

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. 17

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1902

No. 12

The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

III

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.

AFTER the death of Pope John XXII., in 1334, when the cardinals entered into conclave for the election of a new pope, there were the same difficulties as formerly in reaching an election, for they would not, if they could avoid it, elect as pope a man who would not remain in Avignon. There was a general agreement in favor of one of the number; but they required a promise that he would continue to reign in Avignon, to which he replied: "I would sooner yield up the cardinalate than accept the pope-dom on such conditions." This destroyed all his chances; and, in playing against time, each thought to throw away his vote by casting it for one whom no one would ever expect could be chosen pope. But, as it happened, in thus seeking to throw away their votes, enough of them threw their votes to the same man

to elect one who, when to the surprise of all it was discovered, exclaimed: "You have chosen an ass!" He took the name of Pope Benedict XII. (Dec. 20, 1334, to April 25, 1342). He immediately dismissed a vast number of hangers-on at the papal palace, and declared that he found great difficulty in finding ecclesiastics who were worthy to be appointed to vacancies. He bestowed upon the cardinals one hundred thousand florins (\$242,000) of the many millions left in the treasury by John XXII. Also from the treasures he began the building of a magnificent palace.

The king of France and the emperor Louis were under excommunication, from Benedict's predecessors, and not only the sovereigns, but the imperial diet, sought earnestly, by humiliating concessions, to have Benedict XII. to release them. But

the pope delayed so long that the sovereigns and the nobles grew weary. The emperor appeared before a diet at Frankfort, and complained of the obduracy of the pope. The diet declared that he had done enough to satisfy the pope, and, since it was all in vain, they pronounced null and void the excommunications and all the other papal proceedings in the case. And, at a diet at Rhense, July 16, 1337, at which all but one of the electors were present, the imperial office was declared independent of the Papacy.

"They solemnly agreed that the Holy Roman Empire, and they, the prince-electors, had been assailed, limited, and aggrieved in their honors, rights, customs, and liberties; that they would maintain, guard, assert those rights against all and every one without exception; that no one would obtain dispensation, absolution, relaxation, abolition of his own vow; that he should be, and was declared to be, faithless and traitorous before God and man, who should not maintain all this against any opponent whatsoever." August 8 following, a diet, held again at Frankfort, "passed as a fundamental law of the empire a declaration that the imperial dignity and power are from God alone; that an emperor elected by the concordant suffrage, or a majority of the electoral suffrages, has plenary imperial power, and does not need the approbation, confirmation, or authority of the pope, or the Apostolic See, or any other."

In response to this Benedict declared the throne vacant, and named himself as protector of the empire. But death prevented him from any further aggression. An epitaph describes him as "a Nero, death to the laity, a viper to the clergy, without truth, a mere cup of wine." To the customary vices of the popes of the times, he added that of drunkenness to such a degree that his example gave rise to the proverb, "As drunk as a pope."

He was succeeded by Clement VI. (May 7, 1342, to Dec. 6, 1352).

THE PAPAL COURT A PLACE OF WEALTH,
SPLENDOR, LUXURY, AND COR-
RUPTION

What little check had been put upon the hangers-on at the palace by Benedict XII. was more than swept away by Clement VI. He actually published a letter giving notice that "all poor clergy who would present themselves at Avignon within two months, should partake of his bounty." An eye-witness declares that a hundred thousand greedy applicants crowded the streets of Avignon. "If Clement acted up to his maxim, that no one ought to depart unsatisfied from the palace of a prince, how vast and inexhaustible must have been the wealth and preferment at the disposal of the pope!" Where Benedict XII. hesitated to fill ecclesiastical vacancies because of the dearth of those worthy to fill them, Clement VI. not only filled all the vacancies that could be found, but a great number of bishoprics and abbasies he *declared* vacant in order that he might fill them. This was for revenue, because every appointment to a vacancy brought a considerable sum of money, according to the dignity and wealth of the position. When it was objected that no former pope had assumed this power, he merely answered: "They knew not how to act as pope."

"If Clement was indulgent to others, he was not less so to himself. The court at Avignon became the most splendid, perhaps the gayest, in Christendom. The Provençals might almost think their brilliant and chivalrous counts restored to power and enjoyment. The papal palace spread out in extent and magnificence. The young art of painting was fostered by the encouragement of Italian artists. The pope was more than royal in the

number and attire of his retainers. The papal stud of horses commanded general admiration. The life of Clement was a constant succession of ecclesiastical pomps and gorgeous receptions and luxurious banquets. Ladies were admitted freely to the court, the pope mingled with ease in the gallant intercourse. If John XXII., and even the more rigid Benedict, did not escape the imputation of unclerical license, Clement VI., who affected no disguise in his social hours, would hardly be supposed superior to the common freedom of the ecclesiastics of his day. The Countess of Turenne, if not, as general report averred, actually so, had at least many of the advantages of the pope's mistress—the distribution of preferments and benefices to any extent, which this woman, as rapacious as she was handsome and imperious, sold with shameless publicity.—*Milman*. Petrarch declared that Avignon was one vast brothel.

ANOTHER SKILLFUL TURN PRODUCES "INCALCULABLE WEALTH"

Pope Clement VI. took yet another turn to increase the revenues of the Papacy. Boniface VIII. had established the jubilee, to be celebrated each hundredth year, with complete indulgence to all who would make the pilgrimage to Rome. The result of the jubilee appointed by Boniface was such that a writer who was present said: "I can bear witness to it, since I dwelt in that city: by day and by night, there were two clerks at the altar of St. Paul, with rakes in their hands to rake up the gold which the faithful unceasingly threw down there. Boniface amassed an immense treasure from these donations, and the Romans were enriched by selling their wares, at excessive prices, to the simple people who came to obtain indulgences and empty their purses."—*De Cormenin*.

And now the people of Rome were more urgently than ever pressing the pope to remove his court to that city. They sent an embassy "to offer the pope, in the name of their fellow-citizens, the posts of first senator and captain of the city, provided he would return to Rome, and reduce the interval of the jubilees from one hundred to fifty years, in order to multiply the causes of the prosperity of Italy, and increase the imposts of the holy city. Clement accepted the dignities and magistracies which were offered to him, and assured the ambassadors that he had the re-establishing of the Holy See much at heart, and that he would engage to do it as soon as possible. As a proof of the sincerity of his word, he fixed the period of the new jubilee for the year 1350. The following was the bull published on the occasion:

The Son of God, by expiring on the cross, my brethren, has acquired for us a treasure of indulgences, which is increased by the infinite merits of the holy Virgin, the martyrs, and the saints; for you know that the dispensation of these riches belongs to the successors of St. Peter. Boniface the Eighth has already ordered the faithful to make a pilgrimage to the churches of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and his bull grants entire absolution of sin to those who make this journey at the commencement of each century. We, however, consider that in the Mosaic law, which Jesus Christ came to accomplish spiritually, the fiftieth year is that of jubilee or the remission of debts. For this reason, then, on account of the short duration of human life, and that the greatest number of Christians may participate in this indulgence, we grant full and entire absolution to those who shall visit the churches of the two apostles, and that of St. John of the Lateran, in the year 1350, during thirty days, if Romans, and during five months, if strangers.—*Id.*

Clement lived to see this jubilee that he had appointed, and to enjoy the rich returns that came to the papal treasury. "Annibal Cecano placed his soldiers around the church of St. John of the Lat-

eran; and at the end of the year he left Rome followed by fifty wagons loaded with gold and silver, which he conducted to the holy father under the charge of a good escort. Clement himself had not remained inactive. He had sold a goodly number of dispensations to kings, princes, and lords who could not go to Rome; and they counted that the jubilee produced incalculable wealth to the court at Avignon."—*Id.*

PAPAL FURY FULMINATED AGAINST TWO RULERS

Benedict XII. had failed to raise the excommunication from Emperor Louis. The emperor besought Clement VI. so earnestly to release him, and the pope held off so long, that, at last, he offered to allow the pope himself to dictate the terms of his release. This, of course, the pope willingly did; and, amongst the terms, he stipulated that the emperor should never issue any ordinance "as emperor or king of the Romans, without special permission of the Roman See; and that he would supplicate the pope, after absolution, to grant him the administration of the empire; and that he would make the states of the empire swear by word and by writing to stand by the Church." Even to these terms the emperor agreed. But the nobles of the empire denounced him for it. They also protested to the pope, and began to say that an emperor who had so debased the imperial office ought to be compelled to abdicate.

Yet, even after the emperor had done all this, under the plea that the emperor had not fulfilled the treaty with becoming promptness, Clement VI. issued the following bull, "which in the vigor and fury of its curses transcended all that had yet, in the wildest times, issued from the Roman See":

We humbly implore the divine power to con-

fer the madness and crush the pride of the aforesaid Louis, to cast him down by the might of the Lord's right hand, to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, and those that persecute him. Let the unforeseen snare fall upon him! Be he accursed in his going out and his coming in! The Lord strike him with madness, and blindness, and fury! May the heavens rain lightning upon him! May the wrath of Almighty God, and of the blessed apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, turn against him in this world and in the world to come! May the whole world war upon him! May the earth open and swallow him up quick! May his name be blotted out in his own generation; his memory perish from the earth! May the elements be against him; his dwelling be desolate! The merits of all the saints at rest confound him and execute vengeance on him in this life! Be his sons cast forth from their homes and be delivered before his eyes into the hands of his enemies.—*Id.*

In 1347 Rienzi roused Rome to the establishment of a new republic, with Rienzi himself as great tribune. Clement VI. condemned Rienzi and his whole proceedings, denounced him "under all those terrific appellations, perpetually thundered out by popes against their enemies. He was 'a Belshazzar, the wild ass in Job, a Lucifer, a forerunner of antichrist, a man of sin, son of perdition, a son of the devil, full of fraud and falsehood, and like the beast in the Revelation over whose head was written, Blasphemy.' He had insulted the holy Catholic Church by declaring that the church and state of Rome were one."—*Milman.*

PRELITICAL CORRUPTION EXCITES EVEN THE DENUNCIATION OF A POPE

In the year of 1348 the black plague swept over Europe, and caused multitudes to perish. The clergy had neglected the attentions due to the suffering, the dying, and the dead; and the friars everywhere had administered those offices. This everywhere turned the gratitude of the people to the friars, and brought to the friars vast numbers of gifts in wills

and offerings. "Cardinals, many bishops, a multitude of the secular clergy, thronged to Avignon. They demanded the suppression of the mendicants. By what authority did they preach, hear confessions, intercept the alms of the faithful, even the burial dues of their flocks? The consistory sat, not one was present who dared to lift his voice in favor of the friars. The pope arose. . . . He defended them with imposing eloquence against their adversaries. At the close of his speech he turned to the prelates," and thus addressed them:

And if the friars were not to preach to the people, what would ye preach? Humility? you, the proudest, the most disdainful, the most magnificent among all the estates of men, who ride abroad in procession on your stately palfreys! Poverty? ye who are so greedy, so obstinate in the pursuit of gain, that all the prebends and benefices of the world will not satiate your avidity! Chastity? of this I say nothing! God knows your lives, how your bodies are pampered with pleasures. If you hate the begging friars, and close your doors against them, it is that they may not see your lives; you had rather waste your wealth on panders and ruffians than on mendicants. Be not surprised that the friars receive bequests made in the time of fatal mortality, they who took the charge of parishes deserted by their pastors, out of which they drew converts to their houses of prayer, houses of prayer and of honor to the Church, not seats of voluptuousness and luxury.—*Id.*

THE CHOOSING OF ONE "SUCCESSOR OF SAINT PETER"

At the death of Clement the cardinals met in their solemn conclave. They first unanimously enacted a law for themselves, ordaining that the pope should create no cardinal till the number of cardinals was as low as sixteen, and then could not increase the number beyond twenty; that he must not nominate cardinals without the consent of the whole college of the cardinals, or, in extremity, at least two-thirds; that likewise,

without their consent, he could neither depose a cardinal, nor put one under arrest, nor seize nor confiscate their property; and that the college of cardinals were to have one-half of the total revenues of the Papacy. All solemnly swore to obey the law which they had made to bind themselves; some with the reservation, "if it be according to law."

A proposal was made to elect a certain one of their number, but another of the number warned them that if that man were made pope, the "noble horses of the cardinals" would "in a few days be reduced to draw wagons, or to toil before the plow." This dire consideration put an end to that cardinal's candidacy. The choice finally fell upon the bishop of Clermont, who took the name of Pope Innocent VI. (Dec. 18, 1352, to Sept. 12, 1357). His very first act as pope was to release himself from his oath to observe the statute that he with the other cardinals had framed, and then to declare that statute void and illegal from the beginning.

A BOLD GERMAN PROTESTS AGAINST "PONTIFICAL DESPOTISM"

He tried to stir up a crusade to help the emperor of the East to defend Constantinople against the Turks. But the only monarch who received his call with any favor was Charles of Germany; but even he was prevented from rendering any aid by the protest of his chancellor, Conrad of Alezia, who called upon him to "recollect that the popes have always regarded Germany as an inexhaustible mine of gold, and that they have their hands constantly extended toward us to despoil us. Do we not send enough money to Avignon for the instruction of our children and the purchase of benefices? Do we not furnish every year sufficiently large sums for the confirmation of bishops, the impetration of benefices,

the pursuit of processes and appeals; for dispensations, absolutions, indulgences, privileges; and, finally, for all the simoniacal inventions of the Holy See? Lo, the pope demands still a new subsidy. What does he offer us in exchange for our

gold?—Inefficacious blessings, anathemas, wars, and a disgraceful servitude. Arrest, prince, the course of this evil, and do not permit pontifical despotism to make a second Italy out of Germany.”—*Id.*



England's New Education Bill

By W. E. Cornell

EDUCATIONAL matters in Great Britain just now are in a state of ferment, and are likely to undergo some interesting experiences if the new Education Bill, recently introduced by the government, becomes law.

To those unacquainted with the situation it may be stated by way of explanation that previous to 1870 elementary education in Great Britain was left practically to private enterprise and control. In 1808 the British School Society, a non-sectarian organization, was formed, under which schools for the young were opened in various places. A few years later, spurred to action by the example and work of this society, and as a matter of self-defense, the Church of England organized what was known as the National Society to look after the educational interests of the young within its sphere of influence. Previous to this the established church had quite ignored elementary education.

Both societies combined, however, though receiving annual grants from the government for building school-houses, training teachers, and maintaining their schools, failed to meet the educational requirements of the country. After a time it became evident that the care of elementary education ought not to be left wholly to voluntary agencies. Accordingly, in 1870, a Liberal government,

with Mr. Gladstone at its head, passed the Forster Act, which provided for the existence of school boards to open, superintend, and maintain schools, public and non-sectarian in character, in communities where the voluntary system failed to meet the educational needs.

But the passing of this act did not do away with the voluntary schools. The Church of England was unwilling to turn over its schools to the new school boards. It proposed, upon condition that the grants from the national treasury were continued and it were left in control of its schools, to raise by private subscriptions the difference between the government grants and the total cost of maintaining its church schools. This arrangement was agreed to.

As a result of the act of 1870, therefore, there have been for the past thirty years and more two sets of schools in England, "voluntary schools" and "board schools"; one sectarian, the other non-sectarian; one private, the other public; one controlled by the church, the other by the state through local boards.

But the Church of England failed to keep its promise as to subscriptions, and on the whole has been hostile both to the school boards and to the school-board system. While unwilling to give up the management of its schools to the educational system provided by the state, and

although assisted financially as it has been by the government, it has for nearly a score of years continually complained of the burden of its schools. And its complaints and appeals for more help have not been without avail. In 1897 a law was passed giving denominational schools an annual grant from the imperial exchequer of \$1.43 per child in the city schools and 81 cents per child in the country schools. Thus a considerable proportion of the cost of maintaining the voluntary or denominational schools has of late been assumed and borne by the government.

But this increase in the government grant did not long satisfy the church. It was hardly in possession of it before it began a new and persistent agitation of the question, the direct outcome of which is the new Education Bill recently introduced into Parliament at the request of the Anglican Church, and especially, it is understood, of the "high church" wing of that body. The grants were inadequate to the needs of the situation. The church's end of the load was still too heavy for it to carry. Notwithstanding the assistance already provided by the government, many of the denominational schools would have to be abandoned unless the expense of maintaining them could be laid upon the ratepayers.

The latest claim of the church, therefore, as exhibited in this Education Bill, is that the entire cost of maintaining its schools shall be a public charge, and that in return for providing school-houses and keeping them in repair it shall be left in control of its schools, and continue to appoint their teaching staffs as heretofore.

All these claims are conceded in the new Education Bill. Henceforward, if this measure becomes law, as seems very likely, the church schools will be sup-

ported by government grants and taxes levied by the municipal councils upon ratepayers of all classes. The government will provide part of the funds, but the main cost of the schools will be assessed to the ratepayers. The principle upon which the bill is based is that the church should educate the children and the nation should pay all expenses.

The bill is so framed that the managers representing the church shall always be in a majority of the municipal committees controlling these church schools, the county or town council which provides most of the funds having power to elect only one-third of the members of such committees. These committees are empowered to elect teachers on theological grounds, provided they are not disqualified by an utter lack of educational attainments, thus leaving the appointment of the teachers in the hands of the church, as already stated. This is one of the chief grounds of the opposition to the bill; for while the salaries of the teachers in these schools are to come entirely out of public funds, there is to be no effective control over their appointment by any body representing the taxpayers, and yet, as in the past, none but communicating members of the Church of England will be appointed to the staffs of these church schools. This arrangement will put not only large sums of money, but a large number of government-paid and therefore civil servants under the control of the church, and exclude non-conformists from the teaching staffs of nearly two-thirds of the public elementary schools of the country.

The result of passing such a measure can only be to introduce sectarian controversies into municipal politics and to stir up religious animosities. Speaking of the working of the bill and the likelihood of its being passed, the following from the *New York Sun* of recent date

is of special interest to SENTINEL readers:

The payers of "rates," or taxes for local purposes, who, since the passage of the Forster Education Act in 1870, have had to contribute to the maintenance of the so-called board schools, which give a purely secular education, will henceforth have to contribute also to the support of denominational schools—Anglican, Wesleyan, Catholic or non-conformist—which latter schools have hitherto had to depend on voluntary subscriptions, supplemented by small annual grants from the imperial exchequer. Although the innovation is vehemently opposed by the non-conformists and by most members of the Liberal party, the government can undoubtedly carry it out if it be resolved to do so, since the normal Union majority of about 140 is strengthened by the Irish Catholics, who, notwithstanding their friendly relations with the Liberals, approve the principle of the bill. . . . It is equally certain that such a law will be a hard one to enforce, for many leading non-conformists are advocating a no-rate campaign; that is to say, they urge their co-religionists to go to jail by the hundreds and the thousands rather than pay rates for the support of schools in which theological views disapproved of by them are taught. If this plan be carried out there is likely to be such a popular convulsion in England as has not been witnessed since the Chartist disturbances.

The writer can quite appreciate the

above relative to the feeling of non-conformists, for he was present at a number of their mass-meetings while recently in England, and the speakers declared that if the bill passed they would suffer any persecution rather than submit to supporting public schools for their children which taught religious views not in accord with their belief. The Congregationalists were especially active in their opposition to the bill.

The Outlook, of New York, styles the bill "one of the most retrograde measures which the most retrograde British government of the last fifty years has submitted to Parliament." Evidently there is need of a radical reform and of far greater activity throughout the world in the matter of education, and especially of religious education, but it augurs no good, but rather a returning to the evils and doleful conditions of mediæval times, when the church asks the state to foot her educational bills. It may be seriously questioned whether the education carried on under such a system will in the end be a blessing or a curse to the world. The whole movement is evidently a backward step.



THE object for which civil government is constituted is the earthly, temporal welfare of men. The government is to promote the prosperity of the nation, and to preserve peace and order. It is to deal only with the things belonging to this earthly life, and not with the things pertaining to man's relation to God and the salvation of the soul. Of course, it is the duty of the government to protect Christians in their assemblies for worship, because they constitute a body of citizens, but the civil authorities, as such, have nothing whatever to do with

the doctrines taught in a church or with the discipline which it exercises over its members, except in cases where public morality is violated or insurrection and rebellion is fomented in the name and under the guise of religion. However heretical the teachings of a sect may be, the government has no right to persecute its adherents or to oppress them on account of their faith; it is rather in duty bound to guarantee liberty of conscience to all the citizens. On the other hand, the church and its officers, as such, have no voice in civil affairs. The pulpit is

not intended for the discussion of political questions, neither is the Bible the source from which the laws of the state are to be framed. The natural law is to

be the source of legislation, and the civil government is to shape its policy solely with an eye to the peace and prosperity of the citizens.—*F. K. in Lutheran Witness.*



The Rumanian Persecutions and the Protest Against Them

By the Editor

NOTWITHSTANDING the boasted progress of the world in enlightenment and civilization there are many chapters of present-day history that if read several hundred years hence would be very likely to impress the reader with an idea concerning the times of the closing of the nineteenth century and the opening of the twentieth much like that which the people of to-day have of the Dark Ages with their cruelties and persecutions. One of these chapters, and there are many, as we have said, is the shameful oppression that has long been inflicted upon the Jews in Rumania, and which has recently evoked a protest that has commanded the attention of the world

By the terms of the famous Berlin Treaty of 1878, to which England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Austria, and Turkey were parties, and which guaranteed with certain condition the independence of Rumania and other Balkan states, it was expressly provided that "in Rumania the difference of religious creeds and confessions shall not be arrayed against any one person as a ground for exclusion or incapacity in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil and political rights, admission to public employments, functions, and honors, or the exercise of the various professions and

industries in any locality whatsoever." Although they were not alone the ones to benefit by it, this provision was meant to apply as fully to the Jews as to any other class of people, and it should have ended the persecutions which the Jews have been compelled to suffer in Rumania for centuries. But intolerance is persistent, and the authorities of Rumania, which by the way is a "Christian" power, evaded this provision by decreeing that the Jews living in Rumania, of whom there were nearly half a million, and most of whom were descendants of ancestors who had lived in the country for generations and centuries, were not citizens, but "aliens not subject to foreign protection," and that therefore the treaty provision did not apply to them. And intolerance usually provides itself with some loophole through which it may crawl when necessary and claim that it is not what it is, and so it was provided that the Jews might be naturalized one by one if they could secure favorable action by the parliament of the country upon each individual application. This provision, of course, amounted to nothing in the way of relief.

Following this decree came a long series of oppressive enactments. "All the avenues of success were as hermetically sealed against the Jew in Rumania as

they had been in most Continental countries during the Middle Ages. On the ground that their schools were not kept open six days in the week, including Saturday, the Jewish schools were closed. Fifteen years ago a decree was passed providing that Jews should be admitted to public schools only to take such places as were not filled by Rumanians; later it was provided that, if there was room, they could enter upon the payment of a large fee. In the University, which was free to Rumanians, Jews were charged about \$75 a year. They were shut out from military academies, and although admitted to the army, were excluded from the privilege of earning pensions after a specified service. They can hold no government position, and are shut out of the learned professions. Journalism was closed to them. They were forbidden to take out licenses to hawk wares about the streets; they were prohibited to live in the agricultural districts; they were prohibited from engaging in agricultural labor, and forbidden to own farming land. Finally a law was passed declaring that no one should employ a Jew without also employing not less than two Rumanians—a provision which was practically prohibitive of Jewish labor on all small estates."

Under these oppressive restrictions the Jews of Rumania were "cut off at once from the possibilities of training themselves for better classes of work, from all incentives to do higher work, and obliged to live in a few cities under conditions which left only the most menial work open to them." Under this oppression, and it is not difficult to believe, "the Jews in Rumania have steadily deteriorated." Professor Dicey, of England, in a newspaper protest in which he was joined by Baron Kelvin, Sir Charles Dilke, General William Booth of the Salvation Army, and other prominent per-

sons, pronounced this ill-treatment of the Rumanian Jews to be "not only gross injustice to the sufferers, but an injury to the whole of Europe," and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has declared that "the impolicy of their persecution is almost greater than its cruelty."

The oppression seems to have become more rigorous in the last few years, and thousands and thousands of Jews have emigrated from the country to escape from the hard conditions to which they are subjected. It is stated that during the month of March of the present year more than nine thousand Jews left Rumania. Many have emigrated on foot and by wagons into the European countries to the west, and large numbers, averaging about six thousand annually for the last three years, have come to the United States. And no doubt many who have not left would have done so had emigration not been rendered impossible by their great poverty.

It is the fact of the immigration into the United States that has afforded a basis for the protest that the American Secretary of State has sent to the signatory powers of the Berlin Treaty. In a state paper of unusual interest and importance, strongly recalling as it does America's early and historic attitude toward the oppressed, Secretary Hay has set before these governments the condition of affairs as respects the Rumanian Jews, and has plainly indicated to them their responsibility in the matter as parties to the international agreement by which Rumania was forbidden to restrict civil freedom because of religious differences. It is not claimed that the United States has anything to do with the Treaty of Berlin, but it is held that inasmuch as the course of Rumania in flagrantly disregarding a plain provision of that treaty imposes a burden upon the United States, in that it drives to

this country as immigrants and refugees large numbers of people whom oppression has unfitted to care for themselves and to become efficient citizens, the Government of the United States has a right to protest against the "international wrong" whereby they are driven to emigrate and to call attention to the fact that that wrong is in violation of an international agreement as well as of "the principles of eternal justice."

This "note" of protest was made public about the middle of September, but was dated early in August. It is understood that a previous protest had been sent directly to Rumania, but without evoking any favorable response. Such a spirit of humanity and justice pervades this document that we cannot forbear making these quotations from the portion that has appeared in the newspapers:

Starting with the arbitrary and controvertible premise that the native Jews of Rumania, domiciled there for centuries, are "aliens not subject to foreign protection," the ability of the Jew to earn even the scanty means of existence that suffice for a frugal race has been constricted by degrees until nearly every opportunity to win a livelihood is denied, and until the helpless poverty of the Jew has constrained an exodus of such proportions as to cause general concern.

The political disabilities of the Jews in Rumania, imposing their exclusion from the public service and the learned professions, the limitations of their civil rights and the imposition upon them of exceptional taxes, involving as they do wrongs repugnant to the moral sense of liberal modern peoples, are not so directly in point for my present purpose as the public acts which attack the inherent right of man as a bread-winner in the ways of agriculture and trade.

The wrongs suffered in this respect are then set forth, and the document continues:

In short, by the cumulative effect of successive restrictions, the Jews of Rumania have become reduced to a state of wretched misery.

Shut out from nearly every avenue of self-support which is open to the poor of other lands, and ground down by poverty, as the natural result of their discriminatory treatment, they are rendered incapable of lifting themselves from the enforced degradation they endure. . . .

Human beings so circumscribed have virtually no alternatives but submissive suffering or flight to some land less unfavorable to them. Removal under such conditions is not and cannot be the healthy, intelligent emigration of a free and self-reliant being. It must be, in most cases, the mere transplantation of an artificially produced diseased growth to a new place. Granting that, in better and more healthful surroundings, the morbid conditions will eventually change for good, such emigration is necessarily for a time a burden to the community upon which the fugitives may be cast.

The teachings of history and the experience of our own nation show that the Jews possess in a high degree the mental and moral qualifications of conscientious citizenship. No class of immigrants is more welcome to our shores, when coming equipped in mind and body for entrance upon the struggle for bread, and inspired with the high purpose to give the best service of heart and brain to the land they adopt of their own free will. But when they come as outcasts, made doubly paupers by physical and moral oppression in their native land, and thrown upon the long-suffering generosity of a more favored community, their migration lacks the essential conditions which make alien immigration either acceptable or beneficial. So well is this appreciated on the Continent that even in the countries where anti-Semitism has no foothold it is difficult for these fleeing Jews to obtain any lodgment. America is their only goal.

The United States offers asylum to the oppressed of all lands. But its sympathy with them in no wise impairs its just liberty and right to weigh the acts of the oppressor in the light of their effects upon this country and to judge accordingly. Whether consciously and of purpose or not, these helpless people, burdened and spurned by their native land, are forced by the sovereign power of Rumania upon the charity of the United States. This Government cannot be a tacit party to such an international wrong.

This protest was immediately seconded by England, but the other powers have

shown no disposition to take action in the matter, and, judging from its immediate effect, the protest will only aggravate the situation that it was intended to ameliorate. The Rumanian authorities at once began the restriction of emigration by increasing its difficulty and expense, even ordering local authorities to cease issuing passports to emigrants. It is thought that the emigration of the Jews may be prohibited entirely, at least so far as emigration to the United States is concerned. So the persecuted Jews will be denied even the privilege of flying from oppression, which will doubtless be continued with even greater rigor than ever. And although the action of the American Secretary of State was taken in response to urgent requests from Jewish citizens and organizations in this country, some of the Jewish papers see in it "elements and implications which must fill the hearts of loyal Jews with regret and apprehension." It is feared that "the most tolerant Government in the world" will take the stand that the oppressed Jews of Europe, at least from Rumania, are undesirable immigrants, and will exclude them as such from the country. A leading Jewish paper which declares that the document issued by Secretary Hay "breathes sober justice and an enlightened humanity in every line," says that "with all its excellent intentions and fine humanitarian ideals this note sounds ominously like the warning of a final lock-out; out of the friendly ring of the calm, judicial plea there sounds another warning peal of the rising Judennoth, premonitive of the closing of the last gate." It is sincerely to be hoped that what is here feared will not be seen in reality.

While the action of the United States was generally applauded upon humanitarian grounds, the press in several of the European countries was disposed to

consider it as an unwarranted intrusion into European affairs and to argue that it was inconsistent with the much-vaunted Monroe-Doctrine policy. But the protest hardly establishes a new precedent, for the United States has several times taken very similar action. In 1840 the American representative at Constantinople was instructed "to interpose his good offices on behalf of the oppressed Jews in the Ottoman dominions," and at least twice protests have been made to Russia in behalf of oppressed Jews in that country, though with very little beneficial effect. And it is said that it was through the efforts of the American consul-general at Bucharest thirty years ago, after the riots and persecutions of 1871, that permission to emigrate from the country was given to the Jews of Rumania.

But there was one argument or criticism advanced by a portion of the European press that was not without point and force so far as the action of the United States was based upon the broad grounds of humanity and justice. A Russian paper declared that "the Rumanian Jews are probably much better off than the Filipinos," and a leading paper of Germany made the stinging suggestion: "Rumania should either remain silent or send a protest to the United States against lynch-law and the treatment of the Filipinos, lest the Negroes and the Filipinos all emigrate to Rumania." Of course the United States can say that it is not driving Negroes or Filipinos as undesirable immigrants to Rumania, but that does not alter the fact that injustice to Negroes or Filipinos by Americans is no better than injustice to Jews by Rumanians.

It is interesting to note that this Rumanian persecution of the Jews, which Mr. Wm. E. H. Lecky, the eminent English historian, has said "forms, in the eyes of enlightened men, one of the most

disgraceful pages of modern history," is defended or excused in much the same way that Sunday legislation and enforcement is defended in the United States, and as in fact the use of governmental power in the interests of religious creeds and institutions, and as a means of persecution and oppression on account of religious differences, has always been defended. It is declared that the laws under which the Jews suffer are not persecuting measures, that most of them are "trade-law" regulations having nothing to do with religion and not especially applicable to the Jews as such, and that "all talk of the persecution of the Jews comes from incorrect suppositions as to what the law is." Before the abolition of their schools the Jews were compelled to keep them open on the seventh day of the week, and in order to observe the Sabbath only religious instruction was given in them on that day. Whereupon "the government found that it was not pedagogic to teach one subject exclusively on one day!"

And so in the United States a law requiring the observance of a religious institution, the enforcement of which in a very distinct sense oppresses the Sabbath-observing Jews and others in this country, as we show elsewhere in this issue, is also defended as a sort of "trade-law" and industrial regulation, and as in no sense a measure of religious restriction and discrimination. It is declared that a rest-day has to be "secured to the poor workingman," and that it would never do to leave industry free to go on every day in the week. Clerks, butchers, barbers, grocers and others who are rapidly becoming infected with the idea that it is very much against their interests as business men and tradesmen for anybody in their respective lines to do business on Sunday, and that it is their right as business men and tradesmen to have

strict Sunday closing enforced, are rapidly imparting to the matter a very plausible "trade-law" aspect. And so Sunday observance must be enforced upon the people, the individual must be denied one of his most fundamental rights on one day of the week, and Jews and all observers of another day must get along as best they can with only five days for labor and business. It is against the public welfare, it is not good policy nor patriotic [pedagogic], to have it otherwise, say clergymen and some statesmen, and, like their friends in Rumania with regard to similar matters, they smile at the intimation that there can be anything like religious bigotry or oppression in their "civil"-holiday-"holy"-day legislation and enforcement. These people should ponder the fact that the first step taken by the Rumanian authorities against the Jewish schools was *to compel them to close on Sunday*. But of course while thus enforcing respect for the "Christian Sabbath" on the part of those who did not believe in its sacredness, the Rumanian authorities, like their American counterparts, had not the slightest idea of injecting any religious bigotry into the matter, or of persecuting anybody on account of religion! Oh! no; they were moved only by "civil" considerations, as are the advocates of Sunday legislation in this country!

In order to be fair in the matter and true to the facts, and at the same time to further emphasize the parallel above indicated, it may be said that the disabilities imposed upon the Jews by the Rumanians are to a considerable extent due to commercial and industrial envy, rather than to bald religious and racial prejudice and hatred. The discriminating laws are no doubt procured and enforced in many cases at the instance of unscrupulous persons who have very little interest in the religious phase of the

matter, being moved by motives of ordinary selfishness rather than by religious intolerance, but who find in the religious prejudice and hatred that exists against the Jews a very convenient and powerful factor in the accomplishment of their purposes. The parallel to this in the matter of Sunday enforcement in this country is afforded by the organizations of clerks, barbers, butchers, grocers and others who seek by means of Sunday legislation and enforcement absolutely to prohibit all persons from engaging in any of their respective lines of business on Sunday. They care very little for the religious phase of the matter, but they find in the religious sentiment which favors and demands Sunday enforcement a very convenient, eager, and powerful factor for the accomplishment of what they are after. And in both cases, although it may somewhat plausibly be argued otherwise, the evil principle of religious bigotry and intolerance is at work.

We have stated that Rumania is a "Christian" nation. So also are the European powers which, though having specifically pledged themselves to permit nothing of the kind, al-

low Rumania to go on unmolested in her persecution of the Jews. There is a lesson in this that is not without value in its bearing upon the "Christian nation" fallacy that is being proclaimed in the United States to-day. A great newspaper well says: "The history of Jewish persecutions the past two thousand years isn't anything for Christians to be proud of." No, it is not; and the reason why there have been such abominable persecutions is because there have been too many "Christian nations," and too many "Christians" drunken with the "Christian-nation" idea. Professed Christians have forgotten the first and most fundamental precepts of the Christian religion, and have gone about attempting to uphold and advance Christianity by means of civil law, not knowing nor caring what manner of spirit they were of. Perhaps it would be hardly fair to say it in this connection, but no Christians have ever persecuted Jews. To persecute is to repudiate Christianity. He who in the name of Christianity persecutes Jews is a thousand times less a Christian than is an honest-hearted, justice-loving Jew.



The struggle now closing has been one of the most momentous in the history of American labor controversies. It has been so for the great numbers and vast interests involved; for the stretch of time through which it extended; for the solidarity of class feeling, on one side and the other, which it evoked; for the dramatic shiftings of the contest, and for the immense significance of the terms of settlement.—*New York Evening Post*.



Chaplains were first authorized in our army in 1812, when one chaplain with

the rank of major was allowed to each brigade and twenty post chaplains were authorized. In 1861 regimental and hospital chaplains were authorized; after the Civil War regimental chaplains were authorized only for the colored regiments, and thirty post chaplaincies were created to take the place of the existing regimental chaplaincies. By the act of Feb. 2, 1901, the post chaplaincies were abolished, and one chaplain was authorized for each regiment, and twelve chaplains for the artillery corps, a total of fifty-seven. There are now forty-eight in the service. The duties required of

chaplains are "that they shall hold appropriate religious services, perform appropriate burial services, and give instruction to enlisted men in the common English branches of education." The appointment of these "sky-pilots," as the

men call them, is in direct violation of the first amendment to our national Constitution. If the men are to be instructed in the common English branches of education let the Government hire some schoolmasters.—*Truth Seeker.*



The Papacy and the Republic

[We are glad to give space to the communication below from Mr. Joseph Bradfield, of Washington, D. C., who has made a careful study of the matters concerning which he writes. We confess that we are not sufficiently versed in the law to thoroughly understand some of the points made, but we have no difficulty in understanding and appreciating the main idea: that this intimacy between the Government and the Papacy is to the great advantage of the latter and is fraught with grave danger to the former, so far as its original principle and practise of the separation of church and state is concerned. And there can be no question that a virtual treaty between the Government and the Papacy has been officially entered into. But though un-American and unconstitutional concessions to and support of the Papacy may have resulted and are yet to result from it, it cannot rightfully be said that what the Government has done in the Philippines it has done with any design to accomplish such ends. Not design, but unanticipated circumstances and the danger-flouting, self-confident recklessness with regard to fundamental principles that has been a leading characteristic of this whole colonial business, is what is bringing these things to pass. And of course there was but an indirect connection between the brutal practises adopted by some American soldiers and officers during the conquest of the islands, and the Papacy. The Americans of course received the practises through natives and Spaniards by legitimate descent from the Inquisition, and in that way they had a connection with the Papacy; and of course the brutalities served the interests of the Papacy in the islands only to the extent that they served to establish American authority and to the extent that that in turn serves the interests of the Papacy. We think it is not a fact that the President has asked the Pope to make Archbishop Ireland a cardinal, but this is not to dismiss the rumor as amounting to and meaning nothing, as there is a somewhat unseemly and short-sighted haste to do in some quarters. We are persuaded that this rumor is indicative of something that demands serious consideration, and that is the mischievous activity of at least one papal prelate in this country to make the Government serve the ends of himself and "the Church."—EDITOR.]

EDITOR THE SENTINEL:

THE timely articles appearing in THE SENTINEL on the supremacy of the Papacy in the past and her present efforts and encroachments for the same thing again have impelled me to ask space for some words with reference to the astonishing progress of this mischievous work with regard to the Government of this country, and with reference to the part played in it by the Romish prelate, John Ireland, who is having wonderful success as a seducer of Protestants.

Long before the death of President McKinley this man had inveigled our Government into a treaty with Spain,

which surreptitiously carried in "its little inside" a provision relating to "corporations ecclesiastical and civil," and to the rights of property in lands, which amounted to a concordat with the Pope of Rome, and obliged this Government to deal with the Vatican as well as with the Spanish government in respect to lands formerly owned by Spain. This treaty was palpably in violation of the first and tenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States. It sanctioned the existence of all the papal corporations in the Philippines, both sole and aggregate, endowed those corporations with large landed estates, and was, in its purpose

and effect, an establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in the Philippine Archipelago by treaty. The archbishop of Manila, all his suffragan bishops, and all his parish priests are now corporations sole under that treaty by the authority of the Government at Washington. They are now American corporations, and, according to the reasoning of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Providence Hospital case, they are not to be considered as sectarian institutions, falling within the prohibition of the first amendment, but as civil institutions, capable of dealing with the Government and of receiving largesses in the form of money and lands from the United States, and worst of all, as capable of holding lands in mortmain.

The friar question is only an insignificant part of this tremendous Philippine religious question. The real and vital part of the business lies in the introduction of corporations sole into our system as Federal corporations, in spite of the fact that the Federal Government was prohibited by the tenth amendment from erecting any corporation whatever; the power to do so being thereby reserved to the States exclusively. To hold franchises or land in perpetuity, or, as the lawyers say, in *mortmain*, is a power delegated to the Government itself but sparingly, and for specified purposes. That power cannot be redelegated. It cannot be communicated by the government of the United States to any other corporate body, sole or aggregate. That is, it cannot be done constitutionally; though it has been done unconstitutionally in regard to the Philippine ecclesiastical corporations and the Providence Hospital.

The "right of investiture," claimed by the Pope, was fully acknowledged in the eighth article of the treaty; and that right is the very essence of the Pope's temporal supremacy. The contest incident to its

establishment in Europe in the eleventh century cost millions of lives, some historians say not less than twenty millions. The "right of investiture" has been the issue in the war in the Philippines under both the Spanish and the American régimes. The Filipinos have fought against it for three centuries. Our Government has by treaty not only surrendered to Rome this tremendous claim, but has become her instrument in the enforcement of it against its own subjects in the Philippines, and has already spent more than a billion dollars of money collected from Protestants at home in this war for the maintenance of that claim against the Gallican sect in those islands. For, by the Gallican sect, I mean those adherents of the Romish religion who deny the papal right of investiture. In this war the Americans have adopted the Romish law and practise of torture for extorting confessions and information to be used as evidence against suspected persons. The old Inquisitorial water-torture; the old vigil, or waking torture; the old pendola, or swinging torture, have all been adopted by Americans in their zeal for aping Spain as the instrument of popery in this new crusade for the papal "right of investiture."

To deny the right of investiture has been made sedition, punishable as treason, in those islands; for to deny the validity of the treaty on this point is to deny the sovereignty of the United States. I deny its sovereignty in this particular, because the Constitution has not delegated to it any such sovereignty, but has distinctly denied it by the first and tenth amendments. Is this sedition? Is this treason? If it is not treason or sedition here, how can it be such in the Philippines? If it is sedition there, how easy will it be to make it sedition here, and to apply to you and me all the forms of torture invented by monks and devils to

make us confess, recant, and accept the papal doctrine of investiture, along with that of purgatory and indulgences.

THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY stands for the maintenance of the first eight amendments of the Constitution of the United States, known as the American Bill of Rights. And especially does it stand for the doctrine of the social compact; for the whole doctrine of delegated powers, including the maxim that delegated powers cannot be redelegated; and for the impotency of Congress or the treaty-making power to make any law respecting an *establishment* of religion, or prohibiting the *free exercise* thereof; or any law abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances; and for the right of every person charged with crime to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the neighborhood. And it reprobates and condemns the whole system of spurious legislation regarding the Philippines, in which all of these principles have been wantonly violated in order to placate the adherents of popery and legitimacy in this country for partizan advantage. I endorse its position on all these points, and would like to have it take hold of this treaty question.

It is unfortunate, but it is true, that in every case where the Pope is dealing with the head of a Protestant nation with a view to undermining its religious and political principles things must go on from bad to worse until the very climax of iniquity is reached before any reaction is possible. As one of Hampden's followers said in the Long Parliament, things must get worse before they get better. "They have been getting worse faster and faster, just as they did in the time of Charles the First and James the Second. Indeed, the climax seems to have been reached at last, and men all over this

country are whispering to one another the names of Cromwell, and William of Orange, and Joseph Warren, and Thomas Jefferson, and are wondering if the breed of free men is entirely extinct. The Wisconsin Methodist Conference has even spoken out officially and publicly, and has asked the President of the United States some questions about Guarandoti Ireland, which the President is not answering.

This "Ireland question" has come all at once to be a national question, because men everywhere have suddenly realized that it involves the whole subject of the relation between the Papacy and the Republic. It is a momentous question. It drags in its train all the abuses that have been perpetrated upon this sleeping nation by Congress and the Supreme Court, as well as by the treaty-making and executive powers. Above all it raises the question of the right of this Government to receive, as a consular agent of the Pope, a delegate to Manila, over which it is exercising sole jurisdiction. For no consular agent can be received, or granted an *exequatur* by any government, except in pursuance of a treaty, since only by a treaty can the functions of such an agent be created. This agent of the Pope is called, as a subterfuge, an "apostolic delegate;" but if he is to transact secular business in addition to his spiritual functions, he is a consul, by whatever appellation he may, for the convenience of diplomacy, be styled.

Settling disputes about land titles, and the sale of real estate, are not spiritual functions. They are purely secular. The agent who does these things is a consul, minister, ambassador, or other political or secular business agent. He cannot be recognized, or protected, or dealt with by this Government unless there has been a treaty between it and the power which he represents. It follows, therefore, that either our Government has made a treaty

with the Vatican, agreeing thereby to give its agent a diplomatic status in the Philippines, or else that anything done by that agent is void in law. Moreover, a treaty of any sort with any foreign power must, under our system, receive the confirmation of the Senate in order to be valid. The Senate has confirmed no treaty with the Vatican. But the Taft "mission" made a treaty granting a purely diplomatic status to the Pope's delegate, in addition to his ecclesiastical status; and this treaty is now, according to common report, being carried out by the President, before it has been submitted to the Senate. True, they don't call it a treaty. They call it an agreement or "contract." They might call it a *splachnuck*; but it would still be a treaty.

With the claim to the right of investiture conceded; with a diplomatic status for his emissaries conceded; with his corporations sanctioned and endowed in the Philippines and in the District of Columbia; with the American army and navy to execute vengeance upon his recalcitrant Gallican subjects; with American generals playing the rôle of Alva, and American judges playing the role of Torquemada, in his service; with, according to reports, the President beseeching him to reward John Ireland with a cardinal's hat for planning all these glorious achievements—with all this accomplished in America, with the full assent of both the great political parties of the nation, the Pope ought to feel happy.

But the Methodists are displeased over the report that the President wants John Ireland rewarded for these "services he has rendered the church and the state." They say that the President really had no right to allow John Ireland to render such wonderful "services." They say nothing about O'Gorman, however; and yet O'Gorman has been one of the chief factors in all this business. He was ap-

pointed officially by the President to assist in the work of the Taft Commission; and his principles are an index to the nature of the "services" performed by that commission, of which he was a controlling spirit. While this O'Gorman was a professor in the so-called Catholic University here some years ago, he wrote a book, which may now be found in the Library of Congress, on the history of the Catholic Church in the United States, in which he expressed his cordial approval of incendiarism, involving wholesale murder of American citizens, as a religious doctrine, and glorified an alleged plot of the Irish papists of New York to reduce the whole of that city to ashes, as a legitimate means of checking the progress of the Native American party.¹ Our Methodist brethren ought to inquire why this historian was made a commissioner of the people of the United States. They ought to read his history, and inquire whether the President had read it when he clothed such a man with official dignity and power.

John Ireland is said to have suggested the Taft "mission" to Rome, and to have secured the appointment of O'Gorman as a member of it. This is one of the "services" rendered by him to the "church and state," for which he claims a cardinal's hat as a reward. And it is for this singular service that the President is said to have solicited that reward for him. There was once a time when no responsible public man in this country would have dared to adopt the political schemes of a Romish prelate, or to use such prelates as instruments in the execution of his policy, much less beseech the Pope to pay his political debts for him. Has America become so poor that she cannot have a policy of her own, that her own citizens cannot be trusted to carry out that policy, that she cannot pay her agents for doing

¹ "American Church History Series," vol. ix., p. 375.

any reasonable service to the United States, but must call on the Pope for his assistance to pay her bills? Has America entered into another secret Treaty of Verona? Has she secretly entered into a

new "Holy" Alliance? Has she become a vassal of the Pope? I am very much afraid that all these things are true. But is there no remedy? Who will suggest a remedy?



The Right to Work and One Way in Which It Is Denied

By the Editor

DURING the last few weeks and months the country has heard much about "the right to work." In certain quarters great emphasis has been placed upon "the right of every man to sell his labor in a free market." It has been declared that the individual has the indestructible and inalienable right to labor when and where and for whom and at what rate of pay he will, and that unless that right is maintained civil liberty is doomed and republican government is a failure; and that, therefore, any body of men who prevent the exercise of that right are the enemies of society.

This position is of course absolutely sound, but perhaps we should not neglect to say at this point, and we mean no reflection upon any of those whose words we quote further on, that the position of some of those who during the past summer have been most stout and persistent in declaring it to be their position, is not absolutely sound by any means. The loud professions of undying allegiance to the inalienable rights of the individual laborer made by the organs of capital and the heads of great combines is neither inspiring nor convincing. What they mean by "the right of the individual to sell his labor in a free market," is the right of the individual workman singly and alone to deal with concentrated cap-

ital—the right of capital to have labor absolutely at its mercy.

But whatever abuse and misuse may be made of it, the principle is absolutely right; and it is right, too, that great emphasis should be placed upon it. The times demand it. Union labor does often exercise a brutal tyranny, and it is right that its aggressions upon the rights of the individual should be met with such words as we quote below. And even such a perilous situation as that which the country has been compelled to face until within a few days ago is not entirely without some compensation when it evokes such a pronouncement of a great, fundamental principle of human liberty. The country, the nation itself, is forgetting the foundation upon which its institutions were erected. The Declaration of Independence has been virtually repudiated by governmental action and by leading men and organs of public opinion in the nation. It is, therefore, well that once more men are made to feel the binding claims of the fundamental principles of human liberty, and to *know* that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *inalienable* rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

So the principle that is emphasized in the quotations given below is broad and

fundamental. Its application is not confined to the question of organized and unorganized labor, nor to that of the disputes between employers and employees. It is evident that in this direction it is thoroughly understood and appreciated, and that its violation here will meet with most capable and vigorous condemnation. But there is another direction in which this principle is being violated in the United States to-day, with very little attention being paid to it, and few who do have their attention drawn to it realize that a fundamental principle of civil liberty, an inalienable human right, is being trampled upon. We desire, in the light of the quotations given below, to have a look candidly taken in that direction.

Because the great principle they assert and emphasize is very likely to be violated more and more seriously in the future in this matter to which we refer, and also in the direction in which those were looking who uttered them, we think it is well to preserve some of these declarations that have recently been made as to the right to work. Here are some of them:

The right to work is the most essential right in any civilized community.—*New York Times*.

Because this is a free country every man has a right to work where he chooses and for such pay as he is willing to receive. Freedom of labor lies at the foundation of free institutions.—*The Outlook*.

The divine law says that by the sweat of your brow you shall earn your bread, and the law of the land is based on that law, and when you interfere with the right of men to work you are violating the law of God and man.—*Father O'Reilly, in sermon at Shenandoah, Pa., October 12*.

A great principle is involved in the contention that the humblest man must be protected in the exercise of the right to sell his own labor where and to whom he chooses, and it is better that we should shiver all winter than that the foundation of civic liberty be sapped

in violation of that principle.—*Dr. W. R. Huntington, in a sermon at Grace Episcopal Church, New York, October 5*.

There is an eternal principle that a man has a right to speak, and to think, and to work for whomever he pleases. If a non-union man needs guns from Wilkesbarre to Washington to protect him, there ought to be bayonets enough there to insure him work [to protect him in exercising the right to work], or else this Republic had better go out of existence.—*Dr. Newell D. Hillis, at Chicago Society Dinner, New York, October 9*.

The right to labor is inherent in every human being and cannot be surrendered without the sacrifice of individual liberty and of private property. It cannot be arbitrated any more than the right of a man to his own home if it shall be claimed by an outsider. It is a question which is in the domain of conscience, and involves the personal liberty of the individual.—*Abram S. Hewitt, in statement to the press at Bar Harbor, Me., August 25*.

The principle at stake in Pennsylvania is one which goes to the foundation of our national life. Unless free men may still engage in their lawful occupations at their own pleasure, whether they belong to the Roman Catholic or the Methodist Church, to a labor union or a Masonic lodge, then the personal guarantees of the Constitution are a dead letter and our doctrines of human liberty under a republican government are outgrown. . . . The essential principle of American freedom is individual liberty regulated by law.—*New York Tribune, October 16*.

We are at present faced with a situation which, in my opinion, is the gravest that has ever faced society in the United States since the beginning of its history. The burning question has been forced upon us whether the fundamental and inextinguishable right of a man to freedom [to work] is to be recognized or to be trodden under the heels of a brutal mob. The right of the individual to liberty must be preserved and defended, or our liberties are gone and the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, which have been our glory for a hundred years, shall pass away like the vision of things which have been.—*Lyman J. Gage, ex-Secretary of the Treasury, at Chicago Society Dinner, New York, October 9*.

Before the living God and the Carpenter of Nazareth, I say no man has a right to say to any other man when or where he shall work. . . . The union miners are arrayed

against the fundamental rights of honest toil. I speak in behalf of the seventeen thousand independents who to-day are working behind barricades maintaining the rights guaranteed in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . . I sing the praises of the men who say “No” to any one who shall deny them the right to work. . . . There is no right in God’s universe comparable to the right of a man to do his work.—*Dr. David J. Burrell, in sermon at Marble Collegiate Church, New York, October 12.*

It seems to me, friends, that the country is getting altogether too callous and indifferent to this fundamental principle of the right to life and liberty, the right to labor and live our own lives and sell our own labor in our own way. If these rights are not guaranteed then the Republic is a failure. . . . No body of men on the face of the earth has any right to interfere with the liberty of any other man. This is a fundamental principle of human rights, fundamental to the very safety and perpetuity of our Republic. . . . It seems to me that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every American citizen personal protection, the right to hold and manage his own property, the right to labor when and where and how and for what wages he will. It seems to me that the Constitution of the United States guarantees this to every citizen. . . . And it seems to me—and I respectfully make this suggestion—that, if the governor of any special State fails to execute the laws and protect the citizens of that State, then the President of the United States would have a right to issue a proclamation calling upon such governor to protect a citizen of the United States, and warning him that if he did not do it the authority of the United States would intervene. . . . The great fundamental principles of liberty, of life, of property, of occupation—these, whatever comes, if we are to be free, if there is to be a republic worthy of the name, must be protected.—*Dr. Minot J. Savage, in sermon at the Messiah Unitarian Church, New York, October 5.*

It seems that it could not be possible that in a country where the above sentiment exists so strongly as these declarations would indicate that work, “honest toil,” could be treated as a crime by the public laws. But nevertheless this is not

only possible, but it is an actual fact. With the exception of only one or two States, every commonwealth in the American Union has on its statute books a law which prohibits “common labor” as a misdemeanor under penalty of fine or imprisonment. The only exception made is in favor of “works of necessity or charity.” The penalties for violating these statutes against doing “common labor” or pursuing one’s “ordinary calling,” range in the various States all the way from a fine of one dollar to a fine of one thousand dollars, but in most of the States the fines range between ten and fifty dollars. And in the State where the highest fine is prescribed it is provided in addition that “imprisonment not to exceed six months, to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or on such other works as the county authorities may employ the chain-gang, not to exceed twelve months, and any one or more of these punishments may be ordered in the discretion of the judge”! This is the penalty to which “any tradesman, artificer, workman, or laborer, or other person whatsoever, who shall pursue their business or work of their ordinary callings” at any time during a period of twenty-four hours each week, which the law arbitrarily undertakes to “protect” from such “crimes,” is liable to-day in one of the great commonwealths of the American nation!

The other day a man was arraigned in the county court at Malden, Mass., under an indictment charging that he “unlawfully did labor and work, the same not being a work of necessity or charity,” it being arbitrarily alleged and assumed that the labor and work done was “against the peace of said Commonwealth [Massachusetts].” The evidence did not show that the public peace had been disturbed, but it did show conclusively that on a specified day the accused was “on a

ladder with a brush in his hand *painting his barn,*" and that although he was warned by officers of the law that he "had better *stop work,* as the work was not a work of necessity or charity," he "deliberately went up the ladder and *continued his work* until he had finished it," and that he even had the hardihood to claim "that *he had the right* under the Bill of Rights *to do that work.*" He was convicted of the charge laid against him in the indictment, and was fined \$10 and costs. And this is only one of many similar cases that could be cited. By going back just a few years many cases could be cited in which far more serious penalties were inflicted for the same "crime." This very man, whose recent case we cite, was fined \$50 in the same court for a very similar offense "against the peace of said Commonwealth" about five years ago, and could have been fined the same amount in this case had the magistrate seen fit to fix the fine at that sum.

"Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad;" and surely it is enough to arouse the moral indignation of any man, and especially in this particular matter of any American, when, with the declarations above quoted ringing in his ears, bringing forcibly to mind as they do a fresh and renewed realization of the fundamental and inalienable character of the right to work, he reflects that for no other offense than that of exercising that right—"the right of a man to do his work," a right to which "there is no right in God's universe comparable," a right that is "inextinguishable and inalienable," that is "fundamental to the very safety and perpetuity of our Republic," which lies at "the foundation of our national life" and without which "the personal guarantees of the Constitution are a dead letter and our doctrines of human liberty under a republican government are outgrown; a right in the exercise of which it is de-

clared that every citizen of the United States should be fully protected even if it requires that the entire military power of the nation shall be called into action,—we say, surely it is enough to arouse the moral indignation of every American citizen when he reflects that for exercising this right to work American citizens have been, in recent years, fined, imprisoned, and worked in the chain-gang with criminals *by authority of the law,* and that these legal penalties against the exercise of that right remain in force and are frequently called into requisition. And it is not likely to soothe the feeling of righteous indignation which this brings to one's breast when the fact is noted that among the above emphatic declarations in support of the right to work are two from men who are active advocates and champions of the sort of legislation that is responsible for the flagrant wrongs to which we have referred. One of these declarations, the one which contains the sentence, "Before the living God and the Carpenter of Nazareth, I say no man has a right to say to any other man WHEN or where he shall work," is by a man who is an active member and supporter of an organization which has for one of its objects, and for which it has been working for many years, the securing from Congress of the enactment of a law by which the exercise of this right to work will be prohibited in all places subject to the national authority during a specific period of twenty-four hours each week!

In all this we of course have reference to the Sunday legislation and enforcement in the United States. "Ah," it will be said at once by some, "but this matter of prohibiting labor on Sunday is not a mere matter of prohibiting labor." We are well aware that it is not; but because we know that it is not likely to give a better aspect to an invasion and denial of a fundamental human right, and cer-

tainly not if it is considered in the light of the fundamental principles of the American Republic, to have the fact brought out that it is due to the enactment of religious sentiment into law and an attempt by legislation to "protect" the "sanctity" of a religious observance, we know it will not help matters any to turn to other phases of the question. The plain and shameful fact is that by such legislation the right to work is denied on one day of the week without any warrant in the civil needs of society, and that is all that it is necessary to know in this connection.

But, it will be said, there is a vast difference between a thing that is done through the orderly procedure of legislation and the enforcement of law, and that that is done by the violence and intimidation of lawless mobs. It is true that in organized society a peculiar odium attaches, and rightly attaches, to the trampling upon human rights by irresponsible mobs—to that invasion of human rights that is made by the threats and violence of persons who are clothed with no legal authority whatever. But after all there is not such a great difference between the invasion and denial of human rights by law and their invasion and denial by mobs, and *so far as society at large is concerned the first is the greatest wrong.*

It is not to be presumed for a moment that those whose words we have quoted hold that an interference with the freedom of the individual in the exercise of his right to work is an outrage only when it is due to mobs and irresponsible persons, and that such an interference would be all right if made by the legally constituted authorities. On the contrary some of them regard as the most reprehensible and outrageous feature of such interferences in the mining regions of Pennsylvania the connivance of the civil authorities with those who made such in-

terferences, it being claimed that such connivance existed. It will not suffice to say that such connivance existed without authority of law, for it is not upon that ground that the declarations above quoted are based. They rest upon the ground of the fundamental, inextinguishable, and inalienable character of the right to work, which, so long as it is not used to the injury of others, is by right as inviolable from the interference of the state and society at large as from the interference of the mob.

And, further, it is not to be presumed that the union workmen would resort to violence and intimidation if the power of the state could be used instead. If they could secure legislation prohibiting "common labor," except upon certain specified terms, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, as the friends of Sunday observance have secured on far less tenable ground than union labor has upon which to base such demand, it is very likely that they would be perfectly content to let the law govern in the matter, and would at least be as orderly and law-abiding in the matter as some of the advocates of Sunday enforcement are with regard to such enforcement. They would no doubt eagerly welcome the substitution of fines and imprisonment by authority of the state for intimidation and violence on their part in the case of "scabs" and all others who, by working in their places, frustrate their attempts to improve their condition and the condition of the workingman generally, as they claim is the object of unionism and strikes. And in view of the fact that the advocates of Sunday enforcement now base their church-and-state scheme almost entirely upon the claim that it is in the interests of "enslaved labor," it is not very clear how they could consistently refuse to support union labor in such a demand as we have indicated. If the cause of "en-

slaved labor" can justify legislative denial of the right to labor on one day of the week, it is not too much to suppose that it can justify its restriction and denial at other times. If it can be shown that the cause of "enslaved labor" is injured by those who work in the places of those who are out on strike, why is it not just as proper and right to prohibit such labor by law as it is to prohibit men from working on Sunday on the assumption that freedom to work on that day would be detrimental to the interests of workmen generally?

But anybody can see that a denial of the right to work would be no less a wrong when done by the authority of the law than when done by a mob. So far as society at large is concerned the first would be the far greater wrong. The shame and dishonor attaching to the deeds of mobs does not rest upon society at large except in a very remote degree, for society does not endorse outrages of mobs which disregard and defy its authority, but puts them down as soon as possible. But when human rights are disregarded and trampled upon in the enactment and enforcement of the public laws, and society, by whose authority the laws are enacted and enforced, calmly acquiesces in it, then, indeed, does all the shame and dishonor of the wrong rest upon it; and it cannot offer even the excuse that the mob can, for the mob does not pretend to be bound by the rules of right and justice, while society does; it can plead that it was overwhelmed by frenzy and passion which temporarily blinded it to the claims of right and justice, while society cannot.

We are well aware that the denial of the right to work in the matter to which we have directed attention in this article cannot command the widespread public interest and attention that its denial commands in the matter to which the quota-

tions given have reference. We know that no wide and deep public concern can exist with regard to any matter unless a great many people come to feel that it is something in which their own interests are vitally concerned. And we know that the condition of things is such that this matter to which we have called attention is not something in which the great mass of the people are ever likely to feel that their rights and interests are menaced, whatever may be the principle involved in it, although it is of course a fact that in the great centers of population a considerable proportion of the people are coming to feel that in one respect at least Sunday legislation is an unwarrantable interference with their liberty as citizens, and are speaking out in no uncertain terms to that effect, being supported in their protest by leading clergymen and citizens. We refer to that phase of Sunday legislation which prohibits the sale of liquors on Sunday. It is curious that it is at this point, and only at this point, that any considerable number of people can discover that Sunday legislation is inconsistent with American principles of government, and that it is only at this point that any widespread popular opposition can be aroused against such legislation. This is something upon which society can hardly pride itself. But it is not likely that the real outrage upon human rights that is perpetrated by Sunday legislation—the denial of the right to do honest labor—will ever arouse any considerable proportion of the people. In this respect this legislation coincides with the convenience of the great mass of the people, so that they are made to feel no inconvenience or hardship from it, and as that will continue to be the case, it is not likely that they will ever be aroused by the injustice of such legislation to the few who do feel its oppression.

And so we do not expect any such pop-

ular interest in the matter to which we have called attention as will of course always be shown in the matter of the right of the individual to freedom to labor as it is involved in the matter of union and non-union labor and as it is related to the great question of capital and labor. But we do expect that those who do give attention to the matter of Sunday legislation will see what is involved in it, and will have the same respect and jealousy for fundamental principles and inalienable rights in this matter as they have in others. We do expect that intelligent men shall not stand for one thing at one point and for exactly the opposite thing at another point. It is a shame not only to themselves but to society at large that some of its teachers and leaders should be advocating and supporting legislation which proscribes the right to labor while at the same time they cry out with all the feeling of which they are capable when that right is interfered with and denied by others in some other direction. We want all those who do give attention to

the matter of Sunday legislation to know that if labor organizations and society as a whole have no right to interfere with the individual in the exercise of his right to labor when and how he will, so long as he interferes with no right of his fellows in so doing, neither has any organization of citizens nor society at large any right to seek to prevent and to prohibit the individual from exercising his right to labor on Sunday, or any other day, so long as in so doing he interferes with no right of his fellows. We want it to be known and recognized that the right to work is as fundamental and inalienable in the one case as in the other, and that an interference with it is as inexcusable and indefensible in the one case as in the other.

If the right to work lies at the basis of civil liberty and is one of the most fundamental and essential rights in civilized society, and we see no reason to question this, then Sunday legislation strikes at the very foundation of civil liberty and should be proscribed and outlawed in civilized society.



The completion of the formation of two more great "trusts" or combines has recently been reported. One is a great shipping combine known as the International Mercantile Marine Company. Included in the combination are six trans-Atlantic steamship lines. Its capital is \$120,000,000. The combination is under the control of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. The other combination is a gigantic "food trust that will affect every family in the nation," and which "includes every living thing that walks, flies or swims." It embraces the great meat-packing concerns of the country, and is known as the United States Packing Company, or in popular parlance, as the "Beef Trust." Its capitalization is to be fixed at \$500,000,000, and in point of capitalization

is said to be "the biggest corporation in the world." Its earnings will be "almost beyond comprehension." Financiers estimate that from 20 to 30 per cent. will be realized annually on the capital invested. The combination will not only "take in every stock-yard in the country, and all the collateral business, such as selling agencies, car lines, and the by-product companies," but will "build, purchase or establish markets and butcher shops, and deal in all kinds of meat, poultry, game and fish and other things incident to the meat and poultry or fish trade." This means that "the new combine may operate butcher shops, and practically grocery stores, in every city, town and village in the United States."

Two Chapters of History*

[Far be it from us to seek to obscure or to detract from in any degree the honor and glory which attaches to the United States because of what it has done for the people of Cuba. There is much to be proud of, but it is all too evident that in the glorification over the chapter of history which it is supposed closed on the 20th of May, another very similar chapter of history has been almost entirely overlooked. Even though this chapter of modern history is henceforth to be utterly unlike its ancient parallel, it is important to know and to recognize the similarity, and therefore we present herewith side by side, the historian's account of the celebration, in the year 196 B.C., of the bestowal of "liberty and independence" upon the Grecian states by the Roman republic, and the account of the celebration in the year 1902, A.D., of the bestowal of "liberty and independence" upon Cuba by the American Republic. The history leading up to the event of the 20th of May need not be recounted here. With regard to the other event it is sufficient to say that for some time preceding it Greece was divided between two powers—the Grecian republics (the confederation of which "is remarkable as the most perfect type of federal government which has been handed down from antiquity"—*Century Dictionary*) and the kingdom or empire of Macedonia under Philip V. These two powers "were always engaged in war, the former to preserve the remains of their ancient liberty, and the latter to complete their destruction."—*Rollin*. "The Romans declared loudly in favor of those republics, made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors."—*Ibid.* In 196 B.C. the Macedonian forces were badly defeated by the Romans, and Philip was obliged to conclude peace on the terms of the conquerors. This practically placed the supreme power in Greece in the hands of Rome, and it was at this juncture that there came the great day of overwhelming joy for the Grecian republicans described below. Notice how similar was that demonstration to those which took place in Havana and Santiago so recently. For those who would see beneath the surface of things in this matter it is important to remember in this connection that Rome was a republic, just as much of a republic as the United States, and that she had behind her a republican history covering a period almost three times as long as that to which the United States can look back; that to all appearances her attitude at that time toward the Grecian states was exactly similar to that of the United States toward Cuba to-day; and that in spite of it all Roman authority and sovereignty did not cease in Greece, but on the contrary grew and was asserted more and more, until within less than half a century from the date of the great rejoicing over the bestowal of freedom upon the Grecians, the rule of Rome over Greece became absolute and "the last stronghold of Grecian freedom" was completely destroyed. And with this, although Rome was still known as a republic, came "the full establishment of the empire of Rome," as Rollin has written. And it is well to remember, too, in this connection, as has also been written by the eminent historian whom we have just named, that "the spirit of sovereignty and dominion" which determined "the fate of all the States of Greece" "does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself only by degrees; and it is only by insensible progressions, which at the same time are rapid enough, that it is carried at last to its greatest height." If the United States is indeed to establish a new precedent in the world, and is from this time forward to write an altogether different story from the chapter of ancient history which it has thus far so closely paralleled in this matter, its people cannot do better than to fix firmly and to keep clearly in their minds this ancient chapter; for to forget it, and it seems to be largely forgotten, is but to greatly increase the probability of its being repeated in full.—THE EDITOR.]

Rome and the Grecians

B. C. 196-146.

IT was now the time in which the Isthmian games were to be solemnized, and the expectation of what was there to be transacted had drawn thither an incredible multitude of people, and persons of the highest rank. The conditions of

the treaty of peace [between Philip and the Romans], which were not entirely made public, formed the topic of all conversation, and various opinions were entertained concerning them; but very few could be persuaded that the Romans would evacuate all the cities they had taken. All Greece was in uncertainty, when, the multitude being assembled in the stadium to see the games, a herald

*This matter was prepared in June, but has been crowded out from month to month until now. Although it has not the freshness that it would have had had it appeared earlier, we deem it worth while yet to present it, for the lesson emphasized is no less timely and important now than it was a few months ago.

comes forward and publishes with a loud voice:

The Senate and people of Rome and Titus Quintius, the general, having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, set at liberty from all garrisons and taxes and imposts, the Corinthians, the Loerians, the Phocians, the Eubœans, the Phtihot Achaëans, the Magnesians, the Thessalians, and the Perrhæbians, declare them free, and ordain that they shall be governed by their respective laws and usages.

At these words, which many heard but imperfectly because of the noise that interrupted them, all the spectators were filled with excess of joy. They gazed upon and questioned one another with astonishment, and could not believe either their eyes or ears; so like a dream was what they saw and heard. It was thought necessary for the herald to repeat the proclamation, which was now listened to with the most profound silence, so that not a single word of the decree was lost. And now fully assured of their happiness, they abandoned themselves again to the highest transports of joy and broke into such loud and repeated acclamations that the sea resounded with them at a great distance, and some ravens, which happened to fly that instant over the assembly, fell down in the stadium; so true it is, that of all the blessings of this life, none are so dear to mankind as liberty! The games and sports were hurried over, without any attention being paid to them; for so great was the general joy upon this occasion that it extinguished all other sentiments. The games being ended, all the people ran in crowds to the Roman general, . . . every one being eager to see his deliverer, to salute him, to kiss his hand, and to throw crowns and festoons of flowers over him. . . .

The remembrance of so delightful a day, and of the valuable blessings then bestowed, was continually renewed, and for a long time formed the only subject

of conversation at all times and in all places. Every one cried in the highest transports of admiration, and a kind of enthusiasm, "that there was a people in the world who, at their own expense and the hazard of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; and that *not* for their neighbors or people situated on the same continent, but who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universally law, equity, and justice. That by a single word, and the voice of a herald, liberty had been restored to all the cities of Greece and Asia. That a great soul only could have formed such a design; but that to execute it was the effect at once of the highest good fortune and the most consummate virtue."

They called to mind all the great battles which Greece had fought for the sake of liberty. "After sustaining so many wars," said they, "never was its valor crowned with so blessed a reward as when strangers came and took up arms in its defense. It was then that almost without shedding a drop of blood or losing scarce one man, it acquired the greatest and noblest of all prizes for which mankind can contend. Valor and prudence are rare at all times; but of all virtues justice is most rare. Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades had great abilities for carrying on war and gaining battles, both by sea and land; but then it was for themselves and their country, not for strangers and foreigners, they fought. That height of glory was reserved for the Romans.—*From Book XIX., Chap. I., Rollin's "Ancient History."*

It was decreed in particular [by the Roman Senate] that the Macedonians and Illyrians should be declared free, in order that all nations might know that the end of the Roman arms was not to

subject free people, but to deliver such as were enslaved; so that the one under the protection of the Roman name might always retain their liberty, and the other who were under the rule of kings, might be treated with more lenity and justice by them, through consideration for the Romans; or that, whenever war should arise between those kings and the Roman people, the nations might know that the issue of those wars would be victory for the Romans and liberty for them.—From Book XX, Art. I., Rollin's "Ancient History."

It must be confessed that this people, [the Romans] on certain occasions show such a moderation and disinterestedness, as (judging of them from their outside) exceed everything we meet with in history, and to which it seems inconsistent to refuse praise. Was there ever a more delightful or more glorious day than that in which the Romans, after having carried on a long and dangerous war, after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim in a general assembly that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty, and desired to reap no other fruit from their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glory sufficed to endear them to the Romans? The description of what passed on that immortal day can hardly be read without tears, and without being affected with a kind of enthusiasm and admiration.

Had this deliverance of the Grecian states proceeded from a principle of generosity, void of all interested motives, had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans never belied such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august or more capable of doing honor to a nation.

Nothing could be more gentle and

equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation toward such states and nations as addressed them for protection. They succored them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences and in suppressing all commotions which arose amongst them, and did not demand the least recompense from their allies for all these services. By this means their authority gained strength daily, and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

And, indeed, under pretense of offering them their good offices, of entering into their interests, and of reconciling them, the Romans rendered themselves the sovereign arbiters of those whom they restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them, to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels. . . . From arbiters and mediators, being become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. . . .

Although it is difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from the first formed a plan in order to conquer and subject all nations, it cannot be denied but that if we examine their whole conduct attentively, it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this; and that a kind of instinct had determined them to conform to it in all things.—From "Reflections on the Conduct of the Romans with Regard to the Grecian States," at the end of Sec. VII., Rollin's "Ancient History."

The United States and the Cubans

A. D. 1898-1902.

Under the direction of the President of the United States I now transfer to you as the duly elected representatives of the people of Cuba the government and control of the island, to be held and exercised by you under the provisions of the constitution of the Republic of Cuba, heretofore adopted by the Constitutional Convention, and this day promulgated; and I hereby declare the occupation of Cuba by the United States and the military government of the island to be ended.—*Portion of American Governor-General's Proclamation to the President and Congress of Cuba, Havana, May 20.*

The deed is done. The promise of the United States is fulfilled. The flag of the United States is replaced by that of Cuba on the palace and fortifications of Havana. The United States troops are on their way home. The United States Governor—no, he is ex-Governor now—is on his way back to Washington. Thomas Estrada Palma is President of the Cuban Republic. The Cuban constitution is in force. Free Cuba is an accomplished fact. Such is the meaning of yesterday's doings at Havana. The circumstances are unique and unprecedented.—*New York Tribune (editorial) May 21.*

The United States has redeemed her promise to the world. Havana and Santiago de Cuba to-day were evacuated by American troops, the reins of power were handed over to President Palma, and now the government of Cuba is free, and to-night the whole island is delirious with joy.

The natal day of the Cuban Republic found Havana arrayed like a queen to await the coming of her lord. She seemed reinvested for the occasion with the dignity of the prosperous days of her

power and wealth. The decorations were universal. . . . The entire population, reinforced by thousands of visitors, were abroad soon after daylight. All was animation and expectancy. . . .

Owing to the limited space, the people were to have no sight of the ceremony [of the transfer of the government] which was to constitute them a nation before the world, but outside they were to witness a spectacle which would stir their pulses, for they were to see the beloved five-barred and single-starred flag, which Cespedes first threw to the breeze in 1868, at the opening of the ten years' war, raised by the act of the United States above the palace. This thing which was to happen had been the dream of their lives and their ancestors' for generations. Their parents, brothers, and friends had gone to their deaths to accomplish it. No strange wonder, then, that hours before the time set they began flocking here from all quarters of the city. Many were already before the palace with the rising sun, and some even slept in the park, to be certain not to miss the sight. . . . Soon all the side streets runnings into the plaza were choked into a solid mass of humanity, and every door and window fronting the square was walled in with faces, white and black, old and young, male and female. . . . As far as the eye could see the roofs were fringed with human freight. It was a sight to live forever in the memory. . . . The eyes of a hundred thousand people were glued on the American flag floating over the palace.

As the time approached for the flag to be lowered, several premature demonstrations occurred. Bells rang, steam

sirens in the harbor shrieked, and rockets and aerial bombs were exploded. But these were mere whispers compared with the volume of sound which burst forth when the American flag came down at ten minutes past twelve. . . . A roar which rolled over the entire city went up from the populace and like an echo came the distant boom of one of the great guns at the Cabanas fortress across the bay, the first of forty-five such detonations, one for every State in the Union.

The American flag had been lowered at Cabanas and from Morro and the other forts around the city simultaneously with the one over the palace. Then all the bells in the city added to the din. Giant firecrackers were exploded until a pall of smoke arose over the city. All this was kept up for five minutes until the Cuban flag was hoisted. As it blew free over the palace and rose on the forts in view of the assembled thousands, the roar was redoubled again. The guns of the Cubans spoke this time with the national salute of twenty-one guns. The United States cruiser *Brooklyn* and the English and Italian warships in the harbor set the flag of the new republic at the main and saluted it with twenty-one guns. The Cuban bands stationed on the plaza at Malacon, Morro, and other places in the city, blared forth in pride of their country, while the guns of the ships thundered the strength of war.

But it was the demonstration of the people that overshadowed all the rest. Their vivas were like the roar of the ocean. They rose and fell. Women waved handkerchiefs, fans and parasols. Men jumped up and down for joy, and everybody embraced his neighbor. Tears flowed from many eyes but the shouting did not cease. The crowds shouted vivas for the United States, for President Palma, for General Gomez, and for General Wood, and it was ten minutes

before the storm of sound began to subside and there was another wild roar as General Wood and the American officers left for the pier. . . . The demonstration they received all along the route was remarkable and left no doubt of the gratitude and the good will of the Cubans towards the Americans.

Dramatic as was the remarkable demonstration when the flag of the United States was lowered, and the flag of the new republic hoisted in its place at noon to-day on the palace from whence Spain had ruled the island for centuries, it was hardly more stirring than the magnificent friendly demonstration which attended the departure of the cruiser *Brooklyn* as she sailed out of Havana harbor. . . . A flotilla of harbor crafts loaded to the guards with people and dressed with bunting from stem to stern escorted her to sea. The water front was a solid mass of people, and the old fortifications at La Punta . . . was a human hillock. . . . As became a commander, General Leonard Wood desired to be the last to leave. . . . As she passed the grim walls of Cabanas and Morro Castle the *Brooklyn* moved swiftly, the American flag at her fore and the Cuban flag at her main peak, sailors manning her sides and the flag at her stern dipping continually to the storm of vivas from ashore and afloat. The Cuban colors on both fortresses were lowered three times in salute. . . . General Wood stood on the bridge and acknowledged the ovation he received by bowing and touching his cap. . . . The flotilla of small craft kept in the wake of the *Brooklyn* until she was hull down on the horizon, then the boats turned back and the people at the entrance of the harbor returned to their jubilations.

The enthusiasm in the city was boundless. Many persons were literally mad

with joy over their new-born liberty. The streets were full of surging, cheering men and women. . . . One hundred thousand visitors were said to be in the city, and the police were utterly unable to cope with the joy intoxicated people. . . . This evening the city is illuminated as never before, and a great pyrotechnic display is being given on the walls of Morro Castle and Cabanas across the bay.

Press Dispatches from Havana, May 20. As the flag [of Cuba] floated gaily to the breeze a mighty shout arose on all sides. Battle-scarred veterans embraced each other. Tears were in the eyes of all, and a whole people, as if overcome with emotion, became silent for a moment, and then, as though just realizing that they had taken their place among the nations of the earth, and remembering their best friend in the time



THE PLAZA AND PALACE IN HAVANA—SCENE OF THE GREAT EVENT OF MAY 20

While this was taking place at Havana, a similar scene was being enacted at Santiago, where Gen. Whitside at noon turned over the authority to his Cuban successor and sailed away with two troops of the eighth cavalry.

Only eight batteries of American artillery remain on Cuban soil. A chapter of American history has ended and the first chapter of the history of the Cuban Republic has begun.—*From Associated*

of their direst need, in one mighty roar shouted, "Viva Estados Unidos!"—*From Special Cable Dispatch to New York Tribune.*

This is indeed a glorious day for Cuba. It is to us what the Fourth of July in 1776 was to the United States. . . . We understand the obligations placed on us, and we mean to live up to them. Though the Stars and Stripes were lowered to-day for the emblem of

Cuba Libre, the flag will live forever in the hearts of all Cubans. . . . When we were in the throes of a rebellion for independence the United States came to our aid. . . . I wish to reiterate the sentiments of gratitude to her government, her press, and her people. Their devotion to the cause of independence, which has helped to bring about this day of independence for the Cubans, shall be the link in the chain which shall bind the two peoples in a friendship never to be severed. . . . I have nothing but gratitude for the Americans for giving us our independence. . . . Cuba is grateful, and will never forget what the Mother of Republics has done for her.—*Statements by President Palma to Press Representatives, at Havana, May 20.*

Everywhere were evidences of joy and exultation. . . . It was an inspiring scene, the like of which has been rare in the world's history—the representative of a great and powerful government voluntarily surrendering into the hands of a comparatively small nation an authority that might have been withheld had the United States been actuated by the motives which control most nations when they go to war. It was an act of magnanimity and of fidelity to principle that raised higher the flag about to be lowered—it was a moral victory more potent for good than any triumph of arms.—*William J. Bryan in Collier's Weekly.*

The story of our share in wresting Cuba from the ancient Spanish tyranny will thrill humanity for all time. Addressing the Cubans in the special edition issued in their own capital of Havana on July 10, 1898, the day of Spanish evacuation, the *American and Journal* said:

In lending her strength to bring quick victory to Cuba's patriots the great Republic has become clothed with a new greatness. The world has been taught that there exists a na-

tion which—sneered at by the Old World as a material people engrossed wholly in the pursuit of money—is yet capable of rising to the plane of noble sentiment and making war from generous human motives—a nation which places love of liberty above love of money and love of peace. Cuba has been the means of a new baptism for the United States. The hearts of the Republic's people have been enlarged and their minds uplifted and broadened. By what they have done for Cuban liberty they have increased devotion to their own and better qualified themselves to be the guardians of freedom on this hemisphere.

To nations no more than to individual man is it given to dwell always on the mountain top of exalted feeling. But the people of America had their great hour when they drew the sword in knightly unselfishness for bleeding Cuba. That high and imperishable past is ours.—*New York American and Journal, May 20.*

In the history of this country and of civilized government there has never been an event of such splendid significance as that which was witnessed in that island [Cuba] yesterday. A solemn national pledge has been redeemed. A republic has been erected under the authority of the United States, and the possession of the island has been surrendered to that republic under happy auspices. A great work has been accomplished in the cause of human liberty. Where there was monarchical power and tyranny four years ago a republic has arisen. The freedom of Cuba is accomplished—accomplished through the valor of American arms and the wisdom of American statesmanship. No suggestion of territorial aggrandizement swerved the nation from its self-imposed task.—*Senator Fairbanks, of Indiana, in U. S. Senate, May 21.*

By the act of the United States a new nation has been established, a new state born, fully developed and in possession of the complete machinery of orderly gov-

ernment. . . . In view of the misrepresentations of the National purpose made both abroad and at home, it is well to recall what the United States has done for a sister country, and to note the significance of the fact that, for the first time in the history of the world [?] one nation has freed another nation, set it on its feet and bidden it God-speed at the outset of its independent life. At the cost of many millions of dollars, a heavy sacrifice of life, and the facing of perplexing problems, the United States has relieved Cuba of the burden of Spanish misgovernment, from which she has suffered since the discovery of the New World, has given her a chance to frame

her own form of government, and with no restrictions save those which are imposed by good sense and a recognition of the inevitable closeness of the relationship between the island and the continent, has left her to pursue her own course. . . .

The story of our transactions with Cuba will not be complete until Congress has taken proper action on the reciprocity measure. . . . When that measure is passed and the final chapter of the liberation of Cuba and the establishment of its free government is closed, it will be one of the most honorable in the history of the world.—*From editorial on "A Chapter of History" in The Outlook, May 31.*



Religious Liberty in Russia.—The government of Russia has recently been compelled to face the principle of religious liberty, and has at any rate not pronounced against it. Some months ago, at the great annual Mission Conference in Orel, probably the most important religious convention held in Russia in which the laity also participate, a high official, M. Stachowitz, the marshal of the nobility of that governmental department, delivered an address in which he declared that the law forbidding any member of the Orthodox Church to join the "Rascol" (or the sects), or even the Protestant Church, was contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and that its abolition would bring only untold blessings to Russia. As the Mission Conference met chiefly for the purpose of devising ways and means to counteract the growing influence of the Rascol, these sentiments from the chief representative of the nobility of Orel attracted wide attention, and aroused considerable interest in Russia and elsewhere as to the probable action of his colleagues and of the government in the premises. Hitherto the

Government had been enforcing the law against apostasy in a determined manner, Russia being the only one of the European states, save Turkey, that prohibits its people from joining religious communions other than the state church. Only a few years ago the Russian government systematically and persistently persecuted the Lutheran pastors of the three German Baltic provinces for giving spiritual comfort or pastoral service to people claimed by the Orthodox Church. Dozens of Protestant pastors were fined, imprisoned, and some even sent to Siberia. Recently the election of a marshal for the nobility of Orel was again before the colleagues of Stachowitz, and he was re-elected practically without opposition. Many feared that the government would refuse to sanction this choice, but it has, on the contrary, confirmed the election. The protagonist of religious liberty in Russia has accordingly at least not been deprived of this influential position, although the government has not given any positive approval of the principle he so vigorously defended.—*The Independent.*

Continued from second page.]

but also because it brought upon Rome "NEW AND COMPLICATED ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS which she had as yet had no leisure to study." "This unique position laid upon her two Herculean tasks—THE EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT OF THE SUBJECT PEOPLES, and their defense against the barbarian races which swarmed around them on all sides—tasks UNDER WHICH THE OLD REPUBLICAN CONSTITUTION BROKE DOWN." And at last, though "Rome had grown more selfishly exclusive in proportion as the value set upon Roman citizenship increased," SHE HAD TO ADMIT A LARGE NUMBER OF THESE PEOPLE AS CITIZENS IN SPITE OF HERSELF. The more domineering the attitude of the Romans, the greater and deeper became the discontent of the Italians and the louder their demand for "complete amalgamation with Rome, which they had at first resented as a dishonor." "The justice of their claims could hardly be denied, the danger of continuing to ignore them was obvious—yet the difficulties in the way of granting them were formidable in the extreme." Although "the temper of senate and people alike was still jealously exclusive," one popular leader after another in Roman politics "held out promises of relief" until at last there was accomplished a "sudden and enormous enlargement of the citizen body" at the very time when the Republic was least able to carry the burden which its own course had rendered more difficult by far than it would have been at the beginning.

From the first the decay of individual integrity prepared the way for what it brought in the end. In practise the government tended more and more to "become an oligarchy." "The senate, not the assembly, ruled Rome, and both the senate and the magistracies were in the hands of a class." "Office brought wealth and prestige, and both wealth and prestige were liberally employed in securing for this select circle a monopoly of political power." The senate and magistracies became "the mouthpieces of this order [the aristocracy of wealth], and identified with it in interest." "The senate became more and more an organ of the nobility [of wealth], and the nobility became every year more exclusive, more selfish, and less capable." Thus, though "the right of the people to govern was still valid," ALL THE REAL POWERS OF GOVERNMENT WERE HELD BY THE ARISTOCRACY OF WEALTH." "The highest offices of state were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined in fact to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms." "THE ELECTIONS WERE MANAGED BY CLUBS AND COTERIES; and, except on occasions of national danger or political excitement, THOSE WHO SPENT MOST FREELY WERE MOST CERTAIN OF SUCCESS." "MONEY WAS THE ONE THOUGHT from the highest senator to the poorest wretch who sold his vote in the comitia." "The elections, once pure, became matters of annual bargain and sale between the candidates and the voters." "Under these conditions THE CHIEF POWERS OF THE COMMONWEALTH NECESSARILY CENTERED IN THE RICH."

And "while Rome had been extending her sway westward and eastward, while the treasury had been enriched, and while her nobles and merchants were amassing colossal fortunes abroad, the small freeholders throughout the greater part of Italy were sinking deeper into ruin under the pressure of accumulated difficulties. . . . The heavy burden of military service pressed ruinously upon them, and in addition they were called upon TO COMPETE WITH THE FOREIGN CORN IMPORTED FROM BEYOND THE SEA, AND WITH THE FOREIGN SLAVE LABOR PURCHASED BY THE CAPITAL OF WEALTHIER MEN. Farming became unprofitable, and the hard, laborious life with its scanty returns was thrown into still darker relief when compared with the stirring life of the camps with its opportunities of booty, or with the cheap provisions, fre-

quent largesses, and gay spectacles to be had in the large towns. The small holders went off to follow the eagles or swell the proletariat of the cities, and their holdings were left to run waste or merged in the vineyards, oliveyards, and above all in the great cattle farms, of the rich, and their own places were taken by slaves." And in this way, together with governmental grants on very loose terms, of vast tracts of public lands, came into existence the celebrated LAND MONOPOLY, which in the Roman Republic became such an evil as monopolies are becoming in the United States to-day.

"CIVIC EQUALITY AND SOLIDARITY WERE ALIKE DESTROYED BY THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH IN A FEW HANDS, the disappearance of the small independent freeholder, and the growing numbers of freedmen and clients. The Roman community became not only unmanageably large, but HOPELESSLY DIVIDED BY CLASS DISTINCTIONS AND INTERESTS. THE OLD TRADITIONS, BELIEFS, AND USAGES inseparably connected with the republican régime, and essential to its continuance, LOST GROUND DAILY before the incoming flood of new fashions, intellectual and social, from Greece and the East." "ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DISTURBANCE AND DISTRESS" came on, "creating A GROWING FEELING OF DISCONTENT" and causing the advocacy of "SOCIALISTIC SCHEMES." The great result of it all was the division of society into two great parties—"THE PARTY OF PROPERTY AND A PARTY WHO DESIRED A CHANGE IN THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY." Not that there were two parties so named and an issue so styled, but such was the great division in the state and the underlying issue in all the lesser issues over which the parties divided and struggled. And the farther things went the more evident did it become, for the more actual it became, that society was divided into these two parties. And in large outline the history of the Republic from the time these two divisions appeared was a more and more desperate struggle for mastery in the state between these two parties, BOTH OF WHICH, AS THEIR INTERESTS SERVED, DISREGARDED THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS, and when necessary raised riots and accomplished their purposes by violence.

REFORM BY LAW was attempted again and again, the popular party of course leading in such attempts, and making them its rallying cry. The great attempt which stands out above all others was that with which the names of the Gracchi are inseparably linked—the attempt to abolish the land monopoly, and to redistribute the land to the people in small allotments. "It was a scheme which could quote in its favor ancient precedent as well as URGENT NECESSITY." "The senate from the first IDENTIFIED ITSELF WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE WEALTHY OCCUPIERS," CLAIMING TO STAND ON THE CONSTITUTION. But by the socialistic scheme of "the establishment of regular monthly doles of corn" for one class of voters, and by conciliating another with special privileges of getting revenues from a new province, the Gracchi were measurably successful in carrying through their reform. But "even in the lifetime of Caius Gracchus the clause in his brother's law rendering the new holdings inalienable, was repealed, and THE PROCESS OF REABSORPTION RECOMMENCED." But the matter gave rise to a desperate constitutional conflict between the two parties, and, "though the agrarian reform failed, THE POLITICAL CONFLICT IT HAD PROVOKED ENDED ONLY WITH THE DICTATORSHIP OF CÆSAR, and the lines on which it was waged were in the main those laid down by Caius Gracchus."

The course of the two parties—the party of the people and the party of wealth and privilege—inevitably brought on military dictatorship. They quarreled with increasing bitterness, and were controlled more and more by a spirit of violent parti-

zanship. They got into the way of "altering the constitution to suit themselves," and, whenever necessary, "were ominously ready for violent measures." With the people generally there was AN EVER "GROWING INDIFFERENCE TO THE TRADITIONAL POLITICS OF THE REPUBLIC" AND "THE ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTION." Aware of the partisanship and corruption of the political leaders, all classes "became indifferent to the questions which agitated the forum and the curia, and CONTEMPTUOUSLY READY TO ALTER OR DISREGARD THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF WHEN IT STOOD IN THE WAY OF INTERESTS NEARER TO THEIR HEARTS." While the senate and the class it represented eagerly grasped every opportunity to increase their power and to strengthen and fortify them in their position, the popular party reelected its leaders to office and granted its favorites long military commands in violation of the constitution, so that it was often the case that "the populares weakened the Republic even more than they irritated the senate."

But it was a general of the aristocracy, Sulla, who by bringing into the city the legions of the Republic to quell a riotous political quarrel, "first taught political partisans to look for final success, not to a majority of votes in the forum or campus, but to the swords of the soldiery." At first such interferences came only for the purpose of suppressing riots, but they soon taught the significant fact "that the final decision of matters political lay with neither of the two great parties in Rome, but with the holder of the military authority." "The recognition of this fact was fatal to the dignity of politics," and it was not long before the opposing parties practically suspended the constitution and government while they "fought out their quarrels with the sword, under the leadership of generals at the head of legions ready and willing to follow them against their fellow-citizens and against the established authorities of the state." At the same time "class hatreds and personal feuds distracted the community," "life and property were rendered insecure by the brigandage which developed unchecked," and there came some very serious insurrectionary outbreaks. Then came the sanguinary dictatorship of Sulla, which restored order for a time. "The Sullan system stood for nine years, and was then overthrown—as it had been established—by a successful soldier." But the "strong, controlling hand" had not yet come, although it was very near.

It is needless to say anything more, except that in a very short time "THE REPUBLIC WAS POWERLESS IN THE HANDS OF THREE CITIZENS"—Pompey, the great and popular general; Cæsar, who had "won the affections of the populace in Rome," and had come to stand in "the front rank on the popular side," and Crassus, the Morgan of the Republic, "whose colossal wealth and wide financial connections were of inestimable value" to those with whom he was associated. These "three self-constituted rulers of Rome" "divided between them the control of the empire." This coalition was of short duration, but since "THE REPUBLIC COULD NOT STAND ALONE," "anarchy inevitably following the withdrawal of a strong, controlling hand," and since "CENTRALIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY WAS INDISPENSABLE," the dictatorship of Cæsar followed immediately, "with suspension for the time of all constitutional government," with "senate, assembly, and magistrates all alike subordinated to the paramount authority of the dictator." And though "the old constitution was not formally abrogated," and "Cæsar himself, like his successors, professed to hold his authority by the will of the people," THE EMPIRE WAS ESTABLISHED AND THE REPUBLIC WAS GONE FOREVER. For "the assembly which made Pompey and Cæsar found out too late that it could not unmake them." The people who would not govern themselves when they could, now found that they could not govern themselves if they would.

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 NOVEMBER, 1902 No. 12

Sunday legislation denies the right to work.

Where church and state are united the usefulness of both is impaired and the true rights and principles of both are undermined.

If "the right to labor is inherent in every human being," then the right to

disregard every law prohibiting all labor "except works of necessity and charity" is inherent in every human being.

If the right to labor "cannot be surrendered without the sacrifice of individual liberty and of private property," then Sunday legislation requires the sacrifice of individual liberty and of private property one day every week.

Where "the rights of honest toil" are fully respected and protected there can be no legislation prohibiting "common labor," "secular business," or "worldly employment," not even "on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday."

If "there is no right in God's universe comparable to the right of a man to do his work," then the highest right in the universe is denied by Sunday legislation, and every individual has the best right in the universe to disregard such legislation.

A church which receives some special favors from government is never satisfied with what it has, but is always seeking greater favors. The only safe rule for government to follow is to grant no special favors to churches, but to leave them to take care of themselves.

A Sunday-enforcement advocate proclaiming "the rights of honest toil" and denouncing those who infringe them is much like, for instance, a reckless *chauffeur* proclaiming the rights of pedestrians and denouncing those who run people down in the public thoroughfares.

If "freedom of labor lies at the foundation of free institutions," then either American institutions are not free, or else the advocates of Sunday enforcement are

much mistaken in their claim that the "American," "civil Sabbath" lies at the foundation of American institutions.



Mob denial of the right to work is temporary and comes only at infrequent intervals here and there in the country; legislative denial of the right to work is constant and comes as regularly as Sunday throughout the length and breadth of nearly every American commonwealth.



A country in which men are fined and imprisoned by the public authorities for engaging in "common labor" and "worldly employments," and yet in which the military forces are called out to protect men in the right to work, must have a very serious flaw somewhere in its governmental machinery.



If "no man has a right to say to any other man when or where he shall work," then no man has a right to say to any other man that he shall not work on Sunday, and no citizen can delegate any authority whatever to legislators and officials to pass and enforce any law prohibiting any man from working on Sunday.



If the matter of working or refraining from work "is a question which is in the domain of conscience, and involves the personal liberty of the individual," then Sunday legislation, without any reference whatever to its religious character, invades the domain of conscience and violates the personal liberty of the individual.



Persecution and governmental tyranny are great evils, but there is nothing that can equal them in teaching men what is the proper relation between church and state, what is the proper length and breadth of governmental power and au-

thority, and what are the fundamental and inalienable rights of human beings. The long absence of persecution and governmental tyranny seems to mean also an absence of keen discernment in these other matters. And so it is that people who have freedom are often blind to the first steps toward persecution and tyranny, and are insensible to their coming until it is too late to stay them.



The right to work, like every other right, is limited by other rights and the rights of others. The right to work is not the only right there is, and the man who wants to work is not the only man who has rights that must be respected. So it is not to be understood that even the inalienable right to work carries with it any right to disregard the rights of others. If by working on Sunday a man interferes with the rights of others it is of course right that he should be stopped. And so it is that if a man invades the rights of others by working at other times he may justly be required to desist. When workingmen are obliged to go on a strike in order to secure their just rights and proper and decent conditions of life for their wives and children, it is not to be doubted that those who take their places and thus defeat their effort for justice and make certain the continuance of the old conditions, are not having a proper regard for the rights of others, however much they may prize their own. A man has a just claim to liberty and freedom of action only so long as he acts in harmony with the just rights of his fellows. And so a man has the right to work on Sunday only so long as he does not violate any right of others in so doing. But of course that work which is done in disregard of the arbitrary and unjust demands of labor organizations is no invasion of the rights of others; and that labor which, under

the same circumstances, is not on Wednesday a violation of the rights of others, cannot be such a violation on Sunday.



The Rumor Denied "with Authority"

THE action of the Wisconsin Methodist Conference in sending a communication to President Roosevelt relative to the report that he had asked the Pope to make Archbishop Ireland a cardinal, called forth a denial of some warmth from *The Independent*, which seems to act as the special champion and defender of both the Government and the Papacy in matters of this character. And in so far as such championship is exercised in the interests of fairness and truth, it is of course perfectly proper and commendable.

In its issues of September 25 and October 9 *The Independent* declared "with authority" that "there is no truth in the report that President Roosevelt has asked the Pope to create Archbishop Ireland a cardinal;" that "President Roosevelt has offered no such impertinent intimation to the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome;" that "the President could not be guilty of such an impertinence and has not been;" and that "neither would Archbishop Ireland be a party to such an interference of our Government with purely ecclesiastical matters." But *The Independent* did not seem quite so positive with reference to another report that "comes from Rome that President Cleveland in his last term asked for Archbishop Ireland's nomination to the cardinalate, and that it would then have been given but for the fact that Monsignor Satolli, then Apostolic Delegate at Washington, had the first claim." *The Independent* mildly observed that "this last rumor seems quite improbable."

While we do not question for an instant *The Independent's* positive declara-

tion that President Roosevelt has not done what it was rumored he had done, we do not believe for an instant the added declaration that Archbishop Ireland would not "be a party to such an interference of our Government with purely ecclesiastical matters." If *The Independent* has anything to offer in support of this declaration, it should offer it, for there are things of public notoriety for years back that go to show exactly the opposite, at least which show that the Archbishop has no scruples against interfering in his capacity as an ecclesiastic in purely political and governmental matters, whatever may be his scrupulosity with regard to governmental interference in "purely ecclesiastical matters."

The Independent said the report which it authoritatively denied was so absurd and ridiculous on the face of it that, until the action by the Wisconsin Methodists, it could take no notice of it except to laugh at it. But though it deigned only to be amused at a report which reflected so seriously upon the President of the United States, a report which, whether true or false, could not be a humorous matter, fortunately, to most people, *The Independent* was at once greatly sobered and distressed by "a ridiculous little ecclesiastical outbreak among our Methodist brethren," and proceeded to mete out quick and stern treatment to those who had shown such readiness "to give currency and disguised credence to a damaging report relating to the Catholic Church." And the editorial treatment administered was not without some features that remind one strongly of the sort of ebullitions which *The Independent* a short time ago was strongly reprobating in some of its Roman Catholic contemporaries, who were also wrought up over the "quite too ready" disposition which they thought they saw in various quarters to give currency and credence to

"vile slanders" and damaging reports "relating to the Catholic Church" and some of its representatives.

So it was declared that these Methodists, in giving credence and currency to this "canard" as they did, were guilty of an "impertinence of which they ought not to have been guilty," and it was intimated quite directly that they had thereby insulted the President, and that they and all others who give credence to this and other "such vile slanders" "about the Catholic Church," are fools and destitute of "Christian charity." It is admitted, "presumably," that some of such persons may have "Christian hearts," but it is asked, "How can we credit them with being guided by intelligent heads?"

Now perhaps all this is all right and just what the circumstances called for, but it does not leave one's mind as clear and contented about this matter as it ought to be left. For instance: In view of the fact that Archbishop Ireland has been enabled to make such improper and unwarrantable intrusions and interferences in governmental affairs, notably at the time of the opening of the Spanish-American war and more recently in connection with a matter pertaining to the government of the Philippines, for it has been declared in *The Independent* itself that it was due to the scheming of Archbishop Ireland that the American "mission" was sent to the Vatican,—we say, in view of this fact which admits of scarcely any escape from the conclusion that not only very intimate but improper relations have been sustained at different times between the Archbishop as an ecclesiastic and the highest authorities at Washington; and in view of the further facts that the rumor was not only a repeated rumor at this time which met with no denial, and that a very similar rumor has been circulated from time to time without denial for several years past, it

being declared at one time that the predecessor of President Roosevelt had "authorized Secretary Hay to inform the Pope of Archbishop Ireland's great service to this country in guiding Catholic opinion and sentiment when this country was at war with a Roman Catholic country" and to urge "the Vatican to confer on the Archbishop of St. Paul such honors as the Church could on a 'worthy and accomplished son,'" and that "the late Senator Davis wrote a similar letter at the same time,"—we say, in view of all this, yes, and in view of the further fact that the Government has taken the unprecedented and astonishing step of sending a representative to the Vatican and negotiating with the Pope, why should it be considered such an inexcusable and outrageous thing to give some credence to the repeated and undenied report that the American President had intimated to the Pope that he would be pleased to see Archbishop Ireland made a cardinal? And if under these circumstances writing publicly to the President to inquire if there was any truth in the rumor and to express disapproval of what it affirmed, was such a terribly impertinent and insulting thing, what was it for Archbishop Ireland and any others who may have been concerned to do things which not only made such a rumor possible, but gave to what it affirmed an aspect of the greatest probability? We do not ask what it was for Archbishop Ireland and those who serve him to promote and foster such rumors and to plan and work by every hook and crook for the accomplishment of the utterly un-American and unconstitutional thing which the rumor affirmed, but if we are to judge from the facts that are public and known, we must conclude that if all the facts in the matter were known this question would be very pertinent and proper. And if these Methodists must be reprov'd so severely

for their "impertinence," why is it that the really serious and dangerous impertinence of Archbishop Ireland in intruding himself as an ecclesiastic in governmental affairs, has been passed by without any reproof at all from *The Independent*? With relation to *The Independent's* fling at the intelligence of those who do not look at the Papacy through its glasses, we may say that they who declare that "the mission of Governor Taft to Rome was *thoroughly successful*," as *The Independent* has declared, are themselves afflicted either with intellectual deficiency or intellectual perversity.

We have no doubt that many people are altogether too quick to believe anything that is evil of the Catholic Church and its representatives, that many are over-prejudiced against and too suspicious of it and them, and it is not at all improbable that these things might have had something to do with the action of the Wisconsin Methodists. But we are certain that the attitude of *The Independent* will not do much to remove and allay such prejudice and suspicion. *The Independent's* persistent attitude, in the face of things which plainly show otherwise, that there is no danger whatever in this country of the Catholic Church, through its leaders of course, trying to obtain favor and prestige with the civil authorities in contravention of the principle of separation of church and state, and that only ignorant fanatics can discover such danger, and its extreme sensitiveness not only to criticisms and reflections upon the Catholic Church and its representatives, but to inquiry and action with reference to things in which they are concerned that are eminently proper subjects for inquiry and action, is better calculated to lead people to suspect that for some reason or other *The Independent* cannot deal fairly and fearlessly with such matters, than it is to remove any unjust

suspicion regarding "the Church" and its representatives.

If *The Independent* would display the same promptness and vigor in going after and dealing with the serious and dangerous ecclesiastical outbreaks that nobody can doubt are at the bottom of this long-repeated rumor indicative of intimate and improper relations between Archbishop Ireland and the high authorities of the Government, which in its latest form it seems anxious to dismiss quickly with a mere denial, that it has displayed in dealing with "a *ridiculous little* ecclesiastical outbreak among our Methodist brethren," it would be doing better service to the country and to mankind in general than it is.



How America Oppresses the Jews

WE have indicated elsewhere in this issue that in one important particular the Sabbath-observing Jew in the United States is as much subject to "Christian" oppression as are his kindred in Rumania. This may seem like a hard saying, but fortunately it does not have to depend upon any argument or assertion of ours.

A short time ago there was considerable comment and discussion relative to the proposition, which seemed to have strong endorsement, in Jewish ranks to forsake the observance of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment and to substitute Sunday observance in its stead. Some saw in this an indication that the Jews were coming over to Christianity, and others saw other things. But there was one thing in it all that might have been seen, and that should be seen and emphasized, that nobody, not even the Jews, seemed to see very clearly, though it stood out as plainly as could be, and was unwittingly stated by many who had

their attention fixed upon other phases of the matter. That thing is the fact that we have stated—the fact that in the United States the Jew has not full religious freedom, but is compelled by law (of course this is on the supposition that the law is enforced) to observe a religious institution in which he has no faith, and is made to suffer no inconsiderable hardship in consequence.

One of the unwitting testimonies from prominent sources to the truth of what we have stated is the following from an editorial that appeared in the Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution* about the time the Conference of American Rabbis was in session in New Orleans in July:

Construing the Decalogue strictly, the seventh day of the week is the only day which the Jews are authorized under the Old Testament Scriptures to observe as the Sabbath, but on account of the action of the Christian nations of the globe in adopting the first day of the week as the Sabbath by authority of the New Testament Scriptures, *the Jews are compelled by reason of this fact to desist from secular employment of all kinds on the first day of the week, and being compelled by statutory enactments to observe the Christian Sabbath, they have consequently grown lax and indifferent in regard to the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. They reject the New Testament Scriptures, which enjoin the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but unfortunately they are the victims of conditions against which they are powerless.* Of course religious services are held in the synagogues on the seventh day, and the rabbis insist with great earnestness upon the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, but the great mass of the Hebrew population, *feeling it an imposition to observe the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sabbath both, continue to transact business in the marts of trade on the seventh day of the week, the same as on other days, and for the reason that the seventh day is an exceedingly busy day in the world of commerce there are comparatively few Jews who are willing to sacrifice the seventh day when they are compelled to sacrifice the first day also.* [Italics supplied.]

The *Constitution* concluded with the

statement that "numerous signs in the sky induce weather prophets to believe that conditions are such that the Jews will eventually find it to be the part of wisdom to adopt the Christian Sabbath and chime in with the balance of the world in yielding obedience to the command of Holy Writ, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.'"

Though reference is made to "the Christian nations of the globe," the above is, of course, a setting forth of the condition that obtains in the United States. And it is true to the facts, and none the less valuable as testimony from the fact that it was evidently given with practically no realization of its deeper meaning. Although we have emphasized some of the points in the quotation, it is worth while to take a good look at them again. Here is the situation:

1. The Jew is required by the Decalogue and the book which is to him the book of divine guidance and of authority in religion, to observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. Such observance is therefore with him a religious duty of the first importance.

2. He is "compelled by statutory enactment"—by the power and authority of the state—"to observe the Christian Sabbath"—"to desist from secular employment of all kinds on the first day of the week."

3. He is thus compelled to choose between violating the Decalogue, between violating his conscience and forsaking one of the most important institutions of his religion, and the hardship, very properly termed an "imposition," of observing two days each week, of sacrificing, and again a very proper term is used, one-sixth of the time that he has for secular business.

4. He and his fellow-religionists are thus "the victims of conditions against which they are powerless," and the result

is that before the constantly-exerted pressure upon him by the command of the state that he "observe the Christian Sabbath," of which his "Christian" fellow-citizens refuse to relieve him, his conscience is yielding, and the great institution of his religion that his fathers have observed clear back to the days of Moses and Abraham is being relinquished and forsaken.

It requires nothing more to exhibit the shameful thing that is here all too apparent. Even that peculiar and common blindness by which men fail to see the evil and wrong that is near at hand and with which they themselves are connected, while perceiving clearly the evil and wrong that is distant and with which others are connected, is hardly sufficient to hide the fact from any American that in this thing to which we have called attention the Jew is dealt with exactly as he is dealt with in Rumania. His "opportunity to win a livelihood" is constricted and denied by at least one public act which attacks "the inherent right of man as a bread-winner" as certainly as do the public acts of Rumania which have brought forth the just protest of the American Secretary of State. And this restriction is due to "the difference of religious creeds and confessions." It has no warrant nor basis in the needs of civil order and public welfare, but is wholly religious. It exists in America as in other countries because "the Christian nations of the globe" have arbitrarily taken it upon themselves, "by authority of the New Testament Scriptures," to enforce "by statutory enactments" the observance of "the Christian Sabbath."

Is it said that Sunday laws are not designed to oppress Jews, and do not especially apply to them? The Rumanians say that their oppressive legislation is not designed to oppress Jews, and that it does not especially apply to them, and in most

instances their contention is just as well grounded as can be any with reference to Sunday legislation.

We have said that by Sunday legislation the Jew is compelled to choose between two alternatives, one of which is to violate his conscience by disregarding the Sabbath. But in so far as showing deference to and observing a religious institution in which he has no belief, and which, to him, is not only an institution of a religion that is especially offensive to him, but is one of the most important, and in practical affairs the most important, thing in which the rivalry of that religion to his own is shown—we say, that in so far as such a thing can be a violation of conscience the Jew is left no choice whatever. He is simply compelled to violate his conscience.

Note another point: "The seventh day is an exceedingly busy day in the world of commerce" and "in the marts of trade." The Sabbath-observing Jew, in obedience to his religion, in obedience to the Decalogue, ceases all secular employment on the day which in the lines of business in which he usually engages is the busiest day of the week. Thus, for the sake of his religion, his conscientious convictions, he suffers what is undoubtedly quite a handicap in business and in earning a livelihood. And then, after having lost the best day in the week for trade and business, which would seem to give him a special right to ply his calling on all other days of the week, he is compelled by law "to desist from secular employments of all kinds" on another day of the week, for no other reason than that the more numerous adherents of another system of religion insist that the day which they regard as holy shall be enforced upon all. The injustice of the thing is too obvious for argument, and on this one point there is no greater injustice done to the Jew in Rumania.

And, of course, there are others besides Jews who suffer as he does in this respect, but it is only his case that we are considering here. And, lest there be any misunderstanding, we will say that the idea here is not that the Jews and other seventh-day observers are the only sufferers under Sunday legislation. Such legislation is in violation of the rights of every citizen, and is an attack upon "the inherent right" of every man "as a breadwinner," an unwarrantable restriction of every man's "opportunity to win a livelihood." But, of course, as can be readily seen, the injustice and oppression of the thing is especially felt by those whose consciences require them to observe some other day as the Sabbath than that which is decreed by the state.

So one very important thing connected with the agitation among American Jews for the transfer from Sabbath observance to Sunday observance should bring very forcibly to the minds of American citizens the shameful fact that in the United States,* in the one nation where perfect religious freedom is supposed to obtain, and from which so recently has gone forth a protest against the oppression of the Jews in Rumania, the Jews are being virtually compelled by law to forsake the Sabbath that they and their fathers have always observed, and to adopt in its stead the "Christian Sabbath."



Porto Ricans and Filipinos Classified as Aliens

THE status of the ten millions or more people who have recently come under the authority of the American Republic still remains "in the air," or rather it becomes more and more evident that that status is to be and is one of subjection and not citizenship. Very significant and noteworthy in this matter was an order sent out early in August by the Commission-

er-General of Immigration to the collectors of customs, immigrant inspectors, and other officials charged with the administration of the immigrant laws, and a decision rendered in the United States Circuit Court in New York on October 8.

The order with regard to immigrants, which was issued in pursuance of a ruling by the Secretary of the Treasury, informed those to whom it was addressed that "the provisions of the laws regulating immigration, including those which prescribe payment of the head tax, apply to the residents and natives of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands," and that "the citizens and residents of the said islands, therefore, should be admitted to the United States upon the same conditions and subject to the same examinations as are enforced against people from countries over which the United States claims no right of sovereignty whatever." Isabella Gonzales, a Porto Rican woman, was refused admittance to the country at New York very shortly after this order was issued. A writ of habeas corpus was at once obtained, alleging that she was a citizen of the United States and unlawfully excluded. The matter was argued before Judge Lacombe in the United States Circuit Court, who dismissed the writ, holding that "the act of Congress fixing the civil rights of native Porto Ricans has certainly not operated to effect a naturalization of the petitioner as a citizen of the United States."

Even such a journal as the *New York Mail and Express* feels that this condition of affairs should not continue, and permits itself these observations in commenting on the above decision:

Legislation is much needed to establish the official status of the people of our island dependencies. Citizenship is denied to our Porto Rican brethren. . . . As matters stand the Porto Ricans enjoy our protection when they

are not under the Stars and Stripes much more distinctly than they do when they are in the United States. [Porto Ricans and Filipinos are entitled to passports as American citizens when traveling to foreign countries, according to the ruling of the Department of State.—ED. SENTINEL.] They are not American citizens. They are Porto Rican citizens; that fact means nothing outside of Porto Rico, but our Government has undertaken, rather as a matter of grace than otherwise, their protection when they are in foreign countries. We certainly have no moral right to deprive them of a country altogether.

But what "we" have no moral right to do seems to be exactly the thing "we" have done.

But a definition of citizenship is being formulated whereby the Porto Ricans and Filipinos can be called citizens and said to have citizenship while still being held as subjects—a definition which "avoids the objectionable inference in the word subject, and prevents confusion by confounding citizenship necessarily with the possession of political rights." Thus it is said that citizenship has two meanings. "In its broad sense it simply means subjection and allegiance on the part of an individual to a certain government or state, and protection on the part of that government to the person in question. In this meaning it is equivalent to the term 'subjection' used in the English common law, because both citizenship in a broad sense and subjection involve the same requisites." "The other meaning of the term 'citizenship' is that of a person possessing certain political rights, *i. e.*, a burgess. It is the confounding of this meaning of the word with the other that has caused so much confusion." "Applying these general principles to the inhabitants of Porto Rico, it would seem that they are certainly *citizens in the broad sense*—passive citizenship, as it has been called." But it is observed that the term "subjection," which is indispensable in defining and describing the

"broad," "passive citizenship" that the Porto Ricans "certainly" have, "has gone out of fashion *because usually it is connected with monarchic governments*, and therefore is scarcely used save in Great Britain."

Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., the eminent lawyer, expresses the opinion that "there is a difference between the Porto Rican born before the Treaty of Paris and the Porto Rican born afterwards," holding that by virtue of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution those born after the island came under the jurisdiction and authority of the United States are citizens of the United States. This is a distinction, however constitutional it may be, that is not likely to be respected, if we may judge from the way things have gone thus far.

All this, as far as it goes, shows that the Republic of the United States is repeating the history of the Republic of Rome. The Roman Republic extended its authority over peoples whom it persisted in holding as aliens. And the Romans did not know, but they learned later, that instead of getting rid of an experiment which they deemed dangerous to the welfare of the state in thus disregarding the very genius of republicanism, they were merely postponing it from the day of union and strength, when they might have borne it, to the day of division and weakness when they were not only least able to bear it, but when it had become greatly aggravated by long discontent and resentment on the part of those who were denied citizenship. At last, when the Republic was reeling with fierce factional and party strife and war, the Romans were obliged, and some of them were very eager, as it served their temporary ends as political partisans, to make a "sudden and enormous enlargement of the citizen body which affected the very foundations of the Republic."—

Encyclopedia Britannica. But the enfranchisement of the Italians would not have been anything like the serious matter that it was had it been done in obedience to principle when it could freely and honorably have been done, instead of being put off until it could not be helped, when it was done regardless of principle to serve the ends of some of the leaders in the republican-wrecking political strife. In all this there is a lesson for the United States.



The Leading Issues in France and England

THE great question in each of the respective countries awaiting the action of the French and English parliaments when they assembled about the middle of October was a church-and-state question. And curiously enough, while the French premier desired endorsement and support for governmental "opposition" to "the church" in the matter of education, the English premier stood greatly in need of endorsement and support for governmental favor to "the church" in the matter of education.

The French parliament heartily endorsed the enforcement of the Associations Law against the monastic schools and religious orders. The question of authorizing and reopening the suppressed schools is to be voted upon later. Premier Combes indicated that there was to be no compromise on his part in the anti-clerical campaign by demanding supplementary legislation against the religious orders.

No action has been taken by the English parliament with regard to the now famous "Education Bill." But action has been taken quite vigorously throughout the country during the last month or so with reference to it. A dispatch says

"the country is split into bitterly opposing camps which flood the papers with speeches and letters" on the subject, and that "the October reviews are bristling with articles on this burning question." The non-conformists have declared that they will "go to prison rather than pay the rates levied in support of church schools," and it is said that the entire Liberal party has "found common ground of action in the democratic cry, 'If the people pay, the people, not the Church, must manage.'" The Congregational Union has protested strongly against the measure, and the British Baptist Union recently "adopted by an overwhelming majority" a resolution "declaring that the government's Education Bill violates the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and pledging the members of the Union to a determined endeavor to make the measure, if enacted, ineffective, and to suffer distraint of property rather than pay the school rate." And at a great popular demonstration at Leeds recently "a hundred thousand people united in a resolution condemning the Education Bill (1) because it deprives men and women who have hitherto elected or served upon a school board of the constitutional rights which for thirty years they have enjoyed; (2) because it abolishes popular control of the schools for which the people are rated and taxed; (3) because it weakens the guarantee of efficiency, progress, and liberty in national education, and (4) because it proposes to levy local rates everywhere in support of sectarian dogmas."

The "government" is seriously troubled by the popular opposition to the measure which it has espoused and advanced so far toward becoming a law, but its spokesmen declare that the bill cannot be withdrawn since it would mean "the downfall of the present cabinet." In a public ad-

dress on the subject Mr. Chamberlain has "acknowledged that the bill was not perfect," and declared that "personally he had always been in favor of governmental provision for secular education only," but that "rightly or wrongly, however, the majority of voters require that religious instruction of some kind be given to the children." And he thinks the present bill is the best way to meet that requirement. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach in a public speech has given warning that "the courts know how to deal with those who, by refusing to pay the rates, range themselves on the side of anarchy."

It is said that "not since the days of the Irish Home Rule bill has any government measure in England created such widespread excitement and fierce opposition" as the Education Bill. It is thought that the bill will be modified somewhat so that the matter can be compromised. "Moderate Churchmen are suggesting that the chief difficulty can be removed by restricting religious instruction to the Bible and the authorized catechism, and by excluding ritualistic manuals and other extreme works." It seems that the bill as it stands is most decidedly partial to the Established Church.



Tardy and Ill-Discerning Alarm

THE rumor that, as one phase of the negotiations between the American Government and the Papacy, the President of the United States was officially interesting himself in behalf of Archbishop Ireland's cardinalate ambition, produced in some quarters, where evidently very little alarm over the matter had previously existed, a very lively sense of the grave dangers of such negotiations. Not only was it then seen that the negotiations at Rome should not have taken place, but

it was declared that there should be no further negotiations anywhere between the Government and the Papacy. It seems strange that those who are now so alarmed could not have seen in the first place, when the project of opening such negotiations and sending a "mission" to Rome was broached, that in the very nature of things it was a dangerous step, and could very naturally involve just such things as this matter of minor importance that was rumored.

And we note, too, that one great religious journal that became so stirred over the thought "that any President or any political party should permit the friends of Archbishop Ireland to use them" in accomplishing his purpose to become a cardinal, which it declared "would be the most astounding act in the history of American politics," is one of the organs of a great religious denomination that insists constantly that civil officials shall be used throughout the length and breadth of the land in compelling the observance of the "Sabbath," a church institution, and which in the summer of 1892 was in the very forefront with other great denominations of the country in intimidating Congress into the enactment of a law declaring the day which they proclaimed to be the "Sabbath" to be, indeed, the "Christian Sabbath," and enforcing, in a specific instance, deference to it as such. Immediately following that it was the boast of the "Protestant" church-and-state element of the country, of which the denomination to which we refer was a most important part, that they had "learned that we [the church party] hold the United States Senate in our hands." There was a "most astounding" instance, indeed, of the use of statesmen and politicians by churchmen for an ecclesiastical purpose, and until the Methodists repudiate their part in that thing and cease their advocacy of state

enforcement of the church's "Sabbath" institution, their protests regarding such matters as these of the President and Archbishop Ireland and the negotiations with the Papacy will have very little force and consistency.

And who shall say that that decision of the Supreme Court in 1892, declaring the United States to be "a Christian nation" governmentally, over which the "Protestant" church-and-state element rejoiced greatly; that the enactment of Congress, to which we have referred, that was passed at the behest and threat of this same church-and-state element; and the constant and growing insistence by churches and religious organizations that state and municipal authorities shall enforce "Sabbath" observance and shall yield more and more to church control—we say, who shall say that these things have not broken down the barriers of principle and prepared the way for just such things as intimate relations between the Papacy and the Government, and the use of the Government by papal prelates to advance the interests of themselves and their church? Is it any more dangerous, any more violative of fundamental American principles, for the Papacy and her agents to "use" the Government than it is for "Protestant" churches to get together and "use" the Government? The thing is equally papal in both cases. And because the "Protestant" bodies will not recognize the papal character of these things that they have done and are doing, and persist in continuing in the same evil way, it is quite certain that they will yet see much more "astounding" things with regard to the Papacy and the Government than they now behold.

In Russia the percentage of Jews allowed to attend the universities is being continually reduced. At the universities

of Charkov and Dorpat the percentage of Jewish students admitted has recently been reduced to only 3 per cent. of the whole, whereas it was once 10 per cent.

♦ Governor Taft on the Vatican Negotiations

ON his arrival in the Philippines late in August Governor-General Taft made a public statement regarding his negotiations with the Vatican. This statement was published in this country about the first of October, and since it is a clear setting forth of the matter, and cannot be regarded as unfair either toward the Government or the Papacy, we present it entire as it appeared in *The Independent* of October 2:

After an audience with the Pope, the instructions [of the President] were referred to a committee of cardinals, and an answer was given me agreeing generally with all the purposes stated in the instructions, which included, among other things, the purchase of the friars' lands by the Government.

This answer proposed that further negotiation be had between an apostolic delegate and myself in Manila. With the hope of having less to do in Manila, and by authority of the Secretary, I replied by suggesting to the Pope the form of a contract to be signed in Rome submitting the questions at issue to a tribunal of arbitration, to consist of two members appointed by the Pope, two by this Government, and the fifth to be appointed by the Viceroy of India. The questions were:

First—The price to be paid for the friars' lands.

Second—The price to be paid for the occupation of parish churches and convents by American troops.

Third—The disposition of educational and charitable trusts, including the San José College case.

The contract included a covenant that the members of the four great religious orders, who were all Spaniards, should leave the islands in two years after the first payment was made for the lands, and that only secular priests or non-Spanish members of the regular clergy should act as parish priests.

The Vatican agreed to sign such a contract excepting the last covenant, which it declined to sign, first, because it related to the administration of religious matters not the proper subject of a commercial contract; second, because by signing such a covenant it would give just offense to Spain, whose subjects these friars were, and as such were entitled to remain in the islands under the Treaty of Paris, and because the Vatican did not wish to give countenance to what were regarded as the exaggerated charges against them.

Instead of this, however, the Pope said, through Cardinal Rampolla, that he intended to reorganize the Church in the islands, to recall the friars now in the islands from political intermeddling to the institutes of their order, to provide ecclesiastical education to natives so that the priesthood should ultimately be entirely native, and now to introduce priests of other nationality than Spanish, chiefly from the United States, into the islands. He said that the money for the lands would go to the Church for the benefit of the Church in the Philippines, and not to the orders, and he finally reiterated what had been said earlier in the correspondence, that no priest would be sent to any parish in the islands whom a majority of the Catholics of the parish did not wish to receive.

In view of the unwillingness of the Vatican to enter into a contract for the definite removal of the Spanish friars, the Secretary of War was unwilling to enter into a contract obligating the Philippine Government and the American Government to pay such indefinite sums without further investigation, and preferred to recur to the original method of negotiation proposed by the Vatican through an apostolic delegate, who is to visit the islands with authority to sell the lands, to settle the rentals due, and to agree upon the question of charitable and educational trusts. This basis was agreed to, and negotiations are to be continued here after all the data necessary have been submitted by the representative of the Church to the Government.

It will thus be seen that the negotiations upon many of the issues are only begun, though the sale of the lands has been approved, and that upon the question of the return of the friars to the parishes the matter is completely in the hands of the people of each parish for a settlement by a quiet, peaceable and lawful expression of their desire to receive or not to receive any priest. . . .

The Secretary of War holds the opinion, in which I concur, that the basis of agreement and friendly co-operation reached in Rome is a long step toward a solution of the difficult questions presented, which will in the end be entirely satisfactory to the people of the Philippine Islands, and in whose interests solely the mission to Rome was undertaken.



By what can scarcely be regarded as anything but persecution it seems that Mr. W. T. Gibson, whose recent trial for Sunday labor was reported last month, is to be made to respect and observe Sunday to the extent of ceasing labor on that day. He is a dealer in coke. On a recent Sunday morning, while engaged with two men in his employ in bagging coke at the works of the coke and gas company in Malden, Mass., for which he had the full and hearty permission of the president of the company, he was visited by two policemen who informed him that they had "orders to tell you that this is Sunday, and that you must not work on the Lord's Day." Mr. Gibson replied that Sunday was not the Lord's day to him and that he would continue the work so long as the president of the company was willing that he should. The officers then went away, seeming to give no heed to the fact that there were a number of men in the employ of the coke and gas company hard at work, and that the crushing mill was in full operation. They evidently went to the president of the company, for he soon came to Mr. Gibson and told him that while he could see no reason why he should not proceed with the work in which he was engaged, and while he himself had no objection whatever, that since the officers were after him it might be best for him to stop working on Sunday at the plant "until this blows over," adding that if he did not do so it might cause the company and its men to get into trouble over the matter of Sunday work. Mr. Gibson of course complied with the desire of the

president. On his way home he met one of the officers, who said he did not want to arrest him and so went to the president and requested him to have Mr. Gibson stop work, adding to Mr. Gibson, "You are the man they are after." Mr. Gibson thinks the action of the police was inspired by rival dealers who desire to annoy him in his business. Whether that be so or not, it is evidently a very unjust proceeding, and one that would not be possible but for the un-American "Lord's Day" statute. While spending that afternoon in enforced idleness Mr. Gibson passed on a public street a gang of men engaged with shovels, picks, engines, and derricks in putting in water mains. And yet he, a man who had already fulfilled the law, since he had observed the preceding day, could not be allowed to bag coke in a place remote from public view! But this is the way in which Sunday statutes are chiefly used, for it is what comports best with their essential character. They are meant to enforce respect for the religious Sunday, and of course more is accomplished in that direction when one who observes another day and has no respect for the religious character of Sunday is made to bow to it, than when one who observes no day at all, but does not dispute or deny its religious character, is compelled to observe it. It is not nearly so terrible for a nominal Sunday observer to work on that day as it is for a seventh day observer, because in the latter case the work is looked upon as the manifestation of religious dissent, and that, in the light of the spirit and character of Sunday legislation, is the one unpardonable offense.



Whatever may be the virtues of Catholicism, it seems to possess in a degree exceeding that of any other system of religion or form of belief the faculty of imparting to or developing in its adherents

a disposition which at one and the same time takes for itself the widest latitude in denouncing and defaming those who differ from it in belief while refusing to accord any latitude whatever to them for criticism of itself and its belief. This disposition is summed up in the one word, intolerance. This thought is suggested by two recent incidents in France. The writer, Emile Zola, who during his lifetime took leave to differ from and to think independently of "the Church," was scarcely cold in death before Roman Catholic priests and monks began "informing their flocks that the infamous Zola, pursued by celestial vengeance, has crowned his earlier crimes by the supreme one of taking his own life." In his native town of Tréguier, in Brittany, a statue is to be erected in honor of the eminent *savant*, Ernest Renan. The proposal to do this evoked at once from the curé of the parish and the bishop of the diocese an attempt to prevent the carrying out of the project. Renan was once a Catholic, but became a freethinker, and this, with the liberal addition of such epithets as "renegade" and "impious blasphemer," is being proclaimed to the people by the bishop in his efforts to incense them against the project to erect the statue. The curé sent a letter of protest to the mayor of the town, and received a dignified reply advising him to confine his activities to their proper sphere and to rest assured that the municipality was able to attend to its own affairs, and warning him that he would succeed only in injuring himself and the interests committed to his care by raising his voice against "the great act of tolerance to be performed." All other efforts seeming not to avail, the bishop at last threatened that if the statue was erected he would suspend the *pardon*, the great annual event among the "faithful" of Brittany, which occurs on the 19th of May each

year. The narrowness and bigotry of all this is perfectly apparent to most people in this country, and yet many to whom it is apparent frequently exhibit an attitude that is the same in one important respect. If it is proper to demand that the civil authorities shall "protect" the "Sabbath" and prevent its "desecration," then assuredly it is proper to demand that they shall refuse to confer any honors upon freethinkers and unbelievers, and the spirit which demands the one is in no essential respect different from the spirit that demands the other. The principle of action is the same in both cases, resting upon the assumption that the state must render special favor and protection to "the church." The reply which the mayor of this Brittany town gave to the curé is the sort of a reply that it would be very proper for mayors and other civil officials throughout the United States to make to clergymen and church people who are constantly appealing to them for Sunday enforcement.



The grewsome list of great crimes committed in New York City promises to be a long one for the year 1902. Recently four of these crimes that followed one another in close succession were not only murders, but were marked by circumstances which gave to them such an atrocious character that they tend to give to mere murder the aspect of a minor crime. Naturally such things are causing some comment. *Harper's Weekly* attempts to argue that the very fact that the papers report so conspicuously so many crimes and are able to make such sensations of the greater ones, is evidence that crime is exceedingly unusual and abnormal in society. It argues that if crime were common it would not be reported and could not be made a matter of sensation in the newspapers, but that the very fact that the great body of the people read of these

crimes with avidity and are greatly shocked by them, is evidence that instead of being representative of what society really is they are representative of what it is the farthest from being. This is a shrewd argument, but it is neither adequate nor satisfactory. A popular writer finds that the cause of the four crimes mentioned was "very primitive," and thinks that "Manhattan is assisting at a relapse of nature." He says that the "beast" which "sprang" in "primitive man" has been "quelled" by "civilized man," but that nevertheless "the beast is here still; he is in us all, but so tame that the majority of us forget that he is about, and it takes a few murders like these to remind us of it." The persons who committed these crimes were moved by "the most primitive of human emotions" and "lapsed into the animal state." And so, "though primitive times have gone, primitive man remains." This last is a very wise statement, if meant in the true sense, and leaves no place for the nonsensical idea that "primitive man" and "civilized man" are two utterly different beings. Primitive man, that is man as he was in the earliest times of which there exists historical knowledge, does most certainly remain, and he remains in every man, not alone in those who commit terrible crimes. He remains with as much "beast" in him as he ever had, and perhaps a little more. Man has the same nature, impulses, emotions, desires, aspirations, and possibilities to-day that he has ever had. If he chooses he can become as much of a "beast" to-day as ever any of his ancestors were; and if he chooses he can become as much of a man as any of them were, but not one whit more than many of them were. It should not require the lesson taught by these frequent and terrible crimes to convince men that man is to-day essentially what he was at the dawn of human history.

In the Roman Republic conquest abroad prepared the way for conquest at home. The use of the military power abroad to crush opposition and resistance taught many of the leaders in the state that legions were far more effective and direct in settling disputes than arguments, and it accustomed them to asserting their own will and having it carried out regardless of the rights and wishes of others. And so when they became involved in the political strife of Rome they naturally turned to the legions of the Republic, and at the least pretext used them in the place of arguments, speeches, and votes. The warning has already been sounded in the United States that somewhat similar results might issue from America's subjugation of the Filipinos. But it was hardly to have been expected that so soon that warning would have been justified and its philosophy shown to be true by such a pronouncement as the following by one of the leading journals of the country. This is an editorial which appeared at the head of the *New York Sun's* editorial page on October 13, under the heading, "Abroad and at Home":

During the late armed resistance to United States sovereignty in the Philippines, the public demand that rebellion and its barbarities be put down without parley with the rebels and without terms was almost universal, and it prevailed. We were spared the humiliation and the damage to our authority involved in our submission to those who defied us. Why is not the same far-seeing patriotism and resolute loyalty to the flag and to the preservation of the rights it guarantees to its citizens, now guiding those concerned with the coal strike, officially or otherwise?

Pennsylvania is in a state of anarchy beyond the power of her entire guard to control [at no time was there such a condition of affairs as would warrant this statement.—ED. SENTINEL]; and yet instead of an irresistible demand for a restoration of law and order without compromise, not a few people, among them public officials of high rank, are

holding soft conferences with the representatives of disorder and directly or indirectly, positively or negatively, some are even throwing the weight of their influence against the objects of their enmity.

Dispute of the authority of our law at home is vastly more serious than resistance to it in the far-off savage country of the Philippines. Compromise there would have been deplorable; here it would be fatal.



To the words given elsewhere from various prominent sources as to what the United States has done for Cuba, may be added these by ex-Senator John M. Thurston, in *Leslie's Weekly* of May 15:

Cuban independence comes as the free gift of the mother of republics to a people who were so enslaved and oppressed as to be utterly incapable of breaking their own chains. The war waged by this government against Spain was the first war ever waged by a nation untainted by some selfish purpose. . . . Never in government had it been contemplated that the duty of a nation extended beyond the protection of its own citizens until the Congress of the United States startled the world with a new declaration, that there is a responsibility resting upon every great and powerful people to assist and protect and relieve those, their neighbors, from tyranny and oppression against which they are too weak to defend themselves. . . . We have purchased the freedom of Cuba by blood and treasure voluntarily offered as a sacrifice at the altar of liberty. We have demanded nothing from Cuba in return. Our gift to her is without condition and is accompanied by no demand for reciprocal favor or reward.

And yet notwithstanding all this boasting there are many who are declaring today, many who have boasted, too, that the conduct of the United States toward Cuba as a whole has been anything but honorable and glorious. Among these is the *New York Tribune*, which, within a month of the time when, in the most glowing terms, it declared that "the promise of the United States is fulfilled" and "Free Cuba is an accomplished fact," felt it necessary to protest in the strongest terms against "the veritable rape of

the Island of Cuba," which it declared threatened to bring "irretrievable dishonor if not another costly war upon the United States and ruin upon a confiding and dependent people." And in its issue of July 13 it dwelt upon "the great betrayal" and "monstrous breach of faith" whereby the good name of the United States had been "tarnished," the Cuban republic "embarrassed and crippled," and the Cuban people "imbued with distrust of us and resentment toward us." Now all this is significant, and it demonstrates that the conduct of the United States in this matter has not, so far, been totally unlike that of Rome toward the Grecians.



When they got ready to settle the coal strike the coal barons, or rather Mr. Morgan, told the President to appoint an arbitration commission of five persons, and specified quite definitely the sort of person each of those five should be. Although these specifications left no place for the appointment of such a person, a Roman Catholic prelate, John L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria, Ill., was made a member of the commission by President Roosevelt. This was done by appointing a commission of six persons instead of five, and the President made this addition after consultation with the head of the miners' organization. Since that seemed to end the objection of the miners, or rather their leaders and sympathizers, that the commission would not be a fair one for them, it is to be presumed that the appointment of Bishop Spalding was a concession to the labor interests. President Baer, of the coal operators, has said in an interview: "President Roosevelt called me up by telephone and said he wished to appoint Bishop Spalding, and asked me whether or not I would consent." He at once gave his consent, and the next day "saw the other gentlemen,

and they cheerfully ratified my action." A metropolitan daily which published the first intimation of Mr. Morgan's move to end the strike had it that he would call for a commission of three persons, and that one of these would be either Archbishop Ireland or Cardinal Gibbons. Taking the thing altogether it is evident that there was a strong feeling somewhere that a prominent Catholic ecclesiastic could not be dispensed with in the matter. So far as we know Bishop Spalding is not a prelate who tries to push himself and "the Church" forward in public matters, and is the best Catholic prelate in the country for the position to which he has been appointed. He is an author of some note, and has written some very excellent things.



We find by repeated experience that it is rather unsafe to announce in one number just what articles are to appear in the next. The intervening period is so long, the current matters that deserve attention are so numerous, and our space is so limited, that it happens always at the last moment that it is necessary to omit some articles that were to have been published. And it is always the case that the articles that have been announced are those which will best keep for future numbers. This is why the article by J. O. Corliss on "The State and the Sabbath," and some others that were announced last month for this number, do not appear in it. We think these articles will appear in the next issue. Following the article by Mr. Corliss will appear a series of excellent articles by him on the general theme of "The Relation of the State to Sabbath Observance." There is in store also for the readers of THE SENTINEL a number of valuable articles by Mr. W. A. Colcord, who has not only long been a student of and writer on the religious liberty question in its various

phases, but who has seen active service in behalf of the principles of religious liberty not only in the United States but elsewhere. He has but recently returned from Australia where he lived for several years, and while there it was his privilege to have an active part in the efforts of the friends of religious liberty in that country which resulted in the insertion in the constitution of the new Federal Commonwealth "a clause guaranteeing perfect freedom in religious matters—as strong a declaration as could possibly be made so far as the general government is concerned." One article will give the interesting story of this clause from its origin to its adoption by the Federal Convention.



At one time during October there were serious labor troubles requiring the use of the military not only in the United States, but in the two other leading republics of the world, France and Switzerland. In the United States, besides the great strike in the anthracite coal regions, there were strikes accompanied by riots and requiring troops to preserve order in New Orleans and in Albany, N. Y. It was only last spring that representatives of labor and capital met in conference in New York City and, after friendly discussion, appointed an arbitration board to deal with labor disputes, it being announced that that step virtually meant that there were to be no more great battles between capital and labor in the United States. And yet the greatest industrial struggle that the country has ever known has taken place since, and the arbitration board appointed to deal with just such troubles was not able to do the first thing toward bringing about a settlement of the dispute. These plans for arbitration are good, but he is shortsighted, indeed, who imagines they will solve the great question of capital and

labor. That question is becoming more serious all the time, and there is every indication that in spite of all the well-meant efforts to provide a remedy, it will not stop short of those desperate and violent lengths to which such disputes in other countries and in other times have gone. But though this may be true, it is right that all that can be done to stay the social cataclysm should be done. But unless enough individuals, both in the ranks of labor and capital, determine to forget their own interests and think of the interests of the other class, at least sufficiently to treat it with justice, the evil day cannot be stayed.



In a recent public address on temperance Bishop Potter declared that for himself he "should be perfectly willing to submit any Sunday law that we have—whatever traffic it regulates or represses on whatever sacred day of the week—to a vote of the people of this town who have a right to vote, confident that every hallowed interest would be protected, and that the day of unbridled license which many so confidently predict would never dawn." There is certainly more sense and consistency in the position that every legislative restriction and prohibition of Sunday traffic should be submitted to vote, than that merely one regulation should be submitted to vote, and that one with regard to such a traffic as the liquor traffic. Commenting on the above utterance, the *Christian Work and Evangelist* says that "perhaps, could the people vote upon the measure, they would not reject a bill providing a license to sell beer only," but adds that "as the law now is the great liquor interests have succeeded in preventing any distinction between houses to sell beer and distilled liquors." And it might be added that as the law now is the great church interests have and do succeed in preventing not only any

distinction being made between the sale of beer and distilled liquors, but between the sale of the absolute necessities of life and distilled liquors. We see very little reason for the distinction that the liquor interests have refused to make; there is every reason in the world for the distinction that the church interests refuse to make.



A man who advocates Sunday legislation and enforcement should be the last person on earth to proclaim the inalienable right of a man to work "when or where" he chooses. But such is the strange and peculiar character of human nature and of the human mind that men can frequently be seen contending frantically for a principle at one point while trampling it under their feet at another. This thought is suggested by the preaching of a sermon on "The Right to Work" by Rev. Dr. David James Burrell at the Marble Collegiate Church in this city on the evening of October 12. We quote some of Dr. Burrell's strongest declarations with regard to the right to work, elsewhere. It is peculiar that of all the ministers in New York who have made the coal strike or some phase of it the subject of a sermon, Dr. Burrell, an active National Reformer and an ardent supporter and advocate of Sunday legislation and enforcement, is the only one who has selected and spoken upon the topic, "The Right to Work." This is a right with which National-Reformers and Sunday enforcement advocates generally are sadly in need of becoming acquainted, for we know of no class of persons in this country who have shown a greater ignorance with regard to it, or else a greater determination and persistence to override it knowingly, than that class which has long insisted and continually insists that honest toil shall be absolutely prohibited

and prevented by law on the first day of the week.



In view of what for months was a matter of great interest to the whole nation, and which for several weeks was the one matter of supreme public concern, it would be well for you to read again carefully the article in *THE SENTINEL* for August on "A Dangerous Tendency." And in view of the thing of which that situation and the manner of its ending are but striking manifestations, and of which there are to be more and more serious manifestations of similar character in the future, it would be well for you not only to read that article carefully, but to follow up the study of what is there but little more than suggested—to become so thoroughly acquainted with the history of the establishment of one-man power in the Republic of Rome and with present tendencies that are leading on toward the establishment of one-man power in the Republic of the United States, that you may have no difficulty in seeing history repeat itself, as it is certainly doing; and that you may know what is to be the outcome of tendencies and problems that are now puzzling the ablest men. In the next number of *THE SENTINEL* we will present as best we can those features of the great industrial struggle that has just ended which go to show that the history of Republican Rome is being repeated in Republican America.



In *THE SENTINEL* of August 1 last year attention was called to the fact that the question of religious instruction in the public schools had been submitted to the supreme court of Nebraska on complaint of Mr. Daniel S. Freeman, a citizen of Gage County, Neb., who objected to Bible reading, prayer, and the singing of hymns in the school attended by his

children. We expressed the hope at that time that the court would uphold the true principle in the matter, and we are glad to report now that it has done so. On October 9 the supreme court rendered its decision in the case. The important paragraph reads as follows:

Exercises by a teacher in a public school, in a school building in school hours and in the presence of the pupils, consisting of the reading of passages from the Bible, and in the singing of songs and hymns and offering prayer to the Deity, in accordance with the doctrines, beliefs, customs or usages of sectarian churches or religious organizations, are forbidden by the constitution of the State.

This, of course, is in thorough accord with the great principle of separation of church and state, and is therefore gratifying to all who honor that principle and would see it adhered to in the country where it was first proclaimed in its fullness by the founders of a state. And, therefore, the American Secular Union and Freethought Federation, through the efforts of which Mr. Freeman's case was prosecuted and carried to the State supreme court, is to be heartily congratulated.



On October 12 The Hague tribunal rendered its decision in the "Pious Fund" case, deciding in favor of the United States, or rather in favor of the Roman Catholic Church in California. The court decided that, "since the government of Mexico had undertaken the administration of a trust fund for the benefit of the Roman Catholic Church of California, it was bound to pay the interest to the beneficiaries, notwithstanding the cession of California to the United States." The New York *Evening Post* says the decision "will tend to give confidence to all donors whose gifts lie in debatable territory," and that its acceptance by Mexico will complete the establishment in inter-

national law of the principle "that an eleemosynary or religious foundation is not rendered void by change of nationality on the part of the beneficiaries." This comment is added by *The Post*:

This principle is not new. Generally, conquering or cessionary powers have respected private foundations in newly-acquired territory. But the particular application of the principle in the case of Mexico is unusual and interesting. The Hague tribunal finds that the mere relinquishing of all civic and political control of a given territory does not of itself terminate special fiduciary duties of a private or benevolent nature. Since the old trust, called the Pious Fund, is judged to be in full vigor, we shall have the curious spectacle of the Roman Catholic Church in California receiving a handsome annual subvention from the Government of Mexico.



In discussing the peril brought upon the country by the coal strike situation—a situation in which "a band of irresponsible strikers and a powerful monopoly have so far trampled upon the inalienable rights of the public as almost to deprive it of one of the absolute necessities of life"—a prominent periodical says the Romans had an axiom: "The safety of the people is the supreme law;" and declares that that is the axiom that must be made dominant "in this Republic." And though not connecting it with the Romans, hundreds of other periodicals and hundreds of thousands of people were moved by the situation to lay great emphasis on the idea of this axiom, and to insist that it must be made dominant at any cost. The axiom is very good, and the demand that it control is no doubt proper enough. But things are going badly when a nation has to cry out for the maintenance of this axiom. This cry in Rome, repeated from time to time, at last brought the dictatorship, with the surrender of all the powers of the state into the hands of a single individual to

be used as he saw fit for "the safety of the people." And thus the will of a single man for the time being became the supreme law. And this, of course, at last ended in an empire and an emperor, when the will of a single individual became permanently the supreme law.



It is announced from Illinois that a plan is on foot in that State "to send to the State capital this winter an immense lobby of Christian citizens, who will remain there and work for the success of every good bill approved by the Christian Citizenship League." It is "hoped to secure the attendance of one thousand clergymen and prominent church workers during the session of the legislature," and it is thought that "the moral force of such a body will be sufficient to insure good legislation." It is safe to say that moral force will be the least of the forces employed by such a body. Mr. James H. Shaw, Jr., of Bloomington, is said to be the leader of this movement. The plan was announced "at the recent Methodist conference in Streator," and will be presented "to every conference in the State," as it "has already met with much encouragement among the clergy and laity of the State." We venture that such a plan will be very much in favor with the clergy and laity, but that may not by any means insure it to be a good one. There is danger in such religious combinations to exercise political power, even when its exercise begins in behalf of such a good measure as an anti-cigarette bill, as it is said is to be among the first of the bills to be pushed by this "immense lobby of Christian citizens."



Mr. John Kensit, the London bookseller who during the past six or seven years has led an agitation in England against the growing ritualism and Romanizing tendencies in the Church of

England, and who gained great notoriety because of certain sensational incidents which marked his crusade, died early in October as the result of a blow from a chisel which some one hurled at him at the close of a meeting which he had addressed on September 25. Mr. Kensit's son, who participated with him in the anti-ritualistic and anti-Roman Catholic crusade, and who was in prison at the time, was allowed, under police escort, to visit his father before his death, and was released very shortly after. He was recently imprisoned "for refusing to find bail to keep the peace by abandoning the holding of meetings." Either these meetings were very fruitful of riots, or else this is very strange news to come from England. But it is not to be presumed that the Kensits were responsible for all the riots that attended their meetings. There are some people, some religionists, so lawless that they will not allow any one to publicly speak the truth with regard to certain things without raising a riot and attempting to kill him.



Whatever it may have been, might be, or will be, it is evident that the theater is to-day a great corrupting force. In a newspaper article on "A Modern Play" "A Woman" well says: "Nothing is gained in any way by seeing such a performance. Young girls and boys sit through the matinees and absorb vice and wickedness. How can we look for a clean-minded, healthy generation of women when girls of sixteen spend their holiday afternoons losing their modesty of mind by listening to the exaltation of wickedness and in watching the obliteration of virtue?" The real problem which these reeking "problem plays" present is the great problem of the open sore of corruption and degeneracy on the social organism. Their popularity emphasizes the existence of that festering sore, and their

constant effect is to aggravate it more and more by swelling the ranks of the dissolute and debauched.



There are indications that the "Reform Bureau" at Washington is making itself distasteful and is losing sympathy in quarters where it might naturally be expected to be regarded with considerable favor. To the plain words presented last month from the New York *Christian Advocate* may be added now these equally plain words from the *Christian Work and Evangelist*, of October 11:

The National Reform Bureau at Washington sends out an alarm with regard to racing and betting at Washington, which it says is "going to be worse than Monte Carlo." The country is indebted to this Bureau for much good work. It would doubtless be more appreciated and the efforts of the Bureau would be more effective if the officers of the latter were able to perceive that others besides themselves are interested in preserving the morals of the country. . . . We judge that the Bureau would be more readily appealed to for cooperation in averting impending evil if it were not so eager to claim all the credit of every good work.



Perhaps, in view of the inherited and widespread popular misapprehension on the point, it should not call for special remark that the Atlanta *Constitution*, in the quotation given elsewhere in this issue, assumes as so much a matter of course that the observance of the first day of the week is enjoined by and rests upon "the authority of the New Testament Scriptures," but it would seem that a journal of its standing would not allow itself, and could not afford, to fall into such an error. Whatever else it may do a great newspaper is expected to bring to its consideration of matters which it discusses a high degree of intelligence and to view them in the light of known and established facts, even though it involve in some things a considerable divergence

from the commonly accepted view. It should educate the people out of their misapprehensions, rather than confirm them in them.



"Cardinalates are a matter with which Presidents should have nothing to do," very properly says *The Independent*. Yes, and cardinals and archbishops as such are things with which Presidents should have nothing to do, but unfortunately this is a rule that has not been adhered to. Whether it be meant as a sort of extenuation for this fact, which is well known, we do not know, but *The Independent* hastens to say in the same connection that "the Protestant Emperor of Germany, whenever he wishes to honor a prelate, requests the promotion from the Vatican." But it is added: "But in Germany the state supports the Church." We wish it could be said that there are not significant and dangerous tendencies toward church-and-state alliance in this country, which means state support of "the Church" for one thing, but unfortunately this cannot be said.



General James F. Smith, who was a member of the "mission" to the Vatican, has been selected for appointment as a member of the Philippine Commission to succeed Commissioner Moses, who is to retire on January 1 next. As we stated when the "mission" to the Vatican was announced, Judge Smith, for he is now and has been for some time an associate justice of the Philippine Supreme Court, is a Roman Catholic and has very decided sympathies for the much-disliked Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in the Philippines. And so the dispatch announcing the new honor that is to come to him is careful to state that "he is a prominent Roman Catholic." He was a lawyer of some prominence in California before he went as a colonel to the Philippines, and

was deputy collector of the port of San Francisco under one administration of President Cleveland.



During a Sunday-closing campaign prosecuted a few months since by the retail grocers' association of Columbus, Ohio, it was announced as quite a victory that at last the groceryman who had held out the longest had agreed to "comply with the law, but that his door will be open on Sundays, as no one can enter his saloon unless they first pass through the grocery." This is typical of most Sunday enforcement "victories." Honest labor and business is made criminal while those things which destroy character and manhood proceed as usual. Vice is simply given a free hand by the suppression of the honest business and labor with which it is obliged to compete on other days.



An authority on Cuban affairs says "Cuba's fundamental grievance against Spain was caused by economic rather than by political oppression." Then Cuba's fundamental grievance remains, notwithstanding her great "deliverance from oppression," for all authorities agree that economically she is as bad off to-day as she was for the most part under Spain. A change of political mastery has been accomplished, and with that a change in the authority against which Cuba has her fundamental grievance. It is hard to say, in the large sense, that anything more than that has been accomplished.



A dispatch from Rome says "the Vatican is in receipt of numerous protests against the anti-Catholic propaganda in the Philippines," in which "it is asserted that the Catholics ought to be allowed entire freedom of religious teaching among

a community whose only form of worship is Catholic." The senders of these protests, in perfect harmony with Roman Catholic principles, mean by "entire freedom of religious teaching," entire monopoly of religious teaching. They mean that the law should suppress all religious teaching but that of Catholicism.



The title and name of the person whom the Pope has appointed as "Apostolic Delegate in the Philippines," and through whom the Papacy will continue at Manila the negotiations that were adjourned from Rome, is Monsignor Guidi. He was "consecrated" a "titular bishop" in Rome on September 21, and left there about the middle of October for Manila. It is announced in this country that "it is thought at the War Department that three years may be required for a complete settlement of the question of the friars' lands."



The great Congressional Library at Washington is to be opened hereafter on Sundays from 2 to 10 P.M., the librarian Mr. Herbert Putnam, having secured during the last session of Congress an appropriation to meet the expense of such opening. More than three times the number required for the extra service on Sunday responded when the call for volunteers for that purpose was made to the library employees.



The "Sunday Enforcement" department is omitted from this number not because there is not just as much as ever to chronicle in that direction, but because other matter crowded it out. In the December SENTINEL the "Sunday Enforcement" items will cover two months instead of one, so that our readers will lose nothing in this direction that is of interest and importance.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

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

CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year.....	per copy.
Club rate for three and six months in proportion.	.70
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.

In order to have the new volume begin with the January number the December number of THE SENTINEL will be included in the present volume, thus making thirteen numbers for this volume instead of twelve.



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.

THE SENTINEL was never better than it is now.

-L. A. SMITH.



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

L. F. STARR.

SUNDAY IN HISTORY

By C. H. EDWARDS

This volume is a concise and valuable collection of historical data relative to Sunday, collected from many books. The author has spent much time in getting these together in handy form for reference.

When was Sunday observance instituted? What brought it about? Is there Bible authority for it? These and many more equally important and interesting questions are answered in this book.

232 pages, paper covers, 50 cts., postpaid.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

11 West 20th Street

New York City

CHOICE SELECTED WINTER APPLES

of all the leading sorts and best keepers furnished by the barrel or in car lots. Write for prices.

F. E. GILBERT, Erie, Pa.

THE GOOD HEALTH BATH CABINET.



A portable appliance for giving vapor baths at home. Recommended by Battle Creek Sanitarium physicians. Good in health, beneficial in disease. Used for breaking up colds and chills and relieving soreness of the muscles, rheumatism, etc. Write for descriptive circular.

Agents wanted.

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

\$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 MALLET, 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 MALLET, Nyack, N. Y.**



An Important New Book for the Children

"THINGS FORETOLD"

by W. N. GLENN, for a number of years editor of *Our Little Friend*. This book contains interesting talks on some of the thrilling prophecies of the Bible. It is written in simple language, so as to be thoroughly understood by the children.

It shows how some of the "things foretold" have been fulfilled, how others are now being fulfilled, and that still others are as certainly to be fulfilled.

The book contains 113 pages, size 6¼ x 8¾ inches; each page has a neat illustrated border in color, and the type is large and clear.

Price, postpaid, 50 cts.

Don't let your children fill their minds with trashy stories, but give them something to read which is interesting and at the same time instructive.

Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY**
11 West 20th Street, New York City

Helpful Holiday Suggestions in Good Books

When you are thinking of a Holiday Present for a friend, why not select a good, helpful book? You'll not make mistake in selecting from the list given below:

Abiding Spirit, The. Cloth, 40 cts.; Presentation Edition.....	\$.75
Battle Hymn of the Kingdom. Illustrated Poem. Cloth gilt.....	.50
Best Stories from the Best Book. Board, 50 cts.; Pres. Ed.....	.75
Christ's Object Lessons.	1.25
Christ Our Saviour. For the Young. Presentation Ed.	1.25
House We Live In, The. For Children, teaching care of body.....	.75
Master's Greatest Monosyllables, The.50
My Mother's Life (Life of Mrs. S. M. I. Henry).....	1.00
Power for Witnessing75
Steps to Christ. Cloth, 50 cts.; Pres. Ed.....	.85
Story of Daniel the Prophet.75
Story of Pitcairn Island. By a Native Daughter.....	1.00
Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing. Cloth, 75 cts.; Half Calf.....	1.00
Things Foretold. Prophecy explained, for the Children.....	.50

Our catalogue describes these and many others. Send for it. Any of the above sent postpaid on receipt of price.

Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY**
11 West 20th Street, New York City

Eighteen years ago, when THE SENTINEL was established, very many people thought the principles for which it stood were so self-evident that in free and enlightened America there was no field for a journal advocating the complete separation of church and state. Its warnings were deemed fanatical. But time has proved the correctness of its position. Many things which were then predicted are now matters of history.

In its work THE SENTINEL has made many friends, and many enemies. Its staunchest friends are those to whom it has shown the true principles of religious liberty. Its bitterest enemies, those whose designs it has exposed. That it has been a potent factor in molding legislation, none will deny. Its great influence among legislators has been the marvel of many, especially those not in accord with its teaching.

THE SENTINEL has ever been a progressive journal. One of the constant aims of the publishers has been to make the style of the journal that best adapted to the demands of the reading public. This being the case, it has been necessary from time to time to change its form, and it will always be the studied plan to present the gems of religious liberty truth in the best possible setting.

It gives us much pleasure to state that many able contributors of years of experience in religious liberty work have been secured to help make the 1903 volume of THE SENTINEL the best one ever issued. Articles setting forth the true principles of religious liberty will appear regularly so that the text of the magazine will be educational as well as dealing with the current happenings.

The following pages will give some idea of what can be expected to appear in THE SENTINEL next year. We invite all our subscribers to read this for yourselves and then try to get others to share in the good things with you.



A. T. JONES,

a former editor of *THE SENTINEL*, is without doubt the best known writer of the day on religious liberty and kindred topics. It is safe to say that he has devoted more time and thought to the various phases of this great question than any of his contemporaries.

At the present time Mr. Jones is contributing a series of articles on

The Supremacy of the Papacy.

This series will conclude with the March issue. Each article, however, is complete in itself.

Following the present series Mr. Jones will contribute another, the general trend of which will be to show the present aim of the Papacy, how she will gain it, and the consequences.

In the Trail of Rome

will be the subject treated by

P. T. MAGAN.

This will be handled in an entirely new manner, and will be highly entertaining. It will show that our country is going the way Rome went; that everything is being centralized into the hands of a few people, and how that will ultimately end in a decree, as it did with the Romans, that "no man shall buy or sell" except he to whom the right is given by those holding the power.

Professor Magan is author of "Peril of the Republic" and has been a careful and diligent student of Roman history, and is very competent to write intelligently upon a subject of this nature.

W. E. CORNELL

has been a religious liberty worker ever since the early days of *THE SENTINEL*. He has had the privilege of studying the question, not only in this country, but in the Old World as well. *THE SENTINEL* the coming year will contain some articles of special interest from him.

Mr. Cornell is now giving special attention to that anomaly in American legislative halls,

The "Christian Lobbyist,"

and our readers may expect some first-class papers from him on this subject.



As staunch an advocate of religious liberty as Roger Williams himself is

G. B. WHEELER.

Both having been advocates of the same religious tenets it is natural that both should also love these principles.

Mr. Wheeler is at the present time devoting the major part of his time to the promulgation of true religious liberty principles. He has in preparation a series of articles showing the immorality and wickedness that result from the conditions caused by the enforced cessation of labor and amusements upon Sunday, and these are to be published in *THE SENTINEL*.

We also have in hand subject matter for two or three papers from his pen on

Baptists and Religious Liberty.

Relation of the State to Sabbath Observance

is the subject of a series of articles contributed by

J. O. CORLISS,

who, ever since especial attention was paid to this great question, has been a constant and devoted defender of true principles. His voice has ever been raised in behalf of truth, and he has always been ready to wield his pen for the right.

Mr. Corliss will also contribute another series of articles in which will be drawn a contrast between true and false governments,—the reign of God's government contrasted with that of man's.



E. E. FRANKE

has for years, as an evangelist, spoken to thousands of New York City's best people in large halls and churches, thrilling his audiences with the clear-cut truths of the Gospel. During the years of his Gospel ministry he has come in touch with many of the leading executive, judicial and legislative officials of the day, and has been the means of interesting many of them in the true principles of religious liberty.

Evangelist Franke has been secured as one of the contributors of THE SENTINEL the coming year and one of the topics he will consider will be

Religious Monopolies and Trusts.

Readers of THE SENTINEL need no introduction to Mr.

C. P. BOLLMAN,

who, for a number of years was one of its editors.

Mr. Bollman has always been recognized as a strong religious liberty writer, and although he is now devoting himself to other lines of work more particularly, still his interest in religious liberty principles is as great as ever it was.

Next year THE SENTINEL will print a number of articles from the pen of Mr. Bollman, the subjects of which can now be announced as "The Proper Functions of Civil Government," "The Basis of Natural Rights," "Civil Law and the Rights of Conscience," "Theocracy and Freedom of Conscience," "The Divine Right of the Subject vs. the Divine Right of the Sovereign."

W. A. COLCORD

for a number of years has resided in Australia. While there he was very active and influential in a religious liberty propaganda in the different Australian States. He will tell of his experiences in articles entitled,

"The Australian Constitution,"

and

"Sunday Laws of England."

Besides these Mr. Colcord will have other articles in THE SENTINEL, among which we announce "Principles Too Little Understood," "Origin and Object of Civil Government," "The Church and Its Work," "Individual Responsibility," etc.





The Love of Power and the Power of Love

(See page 825.)