

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, JANUARY 22, 1903

NO. 4



When there are no other grounds for its support, when we cannot say that the general welfare is benefited, when there is no reason for a law but a theological reason—under such circumstances is a law defensible? . . . This is a very important question, and one that at the outset of any discussion of Sabbatarian legislation must be well settled. . . . I am not asking any of you to change your opinion as to the proper method of comporting yourselves on Sunday, for the question under debate is not what you wish to do on Sunday or even what you would like to see other people do. We are discussing your right to impose your views upon me and my right to prescribe conduct for you. Ought we to proceed upon merely theological grounds? . . . The reasons against such a course are numerous and overwhelming. . . . If we adopt theological opinion as a true basis of legislation we are in reality supplying a strong argument in favor of the reunion of church and state, for we at once encounter the second question, Whose theology are we to enforce? Clearly we cannot turn all the conflicting dogmas into statutes. Going no farther than this Sunday question, for example, are we to adopt the Protestant or the Catholic view of it? Or, are we to determine God's law at the ballot box, and, having voted upon the subject, enforce the view of the majority? Are we to have a Protestant Sunday in Manitoba and Catholic saints' days and fasting during Lent in Quebec? . . . I assert that no one has a right to bind his theology upon any one's back but his own.

—JOHN S. EWART, K. C.

[From a lecture delivered in St. George's Church (Anglican), Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 26, 1902.]



# Your Money Saved by our Periodical Combinations



MANY people wish to subscribe for more first-class journals than their means will really permit. THE SENTINEL has entered into agreements with other publishers, so that by combining orders for two or more periodicals you will be able to secure them at reduced rates, and thus your money will go farther in buying reading matter.

The combination prices quoted below, though very low, will apply to renewals, both to THE SENTINEL and the other periodicals, as well as new subscriptions.

## THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES

is a high class religious journal devoted to the discussion of Biblical truths especially important for this time. *The Signs of the Times* is a weekly journal of sixteen pages.

Price, per year, \$1.50.

Our combination—THE SENTINEL and Signs . . . . . \$2.00

## THE GOOD HEALTH

is the largest and most widely circulated health journal in the United States. Published monthly.

Price, per year, \$1.00.

Our combination—THE SENTINEL and Good Health, only . . . . . \$1.30

## THE PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,

a wide-awake, up-to-date, Pacific Coast publication, is devoted to the promulgation of rational health principles. Monthly, 24 pages, published at Oakland, Calif.

Price, per year, \$.50.

Our combination—THE SENTINEL and Pacific Health Journal . . . . . \$1.25

If you are interested in education the

## ADVOCATE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

is a journal you should read. Published monthly.

Price, per year, \$.50.

Our combination—THE SENTINEL and Advocate of Christian Education, \$1.25

## Some Further Combination Offers.

THE SENTINEL, Signs, Pacific Health Journal, Good Health, and Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	\$3.25
THE SENTINEL, Signs, Good Health, and Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	3.00
THE SENTINEL, Signs, Pacific Health Journal, and Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	2.60
THE SENTINEL, Signs, and Good Health . . . . .	2.50
THE SENTINEL, Signs, and Pacific Health Journal OR Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	2.25
THE SENTINEL, Good Health, Pacific Health Journal OR Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	2.00
THE SENTINEL, Pacific Health Journal and Advocate of Christian Education . . . . .	1.60

Note. In taking advantage of any one of these combination offers, all the periodicals need NOT be sent to the same individual.

SEND ALL ORDERS TO

**The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,**

11 West 20th Street, New York City.



# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1903

No. 4

Some of the "reform" forces that are in evidence in these days stand for reform *backward*; they would take the world back toward the Dark Ages, not forward to better and truer conditions.



If it is the duty of the state to give religious instruction it should not confine its efforts in this direction to the children. Judging by the reasons which are advanced for the giving of such instruction by the state, there are far more adults than children in need of it.



It is just as much in violation of the last provision in Article VI. of the national Constitution to debar a man from public office because of the religion to which he holds as it is to require him to hold to a certain religion as a condition to having a public office. In each case there is an application of a religious test as a qualification for office.



To say that government should confine itself to secular, temporal affairs and leave religious, spiritual matters alone, is not to say that the temporal welfare of man is of more importance than his spiritual welfare. It is to say that the purpose for which government exists and for which it is adapted is the thing to which it should give attention, and that that for which it does not exist and with which it is utterly unfitted to deal is something that it should let alone.

If the very sound proposition that a law which has no basis but a theological one is indefensible as a measure of civil legislation and should be given no place upon civil statute books, were fully carried into effect Sunday laws would completely disappear; at least exceedingly few of those now in existence would remain.



In the nature of things the religious freedom with which government has to do is more than mere freedom of thought, freedom of faith. It is so nearly the truth that it may be said that freedom of thought is something with which government can have absolutely nothing to do; that that is a freedom which government can neither guarantee nor take away. In the sphere of government religious liberty means not freedom of thought, freedom of faith, but *freedom of action* in obeying and practising what one thinks in religion — not freedom of belief, but freedom to profess and practise in conduct and action what one believes.



With such stuff as the "Haegler chart" and the explanation and "reasoning" which go with it, together with advertisements of such books as "The Civil Sabbath" and "Sabbath for Man," presented in a special public document printed for that purpose, it is evident that a very close relationship is being established between the Government at some points and some



of the Sunday-enforcement theologians. As far as it goes, and it goes entirely too far, this late feat of the "Reform Bureau" at Washington could not be surpassed in the most theocratic of governments. Though it may be a small one and somewhat unofficial, this thing is a piece of church-and-state union.



Greater strictness in the enforcement of the Sunday law against the sale of liquor seems to be one of the most prominent features of the régime of New York's new police commissioner. He has spent the Sundays since coming into the office on inspection tours throughout the city, and has personally ordered the arrest of a number of persons for violating the law referred to. No doubt this law is one which it is the duty of the police to enforce, but the "reform" which manifests itself in trying to prevent on one day of the week what is freely allowed on all other days is a rather dubious sort of reform. The evils and crimes that New York needs to have suppressed are those that are evils and crimes on all days. The city is not helped much by the suppression on one day of what it is obliged to put up with as perfectly legitimate during six days.



Mark Twain evidently does not entertain that sort of an opinion of the Papacy that is becoming popular in these days. In his scorching treatment of the "Christian Science" "Trust" in the *North American Review*, he predicts that it "will be handed down like the other Papacy," and "after a generation or two," when it has become "the most insolent and unscrupulous and tyrannical politico-religious master that has dominated a people since the palmy days of the Inquisition," "will probably divide Christendom with the Catholic Church." Mr. Clemens evidently regards the Papacy as the most fit thing with which to com-

pare the "Christian Science" "Trust," and it is certain that he has no very high opinion of the latter. But notwithstanding his great predictions as to the future of the "Christian Science" "Trust," it is not likely that it will ever rival the Papacy as a politico-religious organization for the domination of people and nations.



"Not much like a free country," was the exclamation of Judge Gray, chairman of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, while listening to the evidence of the lawlessness and brutality of union miners during the great strike of last summer and fall. The able representatives of the union miners before the Commission were unable to show why the stigma of this lawlessness should not rest upon the union. Judge Gray demanded to know of one single instance of a man's being disciplined or expelled from the union because of misdeeds of violence, but no such instance was given. In fact, it could not even be shown that the union had taken any action whatever with reference to those of its members who had been convicted of crimes. There is no question but that the coal corporations have greatly violated the law, but it is evident that this is a thing upon which they have no monopoly. Labor organizations are just as lawless as capitalistic combinations when it suits their purposes to be so. The fact that two such forces are constantly becoming more and more powerful bodes ill for the country.



"Our Constitution guarantees to every one freedom of religious belief, which the courts have defined to mean freedom of faith and not freedom of conduct," says *The Outlook*. Is it true, then, that religious liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution and defined by the courts means merely freedom to think and not freedom to act? Would it not be better to say



that the courts have defined the freedom of religious belief guaranteed by the Constitution to mean not only freedom of faith but freedom of conduct in following out that faith so long as the liberty and rights of others are not invaded? Religious liberty means that so long as an individual does not invade any right of others he is to be absolutely free from interference in obeying the dictates of his own conscience in the profession and practise of religion. And it means also that no religious belief or practise can ever of itself be considered an invasion of the rights of others, however diverse such belief or practise may be from their own; and that no religious belief or practise can ever of itself afford the slightest ground for the denial or invasion of even the least of the rights of any human being. And is it not thus that freedom of religious belief is understood and defined by American courts?



It seems that the successor of the late Archbishop Corrigan of New York holds just as strongly as did his predecessor to the logical Roman Catholic attitude concerning the matter of religious instruction in the public schools. At a reception in New York on the evening of January 8, which was attended by "many prominent members of the Catholic clergy and laity of the city," Archbishop Farley, according to the newspaper reports, said this among other things on the same point:

Christianity must be taught in all of the public schools or this great and glorious nation will go back to paganism. Everything points to that end. Those inside and outside of the Church who were opposed to Christian training in the schools have been converted to our way of thinking by the rapid and alarming growth of infidelity. At many of the great educational centers, Harvard, Yale, Cornell and other great universities, they are planning to stem this tide of infidelity by introducing the Christian teachings of faith and morality.

We wonder if the sort of "Christian teachings" that are inculcated at these universities are just the "Christian teachings" that the Archbishop is desirous of having taught in the public schools, and which he would like to have taught to Roman Catholic children in the public schools. There is a movement on foot to secure a larger allowance of public money for the Roman Catholic schools in New York City.



### *The Sunday Question in Winnipeg*

LAST spring the legislature of Manitoba, Canada, authorized the city of Winnipeg to decide for itself, by a vote of the electors, whether or not Sunday street-car service should be inaugurated in that city. The question came to vote on December 9, and the proposition for Sunday cars was defeated by a majority of less than 300 votes out of a total vote of 4,200. From the first the proposition was strongly opposed by the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance and clergymen and church leaders generally, and we should judge from a notice headed "The Sunday Street-Car Victory," which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of December 13, that these forces were heartily seconded by at least one of the newspapers of the city. This notice was prefaced with these words from 1 Cor. 15:57: "Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory." It began thus: "Christians in Winnipeg and throughout the province should rejoice and give thanks to God for the moral victory won at the polls on Tuesday last in the defeat of the Sunday car by-law." Another statement was: "This victory will be a stimulus to all Christians and well-meaning people to persevere in their fight against evil in its various forms." According to a correspondent who writes us from Winnipeg this stimulus is likely to produce a general Sunday enforcement



campaign, as strong efforts are now being put forth by the Lord's Day (Sunday) Alliance and other champions of Sunday enforcement "to educate the people both young and old to enforce the Sunday laws."

No wonder the quotation from Corinthians was cut short in the middle of the sentence and the most important part of the passage omitted. The passage reads: "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Victory at the polls by means of the ballot is not in any sense "victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," and it is an utter perversion of this text in Corinthians to apply any portion of it to this "Sunday street-car victory."

The defeat of the by-law authorizing the institution of Sunday street-car service was evidently due to the action of the labor unions, which, not receiving what was to them satisfactory assurance from the street-car company that the employees would not be expected "to work more than sixty hours or six consecutive days in the week," took a decided stand against the by-law a few days before the election. So the notice from which we have already quoted stated that "though a large number of those who cast their ballots against the cars did so from moral and religious motives, yet the gaining of the day was undoubtedly due to the vote of the workingmen." It would seem then that whatever thanks are to be given in the matter should be given to the workingmen.

It is said that this election settles the question of Sunday street-cars for at least three years, that period having to elapse before the question can be voted upon again. The agitation was useful as serving to bring to the attention of the people the question of Sunday legislation, and notwithstanding the fact that the champions of Sunday observance by law are

able to boast of what they term a "moral victory," it is pretty certain that as a result of this agitation the people of Winnipeg and of Manitoba are much better informed as to the real nature of such legislation, and are much more alive to the fact that there is a limit to the authority of the state in the matter that falls very far short of what is ordinarily assumed by the champions of Sunday legislation. Some friends of religious liberty in Winnipeg printed some leaflets suitable for the occasion and distributed thousands of them in the city and vicinity. Special mention should be made of some excellent lectures that were delivered while the agitation was at its height by Mr. John S. Ewart, K. C., senior member of the law firm of Ewart, Fisher & Ewart. At the request of the pastor of the church, Rev. J. J. Roy, who did not agree with him on the question, Mr. Ewart delivered three lectures on "The Sunday Question" in St. George's Church (Anglican). The lectures were delivered at intervals of two weeks, the first being given on Sunday afternoon, October 26, and the third on Sunday afternoon, November 23. On the Sunday following each lecture a conference, with Mr. Roy as leader, was held for the purpose of discussion, at which time Mr. Roy would reply to Mr. Ewart. The topics of the three lectures were: "Sabbatarian Legislation in Manitoba Cannot be Defended upon Grounds of Merely Theological Character"; "Physical and Moral Advantage and Not the Religious Observance of Sunday Are the True Basis for Legislative Restriction of Individual Liberty of Action on Sunday"; and "There is no Valid Religious Objection to Sunday Street-Cars." As is evidenced by the extracts given on our front cover last week and this week, Mr. Ewart said some very good things in these lectures. He has favored us with complete copies of the three lectures, and at the first opportunity we shall give the



readers of THE SENTINEL the benefit of copious extracts from them.

But it must be said that none did more to exhibit the real character of Sunday legislation and to show that it exceeds the proper limits of civil authority than those who most strongly championed it in this instance. They made it plain all the time that their opposition to the by-law removing the prohibition against Sunday street-car service was inspired by "moral and religious motives" — that is, by their theological opinions concerning Sabbath observance, which are of course no proper standard for determining questions of civil legislation. In one of the Sunday afternoon discussions on the question Rev. Mr. Roy declared: "It is incumbent on the state so to legislate in a general way and in a special way, and restrict individual liberty of action on Sunday that undermines *the Christian religion and the religious observance of the Sabbath.*" "It becomes incumbent upon the state so to restrict individual liberty of action on Sunday that it *may not nullify the religious observance of Sunday.*" "Christianity must be at the basis of Sunday legislation." It is evident that those who most strongly opposed the authorization of Sunday street-cars in Winnipeg did so simply because they regarded it as being a blow at the legal support and protection of the religious Sunday. They could not bear to surrender even that much of the legislation by which "the religious observance of the Sabbath," and "the Christian religion" to that extent, is supported and maintained by the state. It is to be hoped, however, that a genuine moral victory will be brought about in this matter before a great while.



"The absolute severance of the state from all organic connection with religion is absolutely essential to the safety of the civil and religious liberty of the people."

### *The President Takes a Hand in the Campaign Against "Apostle" Smoot*

THE campaign of opposition to the election of "Apostle" Reed Smoot to the Senate that is being carried on by ministerial alliances, the W. C. T. U., and other religious forces, seems to have borne fruit to the extent of leading President Roosevelt to take a hand in the matter. Senator Kearns, of Utah, has been reported thus in a newspaper interview:

When I went to Salt Lake City to spend the holidays with my family I bore a message from President Roosevelt to Mr. Reed Smoot. The message was to the effect that there was no objection to Mr. Smoot personally or his religious faith, but that the election of an apostle would arouse opposition and inject an unfortunate question into national politics and create unfavorable comment. President Roosevelt requested me to state, in the manner I am now stating it, that he very much hoped no apostle would be elected.

According to Senator Kearns a member of the upper house of the Utah legislature was asked by the President to convey a similar message to the Republican members of the Utah legislature. The President had said: "I desire Utah to place me on record as kindly, but firmly, advising against the election of any apostle to the United States Senatorship."

It would be interesting to know where the President gets the authority for his action in this matter. Such information would be none the less interesting from the fact that the President has carefully refrained from "meddling" with Senatorial affairs in Delaware, where the notorious corruptionist Addicks has not only been a candidate for the Senate for years, but has deprived the State of its representation in the Senate. By putting a few things together, however, it is not difficult to know whence the President received his inspiration for this action. A dispatch conveys the information that he had "been much importuned to write a



letter in opposition to Smoot's candidacy, or otherwise to make manifest in a public way his disapproval." As already noted in these columns, the Salt Lake City Ministerial Alliance several weeks ago sent resolutions of protest against the election of Mr. Smoot to President Roosevelt and called upon other ministerial associations throughout the country to do the same. The source of the importuning of the President in this matter is further indicated by this communication that was addressed to the editor of the *New York Sun* by the superintendent of the National W. C. T. U. on January 12:

*Sir:* Possibly on account of President Roosevelt's opposition to Apostle Smoot as United States Senator you may give out the fact that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union are leading in the campaign against Smoot becoming Senator; also an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy. Every State and Territory is in line, backed by the Interdenominational Council of Women, the various women's organizations, the churches of nearly all denominations and the people at large. This combination is formed to continue until polygamy is stamped out in this nation.

And so it is evident that it is from ministerial associations, the W. C. T. U., the Interdenominational Council of Women for Christian and Patriotic Service, and "the churches," that the President has learned that notwithstanding there is "no objection to Mr. Smoot personally or [to] his religious faith," that his candidacy should be opposed and that his election "would arouse opposition and inject an unfortunate question into national politics and create unfavorable comment." The superintendent of the National W. C. T. U. would have given out a far more important piece of information than she did had she stated just why it is that her organization is leading or is engaged in a campaign "against Smoot becoming Senator." And the President, as long as he was to take a

hand in the matter, would have done much better had he stated just why it is that the election of Mr. Smoot, against whom he says there is no objection personally or on account of his religious faith, "would arouse opposition and inject an unfortunate question into national politics and create unfavorable comment." Upon the merits of what can be said on this point depend the merits of the objection to Mr. Smoot upon that ground. The mere fact that his election would arouse opposition and create unfavorable comment, or even inject an unfortunate question into national politics, does not necessarily show that there is anything wrong or out of the way about Mr. Smoot's candidacy. Instances have been known in this country of public speakers having their meetings broken up and coming very near losing their lives because a mob of lawless individuals did not want them to say what they were saying, and in some cases such speakers have been arrested and prevented from speaking altogether by the authorities because of the disturbances that did, or were likely to, occur. But who were the criminals, and where did the blame in the matter rest? Was it the speaker or the mob that should have been suppressed? We cannot but wonder if President Roosevelt would take the same attitude that he has taken with reference to "Apostle" Smoot toward a high dignitary of some other religious body besides the Mormon. Would he, for instance, if Archbishop Ireland were a candidate for the Senate and there was a strong anti-Roman Catholic sentiment manifested against his candidacy, oppose his election merely on the ground that it "would arouse opposition and inject an unfortunate question into national politics and create unfavorable comment"?

The notable thing about this matter so far as the President is connected with it is that by these religious forces which



have taken it upon themselves to prevent Mr. Smoot from becoming Senator, the President has been induced to interfere in a matter with which as President, and even while he is President, he can properly have nothing to do. The election of a Senator is not a matter for Presidential dictation, but is one for the people and legislature of a State to decide for themselves. The editor of the *Sun* gave this very pertinent caution to the superintendent of the National W. C. T. U.:

Lest Mrs. Martin's enthusiasm should tempt her to transgress the proprieties of the occasion, we warn her against seeking to enlist in her movement in Utah politics such citizens as are barred from it by the nature of the Federal Government of which they happen to be for the moment office-holders, chief among whom, of course, is the President of the United States.

We are interested in this matter solely because of its relation to and bearing upon the matter of religious liberty. We believe *The Outlook* was right when it said some weeks ago, referring to the opposition to the election of Mr. Smoot, that "so long as the conduct of a Mormon is in conformity with our laws it would be an unconstitutional act of religious persecution to deny him a public office to which he is elected." And of course to say that a Mormon who is conforming to the laws, and nobody denies that Mr. Smoot is, shall not be elected to a public office is simply the very next thing to denying him a public office to which he is elected. Therefore, until better reasons are adduced for it than have yet been presented, the campaign of opposition to the election of Mr. Smoot which the W. C. T. U. is leading and into which President Roosevelt has been drawn, must be regarded as tending dangerously near to the perpetration of an unconstitutional act of religious persecution.

There is no question of polygamy in the matter. It is merely a question of "apostleship"; that is, those who say Mr. Smoot must not become a Senator take

the stand that because he is a Mormon "Apostle," a leader in the Mormon Church, he should be debarred from public office. But the Constitution says "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and such a course is most decidedly applying a religious test as a qualification for office. We do not say that it is proper for a high church official to seek public office, but we do say that it is absolutely contrary to American principles, to the principles of religious freedom, to debar a man from public office merely because he is a church official. And yet that seems to be exactly what is being attempted in this Smoot case.

❖

### Public "Document No. 53" Again

It seems that the late feat of the Crafts' "Reform Bureau" at Washington in securing the printing of one of its pamphlets as a public document is not to escape public attention altogether. What we published last week regarding the matter was scarcely in type before there appeared in the *New York Evening Post* a two-column article on the subject from its Washington correspondent. "Remarkable Document Printed at Public Expense," and "Book-Advertising Feature of the Scheme," were a part of the *Post's* display heading. The article, which was made up largely of quotations from the document itself, began thus:

Congress prints, at the expense of the tax-paying public, some extraordinary documents, but the acme seems to have been reached in one presented by Mr. Wellington, of Maryland, to the Senate just as that chamber was adjourning for its holiday recess. Nothing but the intervention of a period crowded with gayeties and diversions for the mind could have prevented this wonderful literary effort from receiving attention at the hands of the press all over the United States. It is certain that none issued by Congress in years has



been more in demand among curiosity-seekers since the news of its appearance leaked out.

It seems that one of the features of this document is that long-paraded device in behalf of Sunday enforcement, the "Dr. Haegler chart," by which it is attempted to prove that a person who does "a normal day's work" and takes "a normal night's rest" will continue to get weaker and weaker physically until he dies of physical exhaustion unless he rests on Sunday. All this is solemnly explained in detail in the document, and is quoted by the *Post's* correspondent. Here is something from another quotation that is made from the document:

The primary and the lobby are the two chambers of the sovereign people. . . . Christian men must lay hold of these two handles of politics—the primary and the lobby—of which last the post-office is the annex. Both are now mostly in bad hands. . . . The necessities of life in a republic are intelligence, conscientiousness, and the spirit of equality, which cannot be produced except through the Sabbath and its institutions. Republics are born of Christ and cannot live without Him.

Republics can live better, however, without "Christian" lobbyists than they can with them. By the way they are securing the use of the franking privilege for their literature it would certainly seem that the "Christian men" of the "Reform Bureau" have taken pretty good hold of that "handle of politics" of which we are informed "the post-office is the annex." Do they consider the Post-office Department to be the annex of the "Reform Bureau" lobby? If it is, it cannot be doubted that it is "in bad hands."

It is set forth also in the document that "ancient prophets spoke at least eleven times out of twelve to communities rather than individuals," that "preachers are the descendants of prophets, not of priests, and in this new age of cities and solidarity the preacher ought to devote

at least one of his twelve addresses a month to social themes." It is not explained what the course of the ancient prophets has to do with the business of the United States Government, nor what right the Government has to be undertaking the business of prescribing themes and topics for "the descendants of the prophets."

The correspondent of the *Post* says that "if any one wishes to look into the proposed subjects further than is possible in this pamphlet of twenty-eight pages, he is advised to read certain books mentioned, with publishers' address and retail prices, in a bibliographical paragraph attached to each topic suggested," and that "there is a striking frequency of recurrence of the names of such works as 'Practical Christian Sociology,' by the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts; 'The March of Christ Down the Centuries,' by the same author; 'The Temperance Century,' by the same; 'The Cartridge Box of Temperance and Prohibition,' and 'Half-truth in Darwinism,' by the same."

This incident faintly suggests what would be were the nation fully "reformed" after the "National Reform" ideal. The Government would be merely an adjunct or instrument of the "Reform Bureau," or whatever else might be the machine or organization with which the dominant theologians were directly connected. And, of course, they would have their "studies for the year," "patriotic" and otherwise, to give out to the people, and would, of course, have the Government do the work for them. One important difference from what prevails now would be that the matter would not stop with the mere printing and distribution of the stuff by the Government, but it would have to see to it that the people studied the stuff. If any were so un-"patriotic" as to refuse to study and to follow the program of the "patriotic



# The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

## VIII

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.

### Three Popes—"Confusion Worse Confounded."

BOTH colleges of cardinals now united against both popes. The two colleges of cardinals met in one, at Leghorn. There they agreed, and decided to set their authority above that of the popes; and, on that authority, to call a general council to assemble at Pisa, March 25, 1409. Each company of cardinals sent a summons to its respective pope, and circular letters throughout the realms of Europe that recognized the respective popes.

Benedict's cardinals charged him with being "the author and maintainer of the schism," and as "wicked as the Jews and the heathen soldiers who would rend the seamless robe of Christ." They charged him with insincerity, artifice, obstinacy, and contempt of his oaths. Gregory's cardinals charged him with being "a man of blood, without honor, the slave of his carnal affections, a drunkard, a madman, a proclaimed heretic, a subverter of the Church of God, an accursed hypocrite." They charged him and Benedict XIII. with all the evils that accompanied the schism. They declared that they had chosen Gregory XII. "as the best and most holy of their Order; he had sworn deeply, repeatedly, solemnly, to extinguish the schism by renunciation. He had afterward declared such renunciation diabolic and damnable; as though he had taken the keys of St. Peter only to acquire the power of perjuring himself, and of

giving free license of perjury to others."

The two popes, seeing that a general council was to be assembled, each himself called a general council! But the general council called by the cardinals became the real one. In the general council of Pisa thus called there were twenty-six cardinals, four patriarchs, twelve archbishops and eighty bishops in person, and fourteen archbishops and a hundred and two bishops by their representatives. There were eighty-seven abbots in person, and two hundred by representatives. The generals of the four great Orders of the Church were present; delegates from thirteen of the great universities of all Europe were there—Paris, Toulouse, Orleans, Angers, Montpellier, Bologna, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Oxford, Cambridge—and the chapters of a hundred metropolitan and collegiate churches. There were three hundred doctors of theology and of canon law. There were ambassadors of the kings of France, of England, of Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; of the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, Pomerania; of the margrave of Brandenburg; and the landgrave of Thuringia, with many other German princes.

After the formal opening of the council, proclamation was made at the doors of the cathedral, "demanding whether Peter de Luna or Angelo Corario were present, either by themselves, their cardinals, or



their procurators." Three days in succession this proclamation was made. Then, as there was no answer from either of the popes, they were pronounced "in contumacy." Then resolutions were adopted "that the holy council was canonically called and constituted, by the two colleges of the cardinals now blended into one; that to them it belonged to take cognizance of the two competitors for the papacy." Then there was read a full account of the origin and progress of the schism up to that time, the account concluding as follows:

Seeing that the contending prelates have been duly cited, and, not appearing, declared contumacious, they are deprived of their pontifical dignity, and their partisans of their honors, offices, and benefices. If they contravene this sentence of deposition, they may be punished and chastised by secular judges. All kings, princes, and persons of every rank or quality are absolved from their oaths, and released from all allegiance to the two rival claimants of the popedom.

Following this several days were devoted to the hearing of the testimony of witnesses. But it was soon found that witnesses who could be easily found were innumerable, and so, not to prolong the council to unnecessary length, they declared that the main facts were "matters of public notoriety," and, in the next session, proceeded to definite sentence. The session was opened with a sermon from the bishop of Sisteron, who had been a strong partisan of Benedict XIII. He preached from the text, "Purge away your old leaven," and in his sermon declared that Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. were "no more popes than my old shoes." He pronounced them "worse than Annas and Caiaphas," and compared them even to "the devils in hell." Then the sentence of the council was pronounced as follows:

The holy universal council, representing the Catholic Church of God, to whom belongs the

judgment in this cause, assembled by the grace of the Holy Ghost in the Cathedral of Pisa, having duly heard the promoters of the cause for the extirpation of the detestable and inveterate schism, the union and re-establishment of our holy mother Church, against Peter de Luna and Angelo Corario, called by some Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., declares the crimes and excesses, adduced before the council, to be true, and of public fame. The two competitors, Peter de Luna and Angelo Corario, have been and are notorious schismatics, obstinate partisans, abettors, defenders, approvers of this long schism; notorious heretics as having departed from the faith; involved in the crimes of perjury and breach of their oaths; openly scandalizing the Church by their manifest obstinacy, and utterly incorrigible. By their enormous iniquities and excesses they have made themselves unworthy of all honor and dignity, especially of the supreme pontificate; and though by the canons they are actually rejected of God, deprived and cut off from the Church, the council nevertheless excommunicates, rejects, and deposes them, and pronounces them excommunicated, rejected, and deposed by the present definitive sentence; forbids them henceforth to assume the name of high pontiffs, and all Christians, on pain of excommunication, to obey them, or lend them any assistance whatever; annuls all the judgments they have hitherto given, or may henceforth give, as well as the promotion of cardinals made latterly by either—by Angelus Corarius since the 3d of May of the preceding year, and by Peter de Luna since the 15th of June of the same year; and lastly, declares upon the whole for further security, the apostolic See to be at present vacant, and the cardinals at liberty to proceed to a new election."

—*Milman.*

The next thing was the election of a new pope. This could not be by the council, but only by the cardinals. The twenty-six cardinals spent eleven days in conclave, and then announced the election of friar Peter Chilargi, more than seventy years old, who was proclaimed pope under the name of Alexander V. (June 26, 1409, to May 3, 1410).

It was very soon discovered that, instead of Christendom's having now one pope, it had three; that the efforts of the council and the cardinals in setting up a



new pope, instead of having brought peace to the world, had only increased the confusion; for Alexander V. immediately bestowed papal honors upon the members of his order. He issued a bull by which he "invested the Friar Preachers, the Friar Minors, the Augustinians, and the Carmelites, in the full, uncontrolled power of hearing confession and granting absolution in every part of Christendom. It rescinded, and declared null, if not heretical, seven propositions advanced or sanctioned by other popes, chiefly John XXII. . . . This bull was not only the absolute annihilation of the exclusive prerogatives and pretensions of the clergy, but it was ordered to be read by the clergy themselves in all the churches in Christendom. They were to publish before their own flocks the triumph of their enemies, the complete independence of their parishioners of their authority, their own condemnation for insufficiency, their disfranchisement from their ancient, immemorial rights.

"Henceforth there was a divided dominion in every diocese; in every parish there were two or more conflicting claimants on the obedience, the love, and the liberality of the flock. Still further, all who dared to maintain the propositions annulled by the bull were to be proceeded against as contumacious and obstinate heretics. Thus the pope, who was to reconcile and command or win distracted Christendom to peace and unity—a narrow-minded friar, thinking only of his own Order—had flung a more fatal apple of discord into the world, and stirred up a new civil war among the more immediate adherents of the Papacy, among those who ought to have been knit together in more close and intimate confederacy."—*Id.*

The effect of this act of Alexander V. was to throw back to Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. the sympathy of many, and also to cast discredit upon the Council of

Pisa that had chosen a pope who could act only in a way to make confusion worse confounded. "Murmurs were heard in many quarters that the council, instead of extinguishing the schism, had but added a third pope." This increased confusion also encouraged the other two popes, and it very shortly appeared that now there were indeed three popes instead of one. Gregory XII. was acknowledged as pope by the king of Sicily, by some of the cities of Italy, and by Rupert, king of the Romans. Benedict XIII. was acknowledged as lawful pope by the kings of Aragon, Castile, and Scotland, and the earl of Armagnac. Alexander V. was acknowledged to be pope by the remaining princes of Europe.

Benedict XIII. was now under the protection of the king of Aragon, and he issued his anathemas against the Council of Pisa and the other two popes. Gregory XII. was in the territories of Venice. He by his general council published sentences of excommunication and anathema against the other two popes, declaring that "the election of the one and the other was uncanonical and sacrilegious; both were pronounced schismatics and heretics; their acts were all annulled, and all were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to obey the one or the other." Gregory also published again his many times repeated and broken profession that he was ready to resign immediately, provided the other two popes would do "the same, at the same time, and in the same place." He further declared that "if the two intruders did not agree to these terms, he granted them leave to assemble a general council of the three obediences, at which he said he was ready to assist in person, and to acquiesce in their decrees, provided his two competitors engaged to assist at it in person as well as he, and to stand to the determination of that assembly."—*Bower.*

Instead of following the example of his



immediate predecessors, in hoarding vast treasures, Alexander V. plunged to the other extreme, and gave everything away. He declared that as a bishop he had been rich, as a cardinal he had been poor, and as pope he would be a beggar. "On the very day of his enthronement his grants were so lavish as to justify, if not to give rise to, the rumor that the cardinals, on entering the conclave, had made a vow that whosoever should be elected would grant to the households of his brother

cardinals the utmost of their demands." Alexander V. put himself under the care of his favorite, Balthasar Cossa, cardinal-legate of Bologna. He went with the cardinal to the city of Bologna; and there he died May 3, 1410. The cardinals had gone to Bologna with Pope Alexander. The twenty-four cardinals unanimously elected as the successor of Alexander V. Balthasar Cossa, who took the papal name of John XXIII. (May 25, 1410, to June 14, 1419).

The committee on Sunday observance of the Rock River Methodist Conference of Illinois, in its report to the conference in session in Chicago on October 14, "denounced Methodist laymen who require their workmen to labor on the first day of the week; called upon Methodist families to refrain from patronizing tradesmen who keep their shops open on the morning of Sunday; decried the practise of riding to and from Sunday camp-meetings and picnics, and advised against the holding of such picnics; and denounced political gatherings on Sunday." It was reported that half a dozen members of the conference objected to the report. One member asked: "If it is wrong to go to a political meeting on Sunday, why is it not wrong to attend an Epworth League rally on the Lord's day?" This question would have been especially pertinent with reference to an Epworth League rally in the interests of Sunday legislation and enforcement. Another member inquired if the term political gatherings was intended to include prohibition meetings, and Bishop Merrill, who was in the chair, replied: "The Prohibition Party is as much a political party as the others. If it is wicked to attend the one it is wicked to attend the other." The bishop might also have said that organizations of clergymen and church people that are devoted to such a cause as Sunday legislation and enforcement,

which clergymen themselves are the quickest to declare is not a religious but a "civil" matter, are, if this declaration of clergymen be true, as much political parties as any others, and that if it is wicked to attend the gatherings of political parties on Sunday, it is also wicked to attend the gatherings of religious people on Sunday in the interests of Sunday enforcement. That is a peculiar moral code which forbids attendance upon the gatherings of political parties on Sunday, but which does not forbid attendance upon the meetings held by clergymen and church people on Sunday in the interests of a plainly political end. But this is evidently the sort of moral code that many clergymen and church people believe in. Without regard to whether it be religious or "civil," Sunday legislation and enforcement is a political end. Whenever clergymen and church people declare that it is not religious in any sense, but wholly "civil," they simply declare that they have no excuse whatever for supposing it to be anything else than political.

*Continued from page 56.*

studies" provided for them by the theologians, then the Government would have to compel them to do it. It will be well, however, not to wait until things reach that stage before calling a halt on this sort of thing.



## SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed in the general articles and the editorial department.

A Sunday-enforcement movement was recently launched in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The movement had its inception in efforts put forth by Rev. J. F. Mills, a Baptist minister, who preached several sermons on Sunday observance, and then circulated a Sunday-closing agreement among the merchants of the city. There were a few who did not sign this agreement, and then it was determined that recourse must be had to the law. The mayor was asked for an expression of his views "as to the enforcement of the Sunday-closing ordinances." He wrote a sort of treatise on Sunday legislation to Rev. Mr. Mills in reply, and wound up by declaring that he was "heartily in sympathy with any move tending toward or having for its object the proper observance of this day as a day of rest and devotion," and that "any complaints made to the magistrates or the police of the city of violations of any of the city ordinances in this regard" would receive prompt attention. This communication was read at a mass-meeting that was addressed by a number of clergymen, and at which this was adopted:

*Resolved*, That it is the strong and prevailing public sentiment of the people of Grand Forks that the welfare of the city, as well as obedience to the laws of the city, require that all stores, offices, billiard rooms, bowling alleys, and other places of amusement in the city be closed on Sunday.

That, recognizing the willingness of the mayor as expressed in his letter, we hereby call upon the mayor of the city, the city council, the city attorney, the State's attorney, and the chief of police to maintain and enforce the laws regarding Sunday observance, and we pledge them our support in the same.

A "civic federation" of fifty members was organized at this mass-meeting, and

a "special committee on the enforcement of Sunday laws" was at once appointed. This committee has caused the arrest and fining on the charge of Sunday selling of the manager of the "New York Outlet Company," a Jew, and a local paper says the federation is proving "a powerful factor in seeing that the Sunday-closing laws of the State and city are enforced."



We mentioned last week that the cases of five barbers who were arrested in Sioux City, Iowa, on December 22, for barbering on Sunday, had been continued. It seems that their attorneys have determined to test the validity of the ordinance under which the arrests were made, and for that purpose one of the barbers pleaded guilty and refused to pay the fine of \$5 imposed. He was then sentenced to two days in jail. The attorneys attempted to secure his release by habeas corpus, but the court decided that an appeal was the proper step. The attorneys have filed demurrers to the informations against the barbers, "alleging illegality and unconstitutionality of the ordinance" prohibiting Sunday barbering on these grounds:

First—Because section 5040 of the Iowa State statutes proceeds on the principle that persons who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath shall not be required to abstain from employment otherwise lawful on Sunday.

Second—Because such ordinance is class legislation and grants immunity to one class of citizens which upon the same terms shall not belong to all, in that such ordinance compels certain classes of citizens who in obedience to their religious convictions rest from labor on the seventh day of the week, to rest another day.

Third—Because the ordinance, which secures



special privileges to certain classes of citizens against those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, also compels them to observe the first day as the Sabbath, thus forcing them to rest two days.

In harmony with an Ohio decision which they cited, the attorneys held that "an ordinance which does not in its entirety conform to the State law is void," and that therefore the ordinance in question, failing to conform to the State statute in the important respect of exempting seventh-day observers, was void and unconstitutional. This raises a rather unusual question, and it will be interesting to see what position the courts take in the matter.



In the district court at Fairmont, Minn., on December 13, a saloon-keeper was sentenced to ninety days in jail or to pay a fine of \$100 "for the sale of liquor on Sunday." He paid the fine. In the district court at Buffalo, Minn., on December 6, two saloon-keepers of Waverly, Minn., were fined \$50 and costs each for "selling liquor on Sunday." At Beatrice, Neb., on December 6, two saloon-keepers of Wymore were "tried on a charge of selling liquors on the Sabbath," and were each fined \$100 and costs. On December 1 three saloon-keepers were arrested in Dayton, Ohio, on the charge of Sunday selling; on January 5 one was arrested on the same charge in Calumet, Mich.; and on January 8 one was arrested on the same charge in Armour, S. Dak. Strict Sunday closing of saloons has been ordered recently by the authorities in Sauk Rapids, Le Sueur, and Graceville, Minn.

At a mass-meeting held in "the Tabernacle" in Nashville, Tenn., on the evening of December 29, and which was addressed by a number of clergymen and prominent citizens, resolutions were adopted demanding of the city and county authorities "the rigid enforcement of the laws against Sunday tipping and gambling." A "committe of one hundred" was appointed "to take all necessary steps to make effective the purpose of the mass-meeting." The Nashville *American* is actively supporting the movement.



Fifty-four arrests for violation of the Sunday excise law were reported in New York for January 4, and eighty-eight arrests for the same cause were reported for the Sunday following. In the police courts most of the prisoners were "held for further examination." The revival of activity in the enforcement of this law follows the appointment of a new police-commissioner.



The saloon-keepers of Menominee, Mich., have been notified by the local W. C. T. U. that the Sunday-closing law "must be obeyed." The saloon-keepers threaten that if they are compelled to close they will "stop all labor on Sunday," and "will even stop the labor of mill watchmen, livery stable hostlers, and street railway employees."



The Shreveport (La.) *Times* thinks "the Sunday law is a wise law," and that "our duty is to preserve and enforce it."

---

"The vicious system of delivering coal on Sundays" has been denounced by some one who has written to the editor of the Chicago *Chronicle* regarding "Sunday observance," and who is very much of the opinion that "our American Sab-

bath should be preserved in our cities." He who can discover anything vicious in the delivery of coal on Sunday or any other day at the present time must have very queer ideas as to what constitutes viciousness.



# 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; it 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.

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.

### 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.

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

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

### TO OUR PATRONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**

11 West 20th Street, New York City.

THAT our change from a monthly to a weekly magazine is considered a move in the right direction is daily attested to by letters received from our patrons and friends. The following letter shows how one friend regards the change. She says: "Find enclosed two dollars for which please send THE SENTINEL and The Signs of the Times as offered in THE SENTINEL of January eighth. I have not cared for THE SENTINEL as a monthly as I could not find readers in this place. I welcome it as a weekly, and shall read it, and hope to find others who will read it also."

SEVERAL readers have written asking for suggestions with a view to holding Religious Liberty Conventions for the purpose of promoting true religious liberty principles. We shall be pleased to do what we can to further this work, and would be glad to hear from others who are interested in such conventions, or who would like to see one held in their locality.

ALMOST every day some one writes asking for sample copies which they wish to use as an aid to obtaining new subscriptions and working up clubs of THE SENTINEL. We have plenty of copies to spare for this purpose. We would be glad if every reader of THE SENTINEL would enter upon a crusade to obtain new subscriptions.

## VIOLIN

Mandolin, Guitar, Banjo and Zither Players. Send ten cents silver for a sample copy of THE CADENZA, Monthly Music Magazine. Each issue contains new music worth 50 cents alone. Send to day. C. L. PARTER MUSIC CO., 5 E. 14th St., N. Y. 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.





### 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 Most Perfect Bible Translation in the World"**

This is what an editor of a prominent religious weekly says in regard to the American Revised Bible, just published.

This edition of the Bible is entirely new, printed from large, clear Bourgeois type, and is furnished in the following bindings:

<i>Black Cloth, red edges</i> .....	\$1.00
<i>Egyptian Seal, limp, round corners, gold edges</i> .....	1.75
<i>Egyptian Seal, divinity circuit, leather lined to edge, round corners, red under gold edges</i> .....	2.75

SENT POSTPAID ON RECEIPT OF PRICE

***Pacific Press Publishing Company***  
11 West 20th Street, New York City

## ***Outlines of Modern Science and Modern Christianity***

By **GEO. McCREADY PRICE**

This book is an endeavor to get back to primitive Christian principles, and therefore takes the Biblical side of the pending

### ***Science-versus-Religion Controversy***

The following are some of the chapter headings:

*Divine Immanence*

*Biblical Geology*

*Scientific World Building*

*Evolution and the World Problems*

The consistency and clearness of the author's logic and the grand themes upon which he dwells, will hold the interest of the reader to the end.

*The book is neatly bound in cloth, contains 271 pages,  
and will be sent postpaid for 75 cts.*

ADDRESS

***Pacific Press Publishing Company***  
11 West 20th Street, New York City