more serious all the time and which more and more threatens individual freedom.

## *Some Experiences in Turkey*

[By a native Seventh-day Adventist missionary in Constantinople.]

AT last the treasurer of our church in Shagshag, Nicomedia, has served his three months' term of imprisonment, to which he was sentenced as a slanderer. But Satan was not satisfied with that, and has stretched forth his hand against the Sabbath-keepers in almost every corner of Asia Minor. Believing that the readers of *THE SENTINEL* are interested in the cause of Christian liberty in Turkey as well as elsewhere, I will relate a few facts.

Our worker, A. B., a young man, went to Cheukanergiman and preached the message several days. Soon the people stirred up the police against him. He was arrested and sent to the Castle of Payas, where he was detained till he was sent to Adana. A friend of his gave a trial-bond, and he was set free. All this was done because an unrecognized religion was being preached. Soon after this all the brethren of Adana were arrested on a Sabbath day while they were assembled for worship. In two days they were investigated, and left free on condition that they must not assemble again on the Sabbath day. After this event our worker, A. B., went to Osmaniye, hearing that several were interested in our message. He was cordially received, and a course of study began at once. Others were jealous of this, and called on the police to stop it. But the officers did not hinder him, because they saw no fault in him. Ten days were spent there, and one soul accepted the truth as a witness. Our worker, A. B., received an invitation from Bro. E. A., our worker in Alexandrette. Soon he went there, and both together went to Kessab, an Armenian town near Antioch. The people were

moved to come and hear the truth. Two souls began to keep the Sabbath. An American missionary at once came there from Aintab, and, uniting with the bishops of Armenian and Catholic churches, wrote a letter of complaint against these two workers, and sent it to the Turkish ruler in a village near by. Both were arrested, and in the company of a soldier were sent to Aleppo. There they were investigated and found faultless in civil matters. Their only fault was that they were preaching an unpopular religion. The vali and chief of the police, being broad minded men, let them go free with the condition that they should go directly every one to his place.

Lately Bro. J. H. K. was called from Jerusalem to Constantinople to visit our churches in Broussa and Nicomedia. Sister Aznive accompanied him as interpreter. First they went to Broussa, then to Seuleuz. The people of Seuleuz were deeply moved to hear the message. Soon the government was informed, and a policeman was sent to take them to the ruler. They had already left the village and gone to another village. The policeman followed them, and took them to the ruler, who, receiving commandment from Broussa to put them out of the province, sent them to Yalova. There was a village near by called Shagshag to be visited, but the ruler of Yalova prevented them, only letting them pass to Nicomedia. After visiting all the churches they decided to try once more to go to Shagshag on their way to Constantinople, but again the ruler of Yalova prevented them, so they came back to Constantinople. Bro. K. soon left for Jerusalem. It seems that the ruler of Yalova has

notified the case to Ismid, whence it was notified to the minister of the police. As Bro. K. was gone, Sister Aznive was called and dealt with rather harshly by the police court. She was asked to give a bail-bond not to speak about this new religion and not to go out of Constantinople. She refused both. Thank the Lord she was allowed to go free.

The work in Seuleuz has stirred the bishopric of Broussa. The bishop went to Seuleuz and threatened our brethren. Seeing that they stood fast in their faith he wrote a false complaint against them to the vali of Broussa, as if they were disturbing the peace of the people. Soon all the brethren were arrested and sent to Broussa. The vali investigated the matter, but found no fault in them. At that time the Protestants of Seuleuz and Broussa acted in favor of our brethren, and so the vali let them go free. They went back into their village in safety, but the Armenians and the bishop do not stop their course of enmity. There was a brother from Bardizag working at Seuleuz a few months later. They made a complaint against him, and he was arrested, investigated, and, being a stranger in the village, was at once sent back to Bardizag in the company of a soldier.

Last year about this time six Sabbath keepers at Adana, Cilicia, were together in worship on a Sabbath day, when a policeman came in and took them to the police court. This court had them all delivered to the legal court to be tried and judged. In two days their secret trial was done, and all were sent away until the time of their judgment. This year the legal court appointed the day of their judgment, and called them to appear in court on May 29. All were cleared except the one in whose house the meetings were held, he being fined. As no public worship can be carried on except by religious bodies authorized by the govern-

ment, and as Sabbath keepers have been denied such authorization, their meetings are illegal, and the man in whose house the meetings are held is held responsible. Our brethren continue the meetings.

The readers of *THE SENTINEL* will remember that a seventh-day observer in Constantinople was arrested last year through the misrepresentation by the police of some portions of the *Review and Herald*, received from the United States. The police court took the case and referred it to the legal court while holding our brother in prison. The legal court had the matter that had been objected to translated, and found nothing that could be construed as being against the government. The item announcing that the Sultan had at last paid the money due to the United States was not considered a harmful thing, and the article headed, "The Macedonian Cry," was found to have no reference to the modern Macedonian question. So the *Review and Herald* was vindicated, and the brother released. But the General Plaintiff referred the case to the higher court, claiming that the *Review and Herald* contained harmful words against the government and that our brother must be punished. After a careful investigation by the higher court he was found guiltless. So the *Review and Herald* was cleared in the higher court also. Now the General Plaintiff, not content with the decision, has raised the case to the supreme court. We look for the end with much interest.

From this one may see the condition of things in this country. A policeman can take any trifling thing into his hands and threaten to deliver you to the government in order to get money from you, and when he is not satisfied you find yourself in the prison as a revolutionist. In the legal court you may clear yourself, but the policeman goes unpunished. I can recall now very distinctly a case of this

kind. An Armenian brother was coming on a Sabbath morning to our house to attend the worship. On his way he passed by the police station near us. As he was not a resident of that part of the city, one of the policemen followed and arrested him. He was taken into the station, his pockets were carefully searched, and some money was found about him. This was what the policeman was looking for. Then came the threatenings: "You have put on a European hat; you have a French book, too; you have a paper of some insurance company; we don't know what kind of a fellow you are; we will send you to the ministerial department of the police; clear yourself there," etc. I was called and bore testimony that he was a good man. But my testimony was not accepted. They in-

formed him that six dollars only could secure his liberty. The brother consented to give this, and was released. The six dollars were divided among the police.

All these facts show clearly the contest between the divine truth and human might. All those religions that are devoid of divine power can uphold themselves only by human power, which they find ready to help them in the governments. It is seen that our message is going on even when it was thrice forbidden, and the attempt is made to stop it by the human hand of the government. This contest will go on, and at last it will be seen that divine truth is much stronger than human might. We are glad this contest is waged upon us, and that we have come to this time just for this purpose. Our God is power.



Mr. George Rice, a seventh-day observer, now located in Dawson, Yukon Territory, Alaska, recently served a sentence of two months at labor in jail as the result of the efforts of certain parties who seemed to have taken a dislike to him chiefly on account of his religious views and practises and his zeal and earnestness in making known what he believed to be religious truth. He had very little knowledge of the mining laws, and not realizing that anyone would seek to injure him in that way, in taking up a placer claim he followed implicitly the proffered counsel of certain parties. He found in a very short time that he had been led into some violation of the mining laws. The parties responsible for this then threatened him with prosecution unless he should surrender to them three-fourths of his claim. This he refused to do, and the outcome was that he

was prosecuted, first in the police court and then in the territorial court, and was sentenced as stated, the false testimony of his enemies being more responsible for his imprisonment than the technical offense of which he was guilty. While serving his sentence Mr. Rice refused to work on the seventh day of the week, in accordance with his conscientious convictions of religious duty. This caused the jailor to bring him before the captain of police on the charge of insubordination. Mr. Rice says that the captain was a Roman Catholic, but that he "tore the charge [of the jailor] to pieces and threw it into the waste basket, and ordered the jailor not to ask me to work on Saturday, but that if he had any work to do on Sunday to put me at it." During the remainder of his term of imprisonment Mr. Rice had no more trouble of that sort.

*Continued from second page.]*

*which delights in virtue and sympathizes with suffering wherever they are seen.*

*I call that mind free which is not passively framed by outward circumstances, which is not swept away by the torrent of events, which is not the creature of accidental impulse, but which bends events to its own improvement, and acts from an inward spring, from immutable principles which it has deliberately espoused.*

*I call that mind free which protects itself against the usurpations of society, which does not cower to human opinion, which feels itself accountable to a higher tribunal than man's, which obeys a higher law than fashion, which respects itself too much to be the slave or tool of the many or the few, which guards its empire over itself as nobler than the empire of the world.*

*I call that mind free which, through confidence in God and in the power of virtue, has cast off all fear but that of wrong-doing, which no menace or peril can enthrall, which is calm in the midst of tumults, and possesses itself though all else be lost.*

*I call that mind free which resists the bondage of habit, which does not mechanically repeat itself and copy the past, which does not live on its old virtues, which does not enslave itself to precise rules, but which forgets what is behind, listens for new and higher monitions of conscience, and rejoices to pour itself forth in fresh and higher exertions.*

*In fine, I call that mind free which, conscious of its affinity with God, and confiding in His promises by Jesus Christ, devotes itself faithfully to the unfolding of all its powers, which passes the bounds of time and death, which hopes to advance forever, and which finds inexhaustible power, both for action and suffering, in the prospect of immortality.*

*Such is the spiritual freedom which Christ came to give. It consists in moral force, in the enlargement of thought and affection, and in the unrestrained action of our best powers. This is the great good of Christianity, nor can we conceive a greater within the gift of God.*

WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D.D., 1830.



# 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      OCTOBER, 1902      No. 11

While men are enforcing the observance of the Lord's day they are repudiating the Lord's way of securing obedience to His law and are denying His authority and power.

The enforcement of religion by law, in whatever way it may be done, always works the abridgement and denial of human rights and hence always works

against the very end and purpose for which civil government exists.

Whatever practise is wrong from the standpoint of due regard for individual rights ought to be prohibited by law on all days of the week; and whatever practise is right from that standpoint ought not to be prohibited by law on any day of the week.

If labor should be prohibited by law on one day in order to protect men in the right to rest on that day, then rest should be prohibited by law on other days in order to protect men in the right to work on those days. If a person cannot rest when others are working, then he cannot work when others are resting.

A person who cannot be religious without the aid of a law to regulate the conduct of other people in religious matters cannot be religious when such a law is enacted and enforced. No person can be a true observer of the Lord's day until he is able to keep it without the aid of special legislation and independently of the conduct of all other persons.

An apparently peculiar thing about a Sunday law is that a violation of it by one who observes another day of the week and denies the divine authority of Sunday observance seems to be a far more serious offense than is a violation of it by a nominal Sunday observer. But this is not at all peculiar in the light of the real nature of such legislation.

A seventh-day observer has no right to any more liberty and freedom than anybody else; but every person has the right to be free from governmental interference and control in matters of religion. A seventh-day observer does not have the right to work on Sunday be-

cause he observes another day, but because, in common with all men, he has the right to do what does not interfere with the rights of others, and to dissent from others, if he wishes, in all matters of religious belief and practise.

With all her other iniquities the Papacy has by no means fallen short in the inordinate love of money. And to her belongs the distinction of having devised and employed the most abominable method of getting wealth that the world has ever known. Assuming a monopoly of the moral authority of the universe so far as this world is concerned, she has made the moral nature of man the field of her speculation, and the lust and crime and the fear and remorse of the human heart have alike been made to yield her a golden harvest. See the first article in this issue.

There were no "Christian" lobbyists in the days when the Christian church "went forth conquering and to conquer." The apostles and early believers knew not of the wonderful possibilities of civil legislation; they knew only of the wonderful and glorious possibilities of the gospel of the power and love of God. And of this gospel they were not ashamed, but went everywhere preaching it, and, relying implicitly upon it, they found it to be, without the aid and support of civil power, more powerful than the legislation of the mightiest of empires.

Unjust and unrighteous power is prone to buttress itself with the theory of "divine right." Thus was the despotism of the Papacy established and maintained; thus monarchy and the distinctions and barriers of class were upheld; thus do free nations to-day justify the subjugation of weaker peoples; thus do

the present-day champions of religion by law find a basis for their medieval schemes; and thus, it seems, the barons of industry and commerce will to-day defend monopoly and the corrupt and excessive power of wealth. But the true doctrine of divine right, the only divine doctrine of divine right, is the divine right to do right; human beings have the divine right to do justice, to respect the rights of one another. To claim the sanction of God to do oppression and wrong is to add blasphemy to crime.

The first "Christian" lobbyists were the church leaders of the fourth century who sought the aid of the state in behalf of the church, and among other things secured the enactment of laws closing the "public shows" and prohibiting labor and business on the "Christian Sunday." This is the sort of work to which the "Christian" lobbyists in the United States to-day are chiefly devoted. The efforts of those early "Christian" lobbyists marked the substitution on the part of the church of the power of man for the power of God. That produced the Papacy, and through it an age of civil and ecclesiastical despotism, of intellectual torpor, and of moral and spiritual corruption. What will be the outcome of the efforts of these present-day "Christian" lobbyists, who are walking so closely in the tracks of their prototypes?

We present in this issue quite a full account of the late trial of Mr. W. T. Gibson for Sunday labor. We thought the readers of THE SENTINEL would be glad to have such an account. Because so much space is taken up by this matter and other articles we are obliged to omit mention and comment regarding a number of things that are worthy of note at this time. Those that are not merely of

current importance will be given the attention they deserve later. In addition to the announcement elsewhere there will appear in the November SENTINEL a consideration of some late utterances of Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, in favor of Sunday legislation. We expect also to present an article regarding the matter of child labor or slavery that is just now attracting considerable attention and causing just protest. There will be other interesting matter, and the November number will cover the field of current things in the line to which the magazine is devoted much more thoroughly than is the case in this number.



### *A Rumor that Deserves Attention*

A recent dispatch from Rome relative to the "creation of another American cardinal," to which end efforts have been made by high Roman Catholic dignitaries in this country for the past fifteen years, presents again an idea which has been reiterated in the press a number of times in the last few years. It is that the Government of the United States, particularly as represented in its chief executive officer, has an interest, influence and preference in this matter; that it desires this squabble among the "sons of the Church" to eventuate in the triumph of Archbishop Ireland, and that it is willing to exert an influence, which it is assumed to have in the matter, with the Pope to that end. The statement now is that "if after a satisfactory solution of the Philippine question President Roosevelt asks the Pope to recompense Archbishop Ireland for his services in the affair [by making him a cardinal], the Pontiff will then consider the matter."

Now it seems to us that this reiterated idea is of sufficient importance to receive attention from all Americans who

are not utterly indifferent to and regardless of the welfare of their country for the future and of what has been its chief glory in the past. It seems to us that the utterly un-American and revolutionary assumption coolly embodied in this idea is sufficient to arouse even the indifferent, and to lead them to inquire as to when Archbishop Ireland entered the service of the Government of the United States, as to what governmental service it is for which he is to be recompensed at the request of the President of the United States, and as to when and how the Government of the United States became so influential in the councils of the Catholic Church that its influence counts in the "creation" of cardinals, and that it can dispense the "red hat" in reward for services rendered? In short, when and how did it come about that the Roman Catholic Church and the Government of the United States are so closely allied and interrelated that a Roman Catholic prelate can be in the service of the Government of the United States by virtue of his being a Roman Catholic prelate, and that the President of the United States can be a director in the administration of the Roman Catholic Church by virtue of his being President of the United States? This much and no less is involved in the idea to which we have called attention.

It may be that this idea is an invention of newspaper correspondents and has no foundation but newspaper gossip. If such is the case, some way should be found to let correspondents and newspapers know that there is absolutely no excuse for the propagation of such a notion in this country, and that it should be scorned by all who have any true patriotism whatever. It may be that the Government has done nothing to warrant such an idea. If not, it should not hesitate to let it be known in unmistakable terms. The reiterated attribution to the

Government of an attitude so high-handed and revolutionary would seem to call for and make fitting and proper an absolute and unqualified denial of any such attitude on its part.

We believe that this idea originated neither with the newspapers or the Government, although, in view of some things that have taken place during the time that the rumor has been in circulation, we are unable to say that we feel assured that the Government or its representatives have done nothing to warrant it. Newspaper gossip is seldom without some sort of foundation, and a rumor that has sufficient vitality to live as long as this one has is apt to have pretty good foundation. The real origin and foundation of this idea to which we have referred is to be found in papal intrigue and craft, both at the Vatican and in the United States, of which newspaper correspondents are not ignorant. In the first place it is not at all improbable that a preference on the part of the Government of the United States in this matter as to who shall be cardinal would count much at the Vatican. This is due to the fact that the Papacy is scheming for more and more influence and prestige with the American Government, or, as the Pope expresses it, is working to "strengthen the excellent understanding between the Church and the United States authorities," and she would consider such deference to the Government a very wise stroke of policy. In the next place it is certain that Archbishop Ireland wants to become a cardinal, and that he is working to secure the full benefit of whatever influence the Government can exert in that direction. Therefore he and his supporters are interested in having the idea prevail that the American Government is backing him in his campaign for the cardinalate. And right here is probably where this idea

that we are discussing had its origin. The idea is no doubt inculcated in Rome and urged upon the Pope that the realization of the Archbishop's ambition will mean only an important step in furthering the larger ambition of the Papacy with regard to the United States. And most certainly it would if the Archbishop succeeded in getting the Government to take up his case and to ask the Pope to "recompense" him with a cardinalate. If the Archbishop has not been working assiduously to that end during the last few years then we are much mistaken as to the meaning of certain things that have taken place. And many newspapers and newspaper correspondents have been mistaken also. When the matter of the American "mission" to the Vatican was first broached it was freely and plainly intimated that the secret of the Archbishop's activity and interest in the matter was his ambition to be made a cardinal, and that he expected by his service to the Government on the one hand and to the Vatican on the other in the deal to realize his ambition in the way in which he had planned. But the scheme did not work with entire success, or at least has not so far, and so now, according to the dispatch to which we have referred, which appeared in the *New York Tribune* of August 31, there is to be delay until "after a satisfactory solution of the Philippine question" before the President of the United States "asks the Pope to recompense Archbishop Ireland" with a cardinalate.

It is strange that this reiterated idea is treated with the indifference that it is. If it is not true to the facts there should be no delay on the part of those concerned to make the fact known. The Archbishop has shown himself very zealous of late in discountenancing rumors which reflected upon the Government. Here is an excellent opportunity for him

to dispose of another rumor that is certainly as discreditable to the Government as any that he has seen fit to denounce. If this idea is true to the facts, and there are some things which indicate strongly that it is, it would seem that it is high time that the American people were waking up to some astonishing things that are taking place right before their eyes.



### *The Church Goes to the Caucus in Massachusetts*

ACCORDING to present indications the cause of religion by law will be vigorously pushed in Massachusetts during the coming winter. The "friends of the Sabbath" have already begun their campaign, the first step being an attempt to control the political caucuses of the State in the interests of Sunday legislation. The "New Sunday Movement" was thus described by a special reporter of the *Springfield Republican* in a dispatch from Boston on September 8:

The Civic Committee is the name of a new organization which is just now making an appeal to the ministers of the State to preach sermons on the 21st for the purpose of getting men out to the caucuses who will see that candidates are nominated for the legislature who will not let down the Sunday laws any further. They want "men of convictions and courage, who can be counted upon to support the right side of moral problems and defeat all legislation which would further undermine our Sabbath." They say that the strong current toward the Parisian Sabbath "has indicated a general letting slip of the anchorage of the New England Sabbath." The circular further says: "The Sunday tobacco and news-store and bootblack bills, passed prior to the organization of the Civic Committee, not only compromised but literally surrendered the Sabbath to its enemies. On the Sunday fishing bill, the bill opening liquor saloons on Sunday, and opening general trade on Sunday, the Sabbath would again have been surrendered but for votes giving only one majority for righteousness. There is only one logical conclusion,

that, unless active work supports the New England Sabbath throughout the entire State, the 1903 General Court will be marked by still more serious surrenders to unrighteousness."

With this circular is another sheet addressed to Massachusetts pastors, signed by James H. Earle, chairman of the Civic Committee; Alfred Noon, secretary of the Massachusetts Total Abstinence Society (of which John D. Long is president); Robert H. Magood, superintendent of the Christian Citizenship department of the Massachusetts Christian Endeavor Union; John R. Gow, president of the Baptist Young People's Union of Massachusetts; Franklin E. Hamilton, president of the Epworth League of New England, and E. M. Brown, secretary of the Faxon Temperance Bureau. This sheet reminds the pastors of the Democratic caucuses on the 10th and the Republican on the 24th, and asks them to preach, preferably on the 21st—the Sunday before the Republican caucuses—on "Christian stewardship as related to the matter of the individual citizen's obligation to be faithful in the intelligent use of his caucus vote." It will be noticed that the date, coming after the Democratic caucuses, shows that the Civic Committee and its friends regard the Democrats as a hopeless case, and that the sole reliance of the friends of the Sabbath is on the Republicans. The president of the advisory board of the Civic Committee is Rev. Dr. L. B. Bates, father of Lieut.-Gov. Bates. Other members include President William F. Warren of Boston University, Bishop Willard F. Mallalieu of Auburndale, and Rev. Dr. B. D. Hahn of Springfield.

Whatever may be the idea that obtains as to "Christian stewardship as related to the matter of the individual citizen's obligation to be faithful in the intelligent use of his caucus vote," the plain import of the above is that those who claim to stand for Christianity in Massachusetts not only look upon the political caucus as a fit and suitable instrument for accomplishing what they regard as Christian work, but are attempting to use it to that end, and that they, as churchmen and Christian workers, in some things at least, are adopting the ways and methods of the ordinary politician.

This harmonizes exactly with the genius of Sunday enforcement. If the church continues to cling to and uphold the iniquitous principle of Sunday enforcement it is only a question of time when it will be as political in spirit and practise as any political party, and the caucus will indeed "be as sacred an appointment as the place of prayer" for church members, as declared by Mr. Samuel B. Capen at the Christian Endeavor Convention in Cincinnati last year, but it will be because there will be precious little sacredness about the prayer meeting.

Whatever may be the responsibility of the individual citizen with regard to his vote at the caucus or elsewhere, the church has no such duty and responsibility as that assumed by these religious leaders in Massachusetts. When the church sets itself to work to further and maintain particular measures of legislation and attempts to direct and control the votes of individuals at the caucus or elsewhere, it is entirely out of its proper sphere. The business of the church is to teach men the principles of righteousness and to leave them to vote at the caucus and elsewhere as they see fit. And the appeals of religious leaders who seek to control political action in the interests of *enforced religion*—for that is exactly what Sunday enforcement is—should be spurned by every American and every Christian.

We have in this Massachusetts instance a mild but very suggestive illustration of what is bound to be the result of the following out of the teaching of "Christian citizenship" and "Christian patriotism"—that is, that it is the business of Christians as Christians to get control of and to keep control of all governmental affairs—which has been inculcated for years in the Christian Endeavor and other large religious organizations. The things that result are these:

The religious element as the religious element—the church—becomes a political force, if not a political party; its leaders, just like any other politicians, try to muster and control votes, both of citizens and legislators, in the interests of measures of legislation in which they are especially interested; religious legislation and religious persecution ensues, if the religious leaders have their way, for under such circumstances it will never fail to be the case that the legislation in which the church will chiefly interest herself will be legislation for her own special benefit—legislation in support of what is deemed true religion and its institutions, as is the case in this Massachusetts instance.

When the Christian church begins to devote herself to what some who claim to represent her are pleased to term "Christian stewardship as related to the matter of the individual citizen's obligation to be faithful in the intelligent use of his caucus vote," she is becoming unfaithful to the genuine Christian stewardship committed to her by Him who said: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews"—then would my servants seek to control political caucuses and legislatures, that the Sabbath and other institutions of my religion should not be "undermined"—"but now is my kingdom not from hence."



In the August SENTINEL attention was called to the fact that the supreme court of the State of Washington had reversed the decision of the Walla Walla superior court, which in August, 1901, in the case of a Seventh-day Adventist merchant of College Place, who had been prosecuted for keeping open store on Sunday, pronounced the State Sunday law unconstitutional. Mr. Nichols writes us that

since this late decision he has felt it prudent to keep his store closed on Sundays, and has done so since July 20 for the first time since he began business in College Place. The present Washington Sunday law has been on the statute books since 1872, but until the agitation of last summer in Walla Walla had been practically a dead letter.



### *Sunday Enforcement Demonstrated to be Unnecessary*

One section of the New York Sunday *World* of September 7 was devoted to a profusely illustrated description of the industries of the "Queen City of Michigan"—Battle Creek—particularly that important industry which is an outgrowth of the movement for dietetic reform begun many years ago by the founders of the famous Battle Creek Sanitarium, and of which reform the Sanitarium and its many branch institutions in various parts of the world are to-day monuments of progress and centers of active propagation. According to the *World* the people of Battle Creek were the pioneers in the production of health foods—cereal and other food preparations designed to take the place of flesh foods—and Battle Creek is now the greatest cereal food producing city in the world.

In calling attention to the "most important part" which the Seventh-day Adventists, who "are frugal, industrious and law-abiding," have had in building up the city and its industries, the *World* said:

The Adventists keep Saturday, the seventh day, holy, and work to the extent permitted by law on Sunday. Thus, when the barber shop at the Post Tavern, the delightful hotel already mentioned, is closed on Sunday, the patron of the hotel is directed to go up to the Sanitarium, on the "West Side," where, he is told, it is already Monday. Two big printing

establishments, one carried on directly by the church and the other by a member, the food concerns owned by the church or its members, and all manner of business in which the members of the sect are engaged, are opened only five days in the week. The situation is thus explained by a citizen: "They won't work on Saturday, and we won't let them work on Sunday."

The *World* was partially misinformed here, and the remark quoted does an injustice to the non-seventh-day observers of Battle Creek. The people of Battle Creek are not so bigoted and intolerant toward the people to whom they attribute much of the prosperity of the city as this remark would imply. The Adventists carry on their business and manufacturing six days in the week, and, to the credit and honor of the people of Battle Creek, they are never interfered with in so doing. The non-seventh-day observers of Battle Creek feel that seventh-day observers have rights equal to their own, and they treat them accordingly. And there is never any great difficulty about the matter. Business is not paralyzed; the people are not demoralized. It is demonstrated in actual experience that it is not only possible for seventh-day observers and first-day observers to constitute an orderly and peaceable community while each observe their respective day of rest and worship and carry on their work and business the other six days of the week, but for the community so composed to greatly thrive and prosper industrially and commercially.

The condition which obtains in Battle Creek as respects the observers of the seventh day and the first day, where things are allowed to take their natural course without the mischievous interference of legislation which would compel one to conform to the religious observance and practise of the other, is the condition which accords with the fundamental principles of the nation as re-

spects such matters, and which must obtain in any community of seventh- and first-day observers where these principles are allowed to control. It is an actual and concrete demonstration of the specious character of the contentions of the advocates of Sunday enforcement, who would have the idea prevail that the peace, order and prosperity of a community or country is dependent upon uniform "Sabbath" observance, and who would have such observance strictly enforced by law. An investigation of Battle Creek conditions is likely to impress one very quickly with the fact that Sunday legislation is wholly unnecessary in the interests of civil order and industrial prosperity, and to lead to the conclusion that such legislation is "needed" only in communities where some of the people are too bigoted and intolerant to tolerate those who do not conform to their ideas with regard to Sabbath observance.



### *The Failing of the Devout that is Shared by All*

One of the best religious exchanges that we receive, and one that, not without reason, prides itself upon its adherence to Biblical teaching, observes with reference to "the doctrine recently announced by Dr. Parkhurst, that man is not immortal, but immortable—that is, . . . only those who are in God will live again, namely, in bliss, but the wicked will be annihilated," that "it must be very discouraging to the purveyors of heresy to find that no sooner have they put forth their latest novelties than some one seeks to rob them of their glory by attempting to prove 'priority of invention.'" So it is in this instance, it is declared, for "the glamor of the novelty" of the "heresy" advanced by Dr. Parkhurst has died out since many voices

have been "raised in contention for the honor of having said the same thing long ago." And it is sagely added:

In fact it can be shown that the error was known in the early church. The father of lies seems to be taking delight in leading the wise of our arrogant and conceited age into the errors and absurdities of ages upon which we are wont to look down with contempt. The history of modern heresy is a sardonic commentary on the foolish wisdom of this super-enlightened age.

Now we wish to remain as free as possible from that to which we here call attention, but we must observe that this seems to be a very plain instance of that proneness of people, and especially of people who regard themselves as having special connection with heaven, to pronounce as "heresy" and as having its origin with the "father of lies," anything that does not accord with what they believe. Now the fact is that nobody knows by actual knowledge what becomes of the dead, whether they pass into another stage of existence or are resolved into dust again. So far as human observation and knowledge from that observation goes, the latter is the correct view. The immortality of the soul is a belief, it is not a matter of knowledge. But it is not a belief that the Bible supports, for it cannot be reconciled with the great Biblical doctrine of the resurrection, and neither can it be reconciled with much other Scripture teaching. The Scriptures say that God "only hath immortality," and teach that immortality for man was brought to light in and through the gospel.

The "error" that man is only immortable was known not only in the early church, but a long time before. As far back as the days of Job it was known that in the day that a man dieth his thoughts perish, and that the dead "shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep," "till the heavens be no more." No



consciousness remains to a dead man, for "his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not."

Now it may be that in this "arrogant and conceited age" the "father of lies" has changed his tactics, but it was he who first advanced the doctrine of immortality for sinful beings, as may be found by reading the third chapter of Genesis. And since that time, notwithstanding the fact that he was then and there cut off entirely from the possibility of living forever as a transgressor (Gen. 3:22-24), man has been prone to regard himself as possessed of inherent immortality, and never has he been more sure of this than when sunk in the most abject idolatry and superstition.

But the point we desire to emphasize, and perhaps what we have given will serve to emphasize it, is that it is well to be very careful how we pronounce as heresy and as "foolish wisdom" what others think, for there is no greater heresy and no more foolish wisdom than that which assumes that it understands the full counsel of God, and on the strength of that assumption is ready to pronounce as heretical all that does not accord with it. It is the failing, and the virtue, in a sense, of devout people to believe that they are closer to God than other people, and that they have His truth just about in its perfection; and that therefore all who do not think and believe as they think and believe are in error. And thus they feel free, feel as if they had a special commission from heaven, to pronounce as heresy and foolish wisdom all that does not agree with the truth as they conceive it. They do not realize that in doing so they may be the victims in its most aggravated form of that which they are so quick to condemn in others—an "arrogant and conceited" exaltation of and reliance upon human opinion and wisdom. They forget that they are sub-

ject to the limitations and frailties that are common to all their kind, and are just as liable to err as is the most "super-enlightened" and "arrogant and conceited" of "heretics." And who, indeed, is free from this failing?



"Some Experiences in Turkey," related in this issue, read almost like accounts of the experiences of the early Christian evangelists, given in the "Acts of the Apostles." And, indeed, the experiences are the same. Not only do these present-day experiences occur on almost the very scene of the other experiences, but they are in many respects essentially the same. First, there is the preaching by humble men of what they believe to be a message of truth that the people need to hear without delay. Then there is the constant and bitter opposition of the representatives of other religions, who look upon the new teaching not as a message of truth but as one of error, which, if not positively evil and dangerous, is a needless and useless disturbance of the minds of the people, and in either case an injury to what they are sure is the cause of true religion. Then there are the civil officials, who, while they are on the whole indifferent to the matter, are naturally disposed to side with the representatives of what is and has been, and to look askance at the preachers and disciples of a new religion, and who can be with little difficulty persuaded that there is bound up in it something that is against the interests which they are supposed to guard. And so the disciples of the new religion are regarded with hatred from one direction and with suspicion from another, and between the representatives of known and recognized religion on the one hand and the civil officials on the other, are constantly subject to harassment, arrest and even imprisonment, which of course is always done in the

interests of civil order! But, as of old, there are Gallios and officials like the town-clerk of Ephesus who know what legal authority is for, and who refuse to try and condemn men whose only offense is a failure to agree with the prevailing opinion in "a question of words and names" and of religious practise. So in Turkey it is frequently the case that when Seventh-Day Adventists are arrested at the instigation of religious enemies they are treated with courtesy and quickly released when brought before the higher police officials. And, as of old, in some cases these officials are interested to learn just what it is that meets with such bitter opposition, and in a number of instances have listened eagerly as these humble and persecuted men have told them the truths for which they were willing to suffer so much. In Turkey it is required by law that every religious organization shall be "authorized" by the government before it can carry on operations, and public meetings are not allowed by the adherents of any religious body that is not so recognized. Through the influence, chiefly, it must be confessed to their shame, of the representatives of the leading Protestant religious bodies carrying on missionary operations in Turkey, the Seventh-Day Adventists have been unable to secure such authorization from the government, and in consequence are greatly handicapped in their work and constantly subject to petty persecutions of the sort set forth in the article to which we have referred.



"The coming St. Louis Exposition in 1904 will distinguish itself by the observance of our legal rest day," says the *Presbyterian Banner*, of Pittsburg, Pa., in rejoicing over the apparent certainty of the Sunday closing of the exposition. A St. Louis newspaper announces to the world that while the exposition will be

closed on Sundays, the summer beer gardens in the city will be wide open, and satirically congratulates the "Sabbathites" on their success in making certain swollen attendance and large profits for the beer gardens. "But iron-clad bigotry is insensible alike to reason and sarcasm," remarks another paper. It is not at all unlikely that a strict carrying through of the plan of those who have dictated the Sunday closing of this exposition will be a thorough and practical demonstration of the real worth of their contentions. While they may be relied upon to ignore entirely the evil results of the character indicated above that will follow from the Sunday closing of the exposition, there will probably be one thing, though not necessarily having any special connection with the Sunday closing, that they will not be able to evade, since they have delighted to give it such prominence in connection with the two large expositions that have preceded this one. It is not at all improbable that the St. Louis Exposition, after having observed the "Sabbath" all the way through, will be behind financially in the end. Those who have so glibly accounted for the deficits of the Chicago and Buffalo expositions on the ground that they could not prosper because they had "profaned the Sabbath," will necessarily need a different argument about that time. It would be well for them to begin to think about this now, for it will not be easy to formulate a consistent explanation at the last moment. By the way, we have heard no boasts from the "friends of the Sabbath" over the wonderful financial success of the Charleston Exposition, which was closed on Sundays. They should not be so modest as to ignore so conspicuous a proof of the correctness of their claims and theories. But perhaps the Charleston Exposition was hardly a fair test of the wonderful financial benefits of Sunday closing, since

it was not closed by national legislation, in obedience to the mandates of the champions of Sunday enforcement. But the St. Louis Exposition will be a fair test, and we shall see what we shall see.



*The Independent* at last sees that there was a "real diplomatic side" to the negotiations with the Vatican, which it thinks was that phase of the matter which had to do with the withdrawal of the friars, "which was something more than had been at first outlined to the public." It is satisfied that the negotiations shall be continued "with the properly constituted ecclesiastical authorities at Manila," but adds by way of emphasis, "Observe, at Manila," and explains such emphasis thus:

While no mistake has been made yet, and while we are satisfied to have negotiations carried on at Manila, it is rather to be desired that they should not be transferred to Washington, and that it should not look as if the Apostolic Delegate were to be a sort of ambassador to the United States as well as an ecclesiastic in charge of the affairs of the Catholic Church.

Since *The Independent* was so heartily in favor of the sending of the American "mission" to the Vatican, it appears to us hardly fitting and consistent for it to be making any such utterance as the above. Surely it is not possible that *The Independent* has become identified with those "trembling souls," to which it referred some months ago when endorsing the sending of the "mission" to the Vatican, "whose antipathy to Rome is as red as a cardinal's hat." We are unable to discover any substantial difference between the relation which is sustained between the Government and the Papacy when negotiations are conducted through a papal representative at Washington and that which is sustained when negotiations are conducted through an Ameri-

can representative at the Vatican. We see no essential difference and choice between that which makes it look as if a papal representative were "a sort of ambassador to the United States" and that which makes it look as if an American official representative were "a sort of ambassador" to the Vatican. If negotiations between the two powers were absolutely necessary, especially if they were to be conducted in the sense in which *The Independent* and the Government have sought to have it believed that these negotiations with the Vatican were conducted, we should consider it as far more fitting and proper that the Pope should send a representative to Washington than that the Government should send a representative to the Vatican.



The Sunday-enforcement campaign against baseball and other games, prosecuted during the past summer by a prominent clergyman in Duluth, Minn., has called forth from the *Tribunal* of that city some very plain utterances on the subject which should be sounded in the ears of all those religious leaders throughout the country who are demanding that the law shall prevent the "desecration" of the "Sabbath." The following selections may seem somewhat blunt and harsh, but we cannot say that such a tone is altogether out of place in view of the inexcusable assumption upon which the advocates of Sunday enforcement commonly proceed:

The Sunday blue-law advocate objects to these games on Sunday on the theory that they "desecrate God's holy Sabbath;" but what is the use of the reverend gentleman's prevarication—to use no harsher term? Why should he not tell the truth about this matter? He knows very well that the day that Moses tells us that God "blessed and hallowed" and set apart as "the holy" and "the sacred day" was not the first day of the week, or Sunday, but the seventh day of the week, or Saturday. About this

there can be no dispute. It is well known, too, that it was Saturday, and not Sunday, that was observed as the holy or sacred day from the time of Moses until after the time of Jesus Christ. This fact no Biblical scholar who has any regard for truth will attempt to deny.

How happens it that the day that Christians generally insist shall be the holy and the sacred day shall not be the day that Moses tells us that God set apart for rest and worship, and not the day that Jesus Christ so observed and kept until the day of his death?

History tell us that some years after Christ's death some of his professed followers . . . who hated the Jews so intensely that they did not want to have the same holy or sacred day with them, and who seem to have imagined that they knew better than the Almighty as to what day of the week should be the holy and sacred day, and who seem to have thought that Jesus Christ had made a great mistake in observing Saturday as the holy day, came together and overruled the Almighty, . . . and without further ado proceeded to change the holy day from Saturday to Sunday, and the Christians have refused from that day to this to let the Almighty have His own way as to the day on which He shall be worshipped and as to the day on which we shall recreate and rest.

We defy any person on earth to show that either God or Jesus Christ ever authorized a change of the holy day from Saturday to Sunday, and we defy any one to show that any man or any set of men after Christ's death had any more authority to make such a change than a lot of self-styled theologians in the year 1902 would have to get together and by a vote change the holy day to Wednesday or any other day of the week.

As to the need of one day out of seven—with plenty of holidays thrown in—for rest and recreation, all denominations and ologies are substantially agreed; but the clergy might as well understand, first as last, that the masses of the people in this age of the world are not so stupid that they can be made to believe that Sunday—a man-made "holy" day—is really any more sacred than any other day; and if they really expect us to believe anything they say on any other subject, they must stop telling us things that we absolutely know are not true.

It is a question whether there has been an increase of prosperity for the wage-

earners during the past five years of great "prosperity" in the United States. Careful statistics show that while there has been such an advance in the prices of staple articles of necessity that it now requires \$101,000 to buy at wholesale the same stock of goods that could have been purchased in 1897 for \$72,000, that the average wages have advanced scarcely one-half as much proportionately. There would be no question whatever that prosperity has decidedly not come to the wage-earners, but for two things: The fact that the retail prices of staple articles of necessity have as yet been affected but little by the great advance in wholesale prices, and that now the "army of the unemployed" has employment. According to Dun's *Review* the wholesale price of "breadstuffs" has almost doubled since 1897, meats have advanced more than one-half, and dairy and garden products have advanced more than forty per cent. But with the exception of meats, there has been no very noticeable advance in the retail prices of any of these things and many others on which there has been a great advance in the wholesale price. But under present conditions retail prices are certain to advance, though it may be but gradually, and unless wages advance correspondingly the wage-earners will be anything but prosperous as a result of "prosperity."



Since the article on "A Rumor that Deserves Attention" was written another dispatch from Rome has appeared in the press stating that "it is rumored here that the Vatican has received from President Roosevelt an intimation that he would be personally pleased to see Archbishop Ireland created a cardinal as a reward for the services the Archbishop has rendered the Church and the United States." It was further stated that it

could not be learned whether "the message from the American President was or was not in reply to an inquiry for a recommendation from him as to the high honor, but it is believed that such an inquiry was the reason for President Roosevelt's communication." And since the article referred to was placed in type we note that the Wisconsin Methodist Conference, in session in Milwaukee on September 15, by unanimous vote decided to send the following to the President:

We see with pain in the press dispatches a rumor that the Vatican has received from President Roosevelt an intimation that he would be personally pleased to see that Archbishop Ireland was created a cardinal as a reward for the services he has rendered the church and the state. We strongly doubt the correctness of this rumor, for it does not seem possible that the President of the United States could thus violate the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which requires the complete separation of the church and the state, and we hope to see it authoritatively denied.

Press comments are to the effect that the rumor is without foundation.



"We have heard the suggestion," says *The Independent*, "that President Roosevelt, in his gratitude for the aid that Archbishop Ireland has given in this general matter [the Vatican negotiations], should request the Pope to give the cardinal's hat to the Archbishop of St. Paul. But such a suggestion is absurd on the face of it. It would be an impertinent interference of which President Roosevelt could not be guilty. They are the Archbishop's worst friends who are constantly talking about his being made a cardinal." It would not appear to us that this was a matter to be wound up with an intimation of solicitude for the Archbishop. So far as the mere matter

of his being made a cardinal is concerned, he may be left to the tender mercies of his "worst friends." The thing of importance, that which concerns the public generally, is the manifest attempt that is being made to use the Government as a means of furthering his ambition. We cannot feel certain that in this attempt the Archbishop is not the very foremost of his "worst friends." If this scheme is successful, or if it has met with the degree of success already rumored, it is, on the part of the President, something more serious than "an impertinent interference."



Bishop McFaul, of the Federation of Catholic Societies, desires that the Vatican "may stand on neutral ground in relation to all countries, just as the District of Columbia stands with respect to the United States." In a sermon in Trenton, N. J., recently he declared that this could be attained by the restoration to the Pope of his temporal sovereignty. But he would not have it supposed that the Pope is not more powerful at present than either England or the United States, for, "notwithstanding their greatness, what influence has the United States or England in Russia, Germany or France? Not so with the Pope of Rome. When he raises his hand in benediction that blessing falls upon his children at the frozen poles and on the scorching sands of the equator—nearly 300,000,000 children in every nation, tribe and clime under heaven." It would seem, then, that the Pope, and those who take so much pride in his power, ought to be satisfied with his present eminence, or is the Pope weary of the stupendous greatness and power that he now possesses and does he desire to become a minor potentate?

It is reported from Rome that the Vatican has at last decided definitely "to send the Most Rev. Diomède Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate for the Dominion of Canada, to Washington as Papal Delegate in the United States." Falconio is an Italian, is sixty years of age, and has been a member of the Franciscan order of friars since 1860. He came to the United States in 1865, and was for a number of years president of a college of his order in Allegany, N. Y. He subsequently became procurator-general of the Franciscan Order in this country. This last dispatch relative to his appointment as "Apostolic Delegate" carefully states that it was during "his residence in Allegany that Monsignor Falconio became a citizen" of the United States. The implication seems to be that citizenship in this country is a necessary qualification for the papal "Apostolic Delegate" to this country. Since diplomatic relations are not yet regularly established, no doubt the purposes of the Papacy can best be advanced at Washington by having there a representative who is an American citizen as well as "Apostolic Delegate."



While strongly in favor of the Sunday closing of the St. Louis Exposition, the New York *Christian Advocate*, in commenting on the matter, pays this complement (?) to the great "reform" force that has taken the lead in agitating to that end:

One would think that the "Reform Bureau" was really the greatest power now in existence in this country if he did not watch it closely. That it is of value in agitation is conceded, but it would be much more so if it were not for the peculiar darning-needle, hit-or-miss activity of Dr. Crafts, his frequent statements that have more force of assertion than accuracy, and the tiresome iteration of his claim that everything that is done is the result of his action, and his flippant way of speaking of all with whom he differs.

The characteristics here mentioned are those that one would naturally expect to see displayed by a "Christian" lobbyist—a man who assumes that civil government belongs entirely to "Christians" and that it exists chiefly for supporting and enforcing their religious practices and ideas.



At Havana on September 20, President Palma, of Cuba, who is very kindly disposed toward the United States, expressed himself thus to a correspondent of the New York *Tribune*:

It will be a source of gratitude and rejoicing for the Cuban people when the American troops are all withdrawn, and I hope it will be soon. They are not needed. Their presence has a bad moral effect. It looks to some as though the United States Government has no confidence in the Cubans to maintain peace and govern themselves. I don't want to be misunderstood. We are grateful to the Americans, but the people cannot feel free with American soldiers all around them.

With all its boasting of having given liberty to the Cubans the United States has not yet evacuated the island and has not given the Cubans what was promised them when the Platt amendment was forced upon them. No wonder President Palma is obliged to say, in spite of his own most earnest feelings, no doubt, that "the people cannot feel free."



In connection with reference to Decoration Day and the Fourth of July, President Roosevelt declared in a recent address that "among the holidays which commemorate the turning-points in American history, Thanksgiving has a significance peculiarly its own." We do not know exactly what the President may have meant, but we know that Thanksgiving Day has a peculiarity all its own as an American holiday in that it commemorates no event in the history of the nation and is made the occasion of an act

by the chief executive of the nation and of the governors of most of the States which is plainly inconsistent with the principle of separation of church and state, and which one President of the United States has declared is the exercise of a power which the Constitution has directly precluded to all holding office under it. We refer to the custom of directing by proclamation the holding of religious exercises.



On a recent Sunday morning the pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church in Camden, N. J., preached on "The Religious Outlook in Camden," declaring it to be "very dark." His first point in setting forth the condition of "the King's army in Camden," was that many of the 15,000 church members of the city "are persistent Sabbath-breakers." But we are glad to note that he did not urge the employment of civil authority in straightening out these church members in this matter. Perhaps it is thought that enforced Sunday observance is appropriate only for unbelievers and worldlings, and that it would not look well to call upon the law to get church members right in the matter. It certainly would indicate that the church was about destitute of spiritual power. And that is about what is indicated when the church calls upon the state to enforce "Sabbath" observance upon unbelievers and worldlings.



It is rumored in Rome that when the Czar comes to return the visit of King Victor Emmanuel he will not call on the Pope, and that "the Russian minister to the Holy See, M. Coubestoff, will purposely be absent from Rome during the sojourn of the Czar in the city so as to render it easier to ignore the Vatican." This "has seriously disturbed the Vatican," and "papal diplomacy is doing its utmost to prevent such an awkward inci-

dent." It is said that the purpose of the Czar is "to show his displeasure at the Pope's action in withdrawing the papal nuncio from The Hague because he was not invited to take part in the Peace Congress." All of which goes to show the essentially political character of "the Church."



"An unprecedented increase in crime in the United Kingdom" is shown by the report of the Commissioners of Prisons just published in London. There were 17,163 more persons convicted of crime during the year ending March 31, 1901, than during the preceding year. "The Commissioners find it impossible to assign a specific cause for the increase, as it is distributed generally throughout the country, and they hold out no hope of decreasing the average."



It was reported from London on September 15 that "the committee of the Protestant Alliance is making another attempt to get the Jesuits and priests of other orders expelled from England under the act of George IV." The influx into England of members of the suppressed orders in France seems to be the immediate occasion of this attempt.



*The Sacred Heart Review* (Roman Catholic), which did not agree with Archbishop Ireland in a matter of recent public discussion, referred to him as "the spiritual director of the Government." This is by no means destitute of point in view of a number of things that have occurred in recent years.



The mayor of Beverly, N. J., recently stopped a gang of Italian workmen who were engaged in laying gas pipes in that place on Sunday.

## 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.

*Synopsis.*—Arrests under Sunday laws: For keeping open store and selling, 44; for peddling, 25; for playing ball, 13; for "gaming on the Lord's Day," 9; for barbering, 2; total, 93. Persons fined: For keeping open store and selling, 17; for playing ball, 10; for peddling, 25; for "gaming on the Lord's Day," 9; for barbering, 1; total, 62. Sunday-enforcement movements and agitations: Against opening of stores or shops and selling, 13; against ball playing, 5; against barbering, 3; against saloons, 4; against excursions, 2; against concerts and entertainments, 2; against common labor, 1; against delivering of mail, 1; against racing, 1; general, 5; total, 37. Two ordinances against ball-playing enacted. One city ordinance prohibiting theatrical entertainments enacted. One court injunction issued against ball-playing; another against racing. New Denver ordinance prohibiting barbering sustained by magistrate. New Montreal liberal by-law pronounced void by magistrate. Opening of shops in warm weather for sale of meat and vegetables declared a public necessity by Kentucky magistrate. Court sentence pronounced on Sunday declared void by New York magistrate.

The city council of Heron, Minn., has prohibited the playing of ball on Sunday in that place.



Clergymen of Titonka, Iowa, have begun a crusade against Sunday ball playing and liquor selling.



The authorities of Carthage, N. Y., have prevented the playing of baseball in that village on Sundays.



The ministers' union of Toledo, Ohio, is agitating the question of Sunday enforcement against the saloons in that city.



The city council of Morton, Minn., has passed an ordinance prohibiting the playing of baseball on Sunday within the city limits.



Eight storekeepers were fined for Sunday selling in a Trenton, N. J., police court on July 15. The fines ranged from \$2 to \$3.85 each.



Alex. Zaleski, a barber of Buffalo, N. Y., was arrested by the police on August 26 for having "violated the Sunday shaving law" on the preceding Sunday.

The marshal of Moundsville, W. Va., "seconded by members of the city council, has ordered candy and fruit stores to close on the Sabbath."



The barbers of Marshalltown, Iowa, have organized, and have begun a movement to enforce Sunday closing of all barber shops in that city.



Nine men were arrested in Springfield, Mass., on August 24, "for gaming on the Lord's Day," and were fined \$10 and costs each for the same in the police court two days later.



The journeymen barbers of Cleveland, Ohio, have called upon the mayor of that city to enforce the Sunday closing of barber shops. The mayor has "instructed Director of Police Dunn to see to it."



In response to a request from the retail clerks' union the mayor of Montgomery, Ala., has ordered the enforcement of the Sunday closing ordinance in that city, especially against clothing and furnishing dealers.



The churches of Hartford, Wis., re-



cently held a union service to discuss "the danger of the holiday Sunday," and followed it with the distribution of "Christian citizenship" literature throughout the place.



A dispatch from Jeffersonville, Ind., reported recently that "a Sunday-closing war is among the possibilities in this city." It was expected that the "war" would be inaugurated by the retail clerks, who had just organized.



Two butchers were arraigned before Police Justice Hoos in Jersey City, N. J., on August 4, on the charge of selling meat on Sunday. The magistrate paroled the prisoners until a decision is handed down in a certain appealed case.



Affidavits were sworn out against two grocers of Houston, Texas, on August 12, "charging them with selling groceries on Sunday." These are said to be the first arrests under the ordinance providing for Sunday closing of stores.



Anzibe Landry, a restaurant keeper of Somersworth, N. H., was recently fined \$10 in the police court for keeping his place open on Sunday. He has demanded of the marshal that all other places where sales are made on Sunday be closed also.



According to a dispatch from Monroe, La., a number of saloon-keepers of that city, "who desire that the Sunday law shall be strictly observed," have "presented a petition to the mayor and city council asking that the city have its Sunday laws rigidly enforced."



Two hundred Italians in the employ of the South Jersey Gas, Electric and Traction Company, who were engaged in lay-

ing gas pipes in a street in the eastern portion of Camden, N. J., on Sunday, September 7, were stopped by the police. They were told "that if they again began work on the Sabbath they would be arrested."



An agitation was recently on foot in Rockcliffe, Canada, near Ottawa, to stop Sunday band concerts that were being given in a park on the outskirts of that place. It was found that the point where the concerts took place was outside the city limits, and it was then proposed that the city authorities stop the street-car traffic in that direction.



The marshal of Mexico, Mo., has notified the proprietors of hotels, cigar stores, livery stables and other business men that "the Sunday law will be enforced," and that they must "close their places." The mayor and some members of the city council disapprove of the step taken by the marshal, but it has the endorsement of the city attorney.



W. W. Chalfant, a druggist, and John Brower and William Shriver, bath-house keepers, all of Ocean City, N. J., were recently summoned to appear before a justice of the peace to answer to the charge of being "engaged in worldly employment and business in the showing forth and exposure for sale of certain wares, merchandise, goods and chattels" on Sunday.



"Sunday closing and how to make it more general was the only topic of discussion" at a recent meeting of the Merchants' Protective Association of Jersey City, N. J. "The committee in charge of the movement for closing all places of business on the Sabbath, reported that another conference, in which a committee of the Boss Butchers' Association

would participate, would be held with Chief of Police Murphy shortly."



The barbers' union of Waukesha, Wis., has voted that "on and after September 7, 1902, all the barber shops in this city shall be closed on Sundays." The barbers of Oconomowoc, Wis., have signed an agreement to the same effect. Nothing is said of appealing to the law in either case, but that will no doubt come if any barber tries to do business on Sunday.



The mayor of Salem, Ore., was presented with a petition a few weeks ago asking that "the local fruit stands and similar places which have been violating the State laws regarding Sunday selling be closed." The petition was "signed by about fifty prominent citizens and business men," but it "was first considered at the ministers' meeting," from which a committee was sent out "to work with the petition and secure signatures for the same."



It was reported from Petersburg, Va., recently that a Sunday-closing ordinance that was passed by the city council ten years ago was being strictly enforced for the first time. The ordinance "prohibits the sale of everything except medicine and food at hotels." The authorities allow butchers and fish dealers to deliver fish and meat on Sundays that was purchased on the preceding day. No newspapers are allowed to be sold at stands or on the streets.



Recorder Poirier, of Montreal, Canada, has pronounced the by-law, passed by the council of that city in June, permitting the sale of fruits, cigars, confectionery and temperance beverages during certain hours on Sunday, provided all the articles named were kept for sale at every

place where any of them were sold, to be ultra vires because of its partial and discriminating character. The officials of the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance are greatly pleased over this.



The Prohibition Union of Christian Men in Rochester, N. Y., is conducting a crusade against Sunday liquor selling. They find by patrolling the city that the violations of the provisions of the Sunday-closing law "extend from 35 to 75 per cent." The president of the union has declared that "for every ounce and hour of this continued anarchy in this Christian city we hold Mayor A. J. Rodenbeck personally responsible before the people and before God."



Twenty-five Hebrew peddlers were fined in a police court in Chicago on September 6 for peddling goods without a license on the preceding Sunday in the vicinity of the Jefferson market. It is not clear from the report whether the fines were imposed merely for selling without a license or for selling on Sunday, but evidently the two things were intermingled, as the magistrate, after warning them against attempting to do business without licenses, "explained that it was illegal for them to sell their goods on Sunday."



Three grocerymen of Orange, N. J., were fined \$2 and \$1.70 costs each in the police court of that city on August 6, for having made sales "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." The evidence showed that one had sold eight cents worth of bacon and six cents worth of ginger snaps, another had sold eight cents worth of something else, and one had sold "three tomatoes for two cents." The complaints were made by the retail clerks' association. The clerks'

association and the Federated Trades Council have retained Assemblyman Wm. A. Lord as counsel to aid them in "the fight for Sunday closing."



The United Merchants' Protective Association and the Retail Clerks' Protective Association, of Cincinnati, Ohio, are both working for strict Sunday closing in that city. The first organization was just recently formed for "the primary object of testing the Sunday-closing law, and enforcing it if it is constitutional." The clerks' association has caused the arrest of eight persons, some of whom are clerks, for Sunday selling. The clerks are charged with performing "common labor on Sunday." Two of the merchants who have been tried were fined \$25 and costs each.



As a result of the activity of the retail clerks' union in Covington, Ky., a number of grocers, meat dealers and dry goods merchants were recently arraigned in the police court of that city on the charge of Sunday selling. The dry goods merchants were fined, but the grocers and meat dealers were allowed to go on a suspended sentence of \$10 each, and later were discharged entirely, the justice holding that inasmuch "as the poorer classes could not afford ice in the summer, and consequently had no way to keep meat and vegetables fresh from Saturday to Sunday, the opening of the stores where these things could be had on Sunday morning was a matter of public necessity and public safety."



According to the Owen Sound (Ont.) *Sun*, "the great moral question of the day" at that place a few weeks since was, "Shall we have a Sunday boat service to the park." An effort was being made to inaugurate the running of a small

steamer as a ferry boat between the city and the park on Sundays, but this was vigorously opposed by officials of the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance, who gave as one reason for their course that the running of the boat "would interfere with the services in the churches." They had induced the local crown attorney to look into the matter, and had also appealed to the authorities at Ottawa, but at last accounts "the great moral question of the day" had not been settled.



From Negaunee, Mich., it was reported on September 10 that the liquor dealers of the city "have signed a paper declaring in favor of a rigid prohibition of all manual labor on Sunday, and calling on the authorities to enforce the laws." It is proposed "to stop all Sunday work at the mines, to prevent street-cars from operating, and to close all drug, confectionery, and other stores. Committees have been appointed to collect evidence next Sunday." This action of the saloon-keepers is said to be in retaliation because of the Sunday-enforcement crusade, especially directed against them, recently begun by the pastor of the Methodist church. About a dozen saloon-keepers have been prosecuted.



"From the standpoint of the Lord's Day Alliance," says the Toronto (Ont.) *Telegram*, "British Columbia is a virtuous province." The secretary of this Sunday-enforcement organization reports that greater interest is manifested in the work of the organization in British Columbia than anywhere else in Canada. "The Masonic and Loyal Orange authorities, and the organized labor forces, all strong bodies, have promised their support and hearty cooperation." A movement is on foot to secure amendments to the present act "with regard to

the preservation of the Lord's Day," which is declared to be at present "antiquated, ineffective, and unworthy of the most progressive province in the Dominion."



The attempt by the manager of the local opera house to inaugurate Sunday evening performances in Janesville, Wis., "brought forth a storm of protest from church-goers and business men," and in the end a city ordinance prohibiting all "theatricals and other exhibitions, shows, and amusements on Sunday." The ordinance, which was passed on September 3, not only forbids entertainments and performances of every kind "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," but forbids also the opening of any hall or theater on Sunday for the purpose of giving any sort of an entertainment for gain. The penalty for violation of the ordinance is a fine of not more than \$100 nor less than \$10 for every person offending.



Judge Ross, of Syracuse, N. Y., has decided that "no court of special sessions can be legally held on Sunday," and that a judgment rendered on that day is void. A man who had been sentenced by a police justice to three months' imprisonment was brought before him on a writ of certiorari, and was ordered discharged because he had been sentenced on Sunday. The judge said in rendering his decision: "It would seem to be an anomaly to make it a crime to follow certain pursuits otherwise legal on Sunday, or to indulge in certain amusements otherwise lawful, and yet to allow the courts to be held for commonplace offenses." Yes, that would be an anomaly, but the great anomaly of the whole matter is that that which is otherwise legal and lawful becomes a crime when it is done on Sunday.

The mayor of Woonsocket, R. I., has received a very respectful letter from a citizen of that place, who writes in behalf of the members of the local baseball club and others, requesting him to "allow Sunday baseball playing at Cold Spring Park." It is set forth that "the young men who wish this privilege are workmen, and are obliged to work six days of the week, and Sunday is the only day on which they can have a little amusement." The writer promises, in behalf of those for whom he petitions the mayor, that "there will be no disturbances created and that quiet will be maintained throughout." Certainly nothing more should be required by the civil authorities. It was not stated what action the mayor took in the matter.



The grocery and provision clerks' union in Lawrence, Mass., has appealed to the mayor to enforce the closing of stores in that city on Sunday. It is said that "one hundred small tobacco, variety, bakery, candy, grocery, and ice-cream shops keep open on the Lord's day." A peculiarity of the matter is that all these are small shops in which practically no clerks are employed. But the clerks explain that they are fighting for "shorter hours and higher wages," and that this is the proper step to take first since "it would be unreasonable for us to expect our employers to grant us concessions when they are obliged to compete with people who are allowed to keep their stores open on Sundays." So the big dealers and the clerks have a common interest in overriding the rights of the small dealers and shopmen.



On August 16 Police Magistrate Thomas, of Denver, Col., sustained the validity of the ordinance recently passed in that city requiring all barber shops to close on Sunday. Mr. T. A. McClelland,

who had been arrested for barbering on the preceding Sunday, determined to test the ordinance, and through his lawyer admitted the charge and contended that the right to do such work "was one of the 'inalienable rights' guaranteed by the organic law of the land." Assistant City Attorney Butler opposed this contention, and the two attorneys cited many authorities on the question. At the conclusion of the argument the magistrate "decided to give organized labor the benefit of the doubt, and fined McClelland \$25 and costs." It was expected that the "boss" barbers would "arrange to take the case to the highest courts."



According to a dispatch, A. B. Hoffman, a morocco manufacturer in Lynn, Mass., "undertook to operate his factory" on Sunday, August 17. But the machinery "disturbed the peace and quiet of the locality and jarred the Christian sensibilities of the residents." Soon "the telephone wires leading into police headquarters were busy; people on their way to church dropped in wherever a telephone was available and notified the police officials that the Sunday law was being outrageously violated." In obedience to imperative orders from police headquarters Mr. Hoffman closed down and sent his workmen home. This is said to be "the first time in the history of Lynn that a factory attempted to work on Sunday and was prevented." The implication is that at other times factories have run on Sunday in Lynn without molestation.



At the request of the retail butchers' association in Newark, N. J., the Essex Trades Council in July declared "an official boycott upon all places that persist in keeping their shops open on Sundays. The names of the owners of the shops

were given, and the secretary of the Council was directed to send a copy to all the unions affiliated with the Essex Trades Council, with the request that every member use his influence to have friends discontinue purchasing meat or other articles of food from any butcher who refuses to close his store on Sunday." This is indicative of the circumstances that will lead organized labor, though not directly concerned, to bring its power to bear in behalf of Sunday enforcement. The labor unions and trades councils will feel that it is their duty to aid the clerks and others in securing strict Sunday closing.



According to a dispatch a quarrel and fight "over the question of threshing on Sunday" took place on a farm near Kokomo, Ind., on August 17. It seems that half the threshing crew "wanted to run the machines on Sunday and the other half objected." Fists, forks and clubs were used, and three men were badly injured. The dispatch says "the 'sacred Sabbath' faction won the fight." This certainly sounds peculiar, to say the least, but after all there is not much difference between the method by which "the 'sacred Sabbath' faction" won its fight in this case and the method that is so commonly employed throughout the country by ministers and others in behalf of "Sabbath" observance, and which gives rise to the items in these columns. In the matter of Sabbath observance there is no difference in principle between an appeal to law and courts and an appeal to fists and clubs.



Three ball players were recently arrested at Little Falls, N. Y., for "violating the Sunday law." They were practising on a ball ground just preceding a game, which was played through as soon as the arrested players had had a preliminary hearing. When the trial took

place they were discharged by the police justice on the ground that they had not "wilfully, wrongfully and maliciously desecrated the Sabbath," as charged in the complaint. The ministers of the place were the originators of the crusade against Sunday ball playing.



Eight storekeepers and shopmen of Pittston, Pa., were arraigned before the mayor of that city on August 4 on the charge of having "violated the regulation in regard to the selling of their wares on Sunday." After considering the matter the mayor discharged them "with a reprimand for having broken the law, and the warning that they were not to offend again."



Some stir was created recently in the village of Oyster Bay, L. I., the summer home of President Roosevelt, by the innovation upon the custom of the village of opening the postoffice for an hour or two on Sunday for the distribution of mail. This was done in obedience to a special order from the Post-office Department, which had acted in response to requests from citizens of the place. Rev. Alexander G. Russell, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, preached a special sermon regarding the matter, in which he "denounced the movement for Sunday mails as an innovation which could work only harm, asserting that the opening of the postoffice on Sunday was unnecessary and a baleful desecration of the Sabbath." A dispatch stated that "Rev. Mr. Russell, being president of the Oyster Bay Law and Order League, takes a peculiar interest in Sabbath desecration." Yes, evidently in those forms of "desecration" that are especially harmless, as is characteristic with most "law and order" league representatives, for the dispatch continued: "The fact that all the saloons in the village are wide

open every Sunday, doing as much business as they do any other day in the week, evidently has escaped the observation of the president of the Law and Order League, whose conscience is disturbed so seriously by the delivery of mail on Sunday."



By request the Sun Prairie (Wis.) *Countryman* and other papers in that locality have reprinted from the Revised Statutes of that State the principal sections of the statute "pertaining to Sunday observance." The statute prohibits any person from opening his shop, warehouse, or workhouse, from doing any manner of labor, business, or work, "except only works of necessity and charity," from being present at "any dancing, public diversion, show, or entertainment," and from taking part in "any sport, game, or play, on the first day of the week," under penalty of a fine not exceeding \$10. Any person who "conscientiously believes that the seventh or any other day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath," and who "actually refrains from secular business and labor on that day, may perform secular business and labor on the first day of the week," provided he does not thereby "wilfully disturb some other person or some religious assembly." The selling, giving away, or bartering of intoxicating liquors "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is prohibited under penalty of a fine of from \$5 to \$25. Although this Wisconsin statute is not as stringent and severe as some Sunday statutes, it is a good specimen of the average Sunday law. While it makes no mention of the "Lord's Day," it nevertheless plainly displays the religious character that is inseparable from such legislation.



The Sunday Observance League, or-

ganized in Chillicothe, Ohio, early in July, continues to create considerable stir in that city in pursuing its object, which is "the enforcement of laws against Sunday desecration." It seems to have given most of its attention to baseball players, although it has had a number of saloon-keepers fined, and has threatened the arrest of all persons who engage in common labor on Sunday or who offer for sale on that day ice-cream, cigars, clothing, meat, confectionery, etc. Ten ball players, against whom the league had entered complaints, were allowed by a justice recently to make a voluntary plea of guilty without being placed under arrest, and the complaints were dismissed on payment of one dollar and costs each by the players. The league didn't like this at all, claiming that it indicated "collusion of court with culprit," and through its attorney, Judge Bitzer, has filed new complaints against the ten players. Affidavits have also been sworn out against the members of two other ball teams that have played in Chillicothe during the summer. These teams "have now been disbanded, and the players are scattered all over the United States, some being as far South as Memphis and New Orleans," but at last accounts the league was seriously considering the matter of having them brought back to stand trial. The sheriff of the county has expressed himself as perfectly willing to go after them if the league desires, for although "it will require hard work to find the twenty men," he is of the opinion that "under the law he has no other alternative."



Rev. H. W. Knowles, pastor of Grace Methodist Church, Duluth, Minn., and chaplain of the lower house of the Minnesota legislature, who has been conducting a Sunday-enforcement crusade in Duluth all summer, is now enlarging the

field of his operations in this respect. He has "inaugurated a movement having for its purpose the suppression of crime and the enforcement of Sunday laws throughout the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin. He has asked the support of Catholic as well as Protestant clergymen in the work, and declares that there is already the greatest enthusiasm over the venture." He is quoted as saying:

There is great need of better enforcement of the laws in municipal life throughout the two States. The association will seek, among other things, to put a stop to all professional baseball and open saloons on the Sabbath day. We have received much encouragement in our work, and before long hope to have a membership embracing not only most of the clergymen of Wisconsin and Minnesota, but a large number of law-abiding citizens who believe in decency and good order and who are opposed to the corrupting influences which now mark the Lord's day.

The *Minneapolis Journal* says that "a voluntary organization for the suppression of crime that will stimulate the conscience, brighten the vision, and uphold the hands of officers responsible for the enforcement of law, may have a salutary effect in any community," but that "when it comes to the enforcement of Sunday laws Mr. Knowles' organization should proceed very carefully. It should concentrate its efforts on those laws that are supported by public opinion, and waste no time and strength on laws that, however good, are vetoed by public opinion and cannot, therefore, ever be effectually enforced." But it is evident that it is exactly for the purpose of enforcing the Sunday laws that this organization is being formed, and that it will practically have no other object. Anything that is not tainted with "Sabbath desecration" will be no crime to it. It will simply be one more organization of larger importance added to those already devoted to the work of Sunday enforcement.

The Bangor (Me.) *Daily News*, of August 4, reported "troublesome times" at Northport, due to the opposition of the Northport Methodist Camp Ground Association to Sunday excursions, particularly to the landing of passengers on Sunday at the wharf which extends from the property of the association. On August 3 a steamer drew near the wharf desiring to land a few passengers, some of whom desired to attend the services on the camp ground. The superintendent of the grounds appeared on the wharf and ordered the captain not to tie up at the wharf. Just as preparations were being made for taking the passengers off in boats, the captain of another boat that was tied up at the wharf came down from shore to go on board. Finding the wharf gate locked, he ordered it opened, and on being positively refused by the superintendent, who was standing guard at the gate, he obtained an ax and broke it open. At this a crowd that had been watching the proceedings rushed upon the wharf and called to the captain who had been refused a landing to come alongside, which he did at once. It is said that the affair constituted the one subject of discussion on the grounds the remainder of the day, the question being uppermost as to what step the trustees would take next. It was given out that they would "ascertain exactly what their rights are and protect them." It seems that by a special law enacted in 1891 the association is permitted to close its wharf to boats on Sundays. But lawyers who have expressed an opinion regard the law as scarcely valid, inasmuch as it contravenes the uniform decision of the courts that in such cases a wharf, although extending from private property, becomes to all effects and purposes a public wharf, and that there can be no discrimination as to who shall land at it so long as there is room and reasonable wharf-

age is paid. Later the gate on the wharf was repaired, and the declaration has gone forth that "it would take a battering ram to break through now."



The injunction seems to be coming into use now as a method of Sunday enforcement. On August 16 the ministers of Muscatine, Iowa, secured an injunction, which was to the intent that "no racing whatever take place on the Sabbath day." The injunction was served on certain members of the Elk's lodge, who it was thought were intending to have a horse race in the city on the following day. The race did not come off. Another injunction was issued at Laverne, Minn., on August 9, by Judge P. E. Brown of the 13th judicial district

Abraham Jaycox, plaintiff, vs. Daniel Brownell, C. A. Reynolds and John Huntington. State of Minnesota to the above named defendants, their agents, servants and employes:

Whereas, the plaintiff, Abraham Jaycox, has filed his petition in the district court of Rock County, petitioning among other things that you be restrained and enjoined from in any manner, directly or indirectly, engaging or assisting, conducting or managing any public game of ball on Sunday, August 10, 1902, or upon any other Sabbath day, upon the sw $\frac{1}{4}$  of the nw $\frac{1}{4}$  of section 12, township 105, range 45 west, in said county, and from advertising any such game, or inviting the public to attend or assemble on any Sunday at said place to witness such game, and for other relief; and

Whereas, the said injunction has been ordered and allowed by the Honorable P. E. Brown, judge of said district court, on the filing of the bond duly approved, which has been done;

Now, therefore, you and each of you, the said Daniel Brownell, C. A. Reynolds and John Huntington, their agents, servants and employes, are hereby commanded and enjoined, until the further order of the court, from in any manner, directly or indirectly, engaging in or assisting, conducting or managing any public game of ball on Sunday, August 10, 1902, or upon any other Sabbath day, upon the



above described premises, and from advertising any such game, or inviting the public to attend or assemble at any such time and at said place. And this injunction you will observe under the penalty of the law until the further order of this court.

One of the persons enjoined here was the manager of the local ball team and the other two were the lessees of the Luverne driving park, where the ball grounds were located. In his complaint Mr. Jaycox alleged to the court that he resided on land adjacent to the ball grounds in the driving park; that Mr. Brownell "is the proprietor and manager of certain companies of men organized for playing baseball," and that "during the last two months, with the consent of his co-defendants, the lessees of the grounds, he has conducted games of baseball on various Sabbath days on the grounds described in this complaint;" that "during said time large numbers of persons have been in the habit of assembling to witness said games of ball," and that while so assembled "they have engaged in loud, boisterous and disorderly conduct, creating great noises and disturbances within the hearing of the plaintiff and his family at their place of residence, thereby disturbing their quiet and repose, and interfering with their rest on the Sabbath, causing the plaintiff and his family great annoyance and disturbance, to the plaintiff's damage in the sum of \$100; that by reason of said noises and confusion so created said games became and were a public nuisance, and if continued will greatly diminish the value of the plaintiff's dwelling," etc., etc. The persons enjoined replied at length to the allegations of the complainant, among other things denying "specifically that the premises of the said Abraham Jaycox are adjacent to the grounds on which games of baseball

have been played on Sundays," and alleging that "there is a quarter section of land lying between, and that it is almost three-fourths of a mile in a direct line, and more than half a mile, from the dwelling of the said Abraham Jaycox, and that it is physically impossible for the plaintiff to be damaged, in any way whatever, by the ball games complained of; that the ball grounds are one-quarter of a mile from the main traveled road; that they are surrounded on all sides by trees and hedges, and are in one of the most secluded places in the township of Luverne." The injunction was dissolved after about four weeks time. It is said that the object of the injunction was not so much to abate a nuisance as to raise a case that would cause "the validity of the law in relation to Sunday baseball games" to be passed upon, and in that way to give a new impetus to the enforcement of the Sunday law. But so far the plan has not worked very well, for by a ruse on the part of the owners of the ball grounds and the ball players the games proceeded during the time that the injunction was in effect, and unless this causes the matter to be brought into court again, very little will have been accomplished in the interests of Sunday enforcement.



The Coach Drivers' Union, of Trenton, N. J., has now placed Sunday weddings and christenings under the ban with Sunday funerals, and will not drive on Sundays for any of these functions. The undertakers, liverymen and ministers of Waterloo, Iowa, have also declared against Sunday funerals, and will act in combination to abolish them. "The liverymen do it from a mercenary standpoint, and the undertakers and ministers from the standpoint of needed rest."

# 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.

The Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C., is very desirous of securing complete volumes of THE SENTINEL for the Congressional Library. He lacks Vols. 1 to 12 inclusive. We are unable to supply them. If any of our readers can supply one or more of these volumes, and is willing to donate them for this purpose, we know that they will be appreciated, and believe that they will do much good. Any one who can furnish any of the above should write us before forwarding any papers.

Recently THE SENTINEL has received several letters to which the writers omitted signing their names. If the party in Whitehall, Ill., who wrote us the latter part of August, will send us his or her name, we will be pleased to reply to the letter. Some one in Washington, D. C., sent us a subscription and remit-

tance for THE SENTINEL, but as no name was signed we cannot fill the order. This letter was mailed from Station "C," Washington, D. C. The post-mark on another envelope, which contained a remittance, is so indistinct that we cannot tell from what place, or even what State it came. It looks as though the name of the place might begin with "St." This letter was mailed Aug. 21, 4 P. M. If the writers of the above letters see this notice, please let us hear from you at once.

### TO FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS

Please notice the date of expiration of your subscription, which appears each month on your wrapper. If it has expired, or will expire within a month, renewal should be made at once, as unrenewed subscriptions will be cut off from the list.

The October *Life Boat* is to be a "Special Home and Social Purity" number. There are many wretched and many unhappy homes in the land, and it is the aim of this special number to teach its readers how to make better homes. A number of prominent writers have contributed to this number, among whom are Dr. Mary Wood-Allen, Dr. J. H. Kellogg, Mrs. J. H. Kellogg, A. T. Jones, Mrs. W. S. Sadler, and others.

If you know of a home in your community which would be helped by a copy of this issue send the publishers a two-cent stamp and they will mail a copy direct to the person you name.

Address, *The Life Boat*, 28 33rd Place, Chicago, Ill.

I receive more instruction from THE SENTINEL than from any one of the papers I am receiving either monthly or weekly.

L. F. STARR.

### THE GOOD HEALTH BATH CABINET.



Agents wanted.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

# Religious Liberty Leaflets

Many of the following list are most excellent for use at the present time. Quite a number are already *out of print*, and these will not be reprinted when the present stock is exhausted. While they last we offer them at the rate of

**1,000 PAGES ASSORTED FOR 50 CENTS**

ORDER BY NUMBER

- | No. |  | No. |  |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| 1.  | Due Process of Law and the Divine Right of Dissent. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages.   | 18. | Christ and the Pharisees; or Christ's Faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping. 40 pages.   |
| 2.  | Religious Intolerance in the Republic. 16 pages.   | 22. | Legal Sunday, The; Its History and Character. 252 pages.                           |
| 3.  | Church and State. By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages.  | 25. | The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. 16 pages.                    |
| 4.  | The National Sunday Law. 192 pages.  | 26. | The Puritan Sabbath for Physical Rest. 12 pages.                                   |
| 5.  | Sunday Laws in the United States. By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages.  | 27. | Religious Persecution; or the Blue Laws Revived. 60 pages.                         |
| 6.  | The Captivity of the Republic. 128 pages.  | 29. | Papacy and Prophecy; or the Sovereign Pontiff and the Church of Rome. 32 pages.    |
| 7.  | Appeal and Remonstrance. 24 pages.   | 30. | Papacy and Persecution, or Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute? 16 pages. |
| 8.  | Appeal from the U. S. Supreme Court Decision Making This a "Christian Nation." A protest. By A. T. Jones, editor American Sentinel, New York City. 86 pages. | 31. | The Duty of Civil Rulers.  |
| 10. | Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question. 20 pages.   | 32. | Rights of the People.  |
| 11. | The "Civil Sabbath;" or Disguised Religious Legislation. 12 pages.   | 33. | The Relation of the State and Church.  |
| 12. | The Columbian Year, and the Meaning of the Four Centuries. 44 pages.   | 35. | Is it Persecution?   |
| 13. | The Limits of Civil Authority, from the standpoint of natural rights and divine obligation. 12 pages.  | 36. | Church and State.  |
| 15. | Rome's Challenge: Why Do Protestants Keep Sunday? 40 pages.  | 37. | Our Answer. Revised.   |
| 16. | Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather Than Keep Sunday? 12 pages.   | 38. | Civil Grounds of Religious Intolerance.  |
|     |  | 41. | Fighting Against God. Illustrated.   |
|     |  | 42. | How Shall We Reform Society?   |
|     |  | 46. | Baptist Principles of Religious Liberty.   |
|     |  | 48. | The Power of His Coming.   |
|     |  | 49. | Christian Citizenship.   |
|     |  | 50. | Functions of the Church.   |
|     |  | 51. | Shall Christ and Caesar Yoke Together?   |

... ADDRESS ...

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.**

11 West 20th Street

New York City

# 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.

# BIBLE TRACTS.

The abbreviation B.S.L. is for BIBLE STUDENTS' LIBRARY; A.G.L. for APPLES OF GOLD LIBRARY, and W. of T. for WORDS OF TRUTH SERIES. Order by number. The tracts marked thus "\*" may be enclosed in an envelope with regular correspondence without folding.

## SIGNS OF OUR TIMES.

Great Day of the Lord, B.S.L. No. 65.....	2½c
God's Message for To-day, B.S.L. No. 81.....	½c
Truth for the Times, B.S.L. No. 143.....	1c
Eastern Question, B.S.L. No. 144.....	1c
Wonders of the 19th Century, B.S.L. No. 155.....	2c
*Heralds of His Coming, A.G.L. No. 51.....	1½c
*The Coming of Our Lord, A.G.L. No. 40.....	½c

## NATURE OF MAN.

Tormented Forever and Ever, B.S.L. No. 111.....	1c
Rich Man and Lazarus, B.S.L. No. 146.....	1c
Immortality of the Soul, B.S.L. No. 70.....	2c
Is Man Immortal, B.S.L. No. 51.....	½c
*Jesus and the Resurrection, A.G.L. No. 42.....	½c

## MILLENNIUM.

Temporal Millennium, B.S.L. No. 127.....	1½c
The Millennial Age, B.S.L. No. 136.....	1c
*Winning of Margaret, A.G.L. No. 53.....	1c
The Kingdom of Christ, B.S.L. No. 119.....	1c
Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, B.S.L. No. 127.....	1c

## THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

God's Message for To-day, B.S.L. No. 81.....	½c
*The Great Threfold Message, A.G.L. No. 47.....	1c

## THE SABBATH.

Elihu on the Sabbath, B.S.L. No. 42.....	1c
Which Day Do You Keep, B.S.L. No. 48.....	½c
Who Changed the Sabbath, B.S.L. No. 107.....	1½c
Identical Seventh Day, B.S.L. No. 114.....	1c
New Testament Sabbath, B.S.L. No. 137.....	1c
*The Seventh or One-Seventh, A.G.L. No. 39.....	½c
*Historical Facts and Incidents, A.G.L. No. 45.....	2c
How the Sabbath Came to Me, W. of T. No. 2.....	1½c
*Personal Questions and Answers, W. of T. No. 7.....	1½c
*What History Says Concerning the Change, A.G.L. No. 70.....	½c

## TEMPERANCE.

*There Is Help in God, A.G.L. No. 56.....	½c
*The Name, A.G.L. No. 72.....	1c
*A Chat with My Tobacco-Loving Brother, A.G.L. No. 67.....	½c
*Food: Its Mental and Moral Value, A.G.L. No. 68.....	½c

One each of the above will be sent postpaid for 30 cents. Most valuable treatises on important topics.

— ADDRESS —

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

**\$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.**



# 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 Sep-  
tember, 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 Sep-  
tember, 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 Sep-  
tember, 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 Sep-  
tember, October, November and December issues of  
1902 to

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



## HISTORY THAT IS TO BE AND IS BEING REPEATED

ROME, in its different phases, occupies the largest place of any national name in history." And AS A REPUBLIC Rome occupies a place and has an importance in history beyond that of any other republic ancient or modern.

From a republic Rome passed into an empire; from a government which "in form was in strictness that of a moderate democracy," in which "the senate and the offices of state were in law open to all," and in which "the will of the people in the comitia was supreme alike in the election of magistrates, in the passing of laws, and in all matters touching the 'caput' of a Roman citizen,"\* Rome was transformed into "an imperial tyranny supported by a military despotism," in which all the powers of the state were centered in one man whose will thus became the law of the entire Roman world.

This great change was not wrought by invasion and conquest from without, nor by a great revolutionary upheaval within. "The causes, both internal and external, which brought about its [the republican constitutional government's] fall HAD BEEN SILENTLY AT WORK THROUGHOUT." "Before the Republic fell, Roman society was already in structure, temper, and mind thoroughly unrepublican."

Though it is a most important part of the history, there is not space here to dwell upon the increase of wealth and the spread of luxury, upon the depravity and corruption of manners that ensued, and all the things by which the native self-restraint of the individual Roman was destroyed and he was robbed of that faculty which had been the peculiar honor and glory of the early citizens of the Republic. It is rather to the effect of this decay of individual integrity upon the political structure of the Romans—upon the Republic—that brief mention is to be made here.

The constitution of the Roman Republic (this constitution was not written, but was a system of rules and precedents established by long usage) rested, as the constitution of every real republic must rest, upon the assumption that the great body of the citizens would AS INDIVIDUALS GOVERN THEMSELVES, and each respect and guard the rights of others with the same jealousy as he did his own. The great body of the Romans gradually ceased to govern themselves and to respect the rights of others. They came to care only for their own selfish selves, for the gratification of their own selfish desires—and of course the constitution failed and the Republic fell. Failing to govern themselves, the Romans had to be governed; and since the constitution and the Republic were consistent only with, and could endure only by virtue of the fact of, their GOVERNING THEMSELVES, this power that was to GOVERN THEM and maintain some sort of order had to set aside the constitution and at last to completely overthrow the Republic.

Though they probably little realized it, the first great wrench which the Romans gave their constitution was the EXTENSION OF DOMINION OVER ALIEN PEOPLES WHOM THEY REFUSED TO ADMIT AS CITIZENS OF THE REPUBLIC. They probably believed, and perhaps with some reason, that these people could not be given the privileges and rights of citizenship without endangering Roman institutions, but they were willing to run the risk of holding them as subjects. THIS WAS FATAL TO THE REPUBLIC, not only because IT WAS IN VIOLATION OF THE VERY GENIUS OF REPUBLICANISM,

[Continued on page 764

\* Nearly all the quotations in this matter are from that portion of the article "Rome" in the "Encyclopedia Britannica" headed, "Period III: The Period of the Revolution (146-49 B. C.)."