

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 5, 1903

NO. 6



The experience of history shows that free government, once established, can be preserved only by the individual standing upon his rights, or more pointedly speaking, keeping government . . . at arm's-length. This is a thing . . . entirely consistent with the highest loyalty to government. . . . A small encroachment of arbitrary power by government leads quite inevitably, if suffered without opposition, to greater and greater ones, and to a growing multitude of them, . . . ending in the temporary or permanent destruction of free government. Cicero said of Julius Caesar that as he looked at him adjusting his hair so nicely and scratching his head with one finger, it never occurred to him that such a man could conceive so vast and fatal a design as the destruction of the Roman commonwealth. And so it is with the first invasions and encroachments upon the rights and liberties of the citizen. They appear at first, if noticed at all, as commonplace and harmless as the very ordinary-looking man Caesar scratching his head appeared to Cicero; and yet they are germs pregnant with the destruction of free government.

MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM J. GAYNOR, of the Supreme Court of New York, in the *North American Review* for January.

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 $6\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ 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



A LITTLE DICTIONARY.

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

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

FIRST, THE DICTIONARY.

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

SECOND, THE GAZETTEER.

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

THIRD, THE PARLIAMENTARY MANUAL.

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

FOURTH, THE RAPID CALCULATOR.

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

FIFTH, THE LITERARY GUIDE.

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

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

All styles with thumb index.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

11 West 20th Street, New York.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1903

No. 6

A law compelling rest by all leaves no right of rest to any.



"Theology is a matter for the individual and not for the state."



The rights of one man cannot be protected by taking away the rights of another.



He best maintains his own rights who is most careful to respect the rights of others.



An invasion of the rights of one person or class is an invasion of the rights of all persons and classes.



The conscientious convictions of one person are entitled to as much regard as are the conscientious convictions of another.



Human rights are the same upon all days, and therefore it cannot be that upon the first day of the week they dwindle down to the mere "right of rest."



Civil officials, yes, and even clergymen, are getting somewhat out of their proper sphere when they undertake "to preserve the integrity of the Sabbath." If the Sabbath is a divine institution, if it is indeed the "Lord's day," let it not be doubted that the Lord will take care of its integrity without man's assistance.

The policy of legal "protection" for the "Sabbath" is a policy of monopoly. The Sunday law is a measure for killing all competition with the Sunday sabbath.



When the right to work on Sunday is taken away there can remain no right to rest, for that upon which both are based—the right to use the day as one *chooses*—is taken away.



Sunday seems to be the busiest day of the week with most of the advocates of "Sunday rest." They work hard on Sunday not in order that others *may* rest, out in order that they may be *made* to "rest."



"There ought to be room in this world for *all* the consciences in it, without any encroachment upon the rights of any; and there would be if *all* men, in their relations to each other, would be content to exercise their *own* rights of conscience. This would leave every man free to determine religious questions for himself, and, as the necessary consequence, relieve every man from all impositions, burdens, taxes, or disabilities arising from the determination of such questions by others."



A bill prohibiting the playing of football under severe penalties, and under which "the standing of the football player is even worse than that of a criminal," was recently introduced into the

legislature of South Dakota. In a dispatch it is termed a "freak." And yet is there not more common sense in a measure prohibiting the playing of football than in one prohibiting "common labor" and "worldly employments"? South Dakota, in common with most of the other States, now has upon its statute book such a measure as the latter. See the Sunday law.



Three weeks ago mention was made in these columns of the case of a Seventh-day Adventist whose appointment to a permanent position in the service of the Post-office Department had been "held up" by the officials at Washington because he had stated that he could not conscientiously work on the seventh day of the week. We learn from the newspapers that in a case of this kind that was pending the seventh-day observer "has received a permanent appointment," the matter having "been adjusted on the basis that he will not have to work on Saturdays, and his salary will be deducted for those days." That would seem to be a very proper and fair adjustment of the matter.



A little newspaper in Iowa is authority for the news that "because he refused to sell tobacco and liquor in his drug store on Sundays, and refused to break the Sabbath by waiting on any customers, a Des Moines druggist has been adjudged insane and sent to the hospital at Mt. Pleasant." This is certainly "remarkable, if true." It would not have been so remarkable, but it would have been just as devoid of reason and justice if, instead of what is reported, the druggist had been adjudged an offender against "the peace and order of the State" and fined because he *did* "break the Sabbath" by waiting on customers and selling goods on Sunday.

In a case in which objection was made to the oral repetition of the Lord's Prayer and the Twenty-third Psalm during the opening exercises of a public school, on the ground that such repetition was a form of religious worship, Judge Hazen of Topeka, Kan., has decided that the mere oral repetition of those or any other portions of the Bible "does not constitute a form of religious worship," and that "mere reading in the schools of any portions of the Bible is not prohibited but is permitted by our statute." He says that "in this respect the Bible is placed on the same footing with all other books." Portions of it may be read, but "the teaching or inculcating of it in the public schools is prohibited."



Application for an injunction to prevent the "national church" faction from "defiling" a church in Rizal Province was recently made to the Philippine Supreme Court. The application was denied on the ground of lack of jurisdiction, the matter being one with which the courts of the province were competent to deal. It is not likely, however, that the courts will attempt to deal with the question of "defilement," for they are certainly not competent to do so. But they can decide as to which party is entitled to the possession of the church, and if this is done in this case it will be the first instance in which the courts have settled a dispute between the two church factions over the possession of church property.



Sunday closing has been made the test of unionism by the barbers' union of Quincy, Ill. Shops that have hitherto been placed in the "scab" class are rated as "fair" because they have agreed to close on Sunday, and at least one staunch union shop is rated as "unfair" because its proprietor refuses to close. He declares that the course of the union "is

against all union precedent and principle"; that "the question of keeping open on Sunday or not is very small as compared with the matter of prices and wages," and that he does not understand upon what union principle he, a strong union man who has always upheld prices and wages, is outlawed because he opens his shop on Sunday, and "cut-rate shops" are endorsed by the union and classed as "fair" simply because they close on Sunday. This incident is indicative of the trend of things in the world of unionism with respect to the matter of compulsory Sunday rest.

A "freethought" exchange asks some very pertinent questions in commenting on the dismissal in the superior court at Cambridge, Mass., of the appealed case of Mr. W. T. Gibson, the Seventh-day Adventist who had been tried and sentenced to pay a fine in a lower court for working on Sunday. The district attorney had the case dismissed because Mr. Gibson was a seventh-day observer. Our exchange says:

Is a man legally bound to keep one day of the week sacred? Suppose Mr. Gibson had been a Freethinker and did not believe any day holy, would he have been held guiltless? Not a bit of it.

And this is of course the truth; although Mr. Gibson steadfastly refused to plead in his defense that he was a seventh-day observer. Yes, it is true that in Massachusetts, as in many other States, "a man is legally bound to keep one day of the week sacred"—that is, if he does not observe the "Lord's day" according to the law he must "conscientiously believe that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath," and must "actually refrain from secular business and labor on that day." The law takes no account of persons that do "not believe any day holy"; they must

observe Sunday or suffer the penalty. And therein is exhibited very conspicuously the intolerant and unrighteous character of the law.

Officials of the Canadian "Lord's Day" Alliance have found that it is sometimes necessary for members of the militia who are conscientious Sunday observers "to choose between violating their conscientious convictions and disobeying the orders of their military superiors," and have called upon the Minister of Militia to remedy the matter. At the same time demands looking toward more strict enforcement of Sunday observance throughout the country were made. It would seem that it should occur to these clergymen in connection with their request that consideration be shown the conscientious convictions of members of the militia in the matter of Sunday observance, that there are other people besides Sunday observers who have conscientious convictions, and that it is barely possible that the enforcement of Sunday observance will cause them to be placed in a position every bit as bad as that in which conscientious Sunday-observing militiamen may have been placed. There are people in Canada whose conscientious convictions require them to observe the seventh day of the week and not to observe the first day, and there are multitudes whose honest, conscientious convictions do not require them to observe any special day as the "Lord's day" or Sabbath. To compel any of these to observe Sunday is of course to trample upon their conscientious convictions in the matter. And yet the officials of the "Lord's Day" Alliance are constantly demanding strict Sunday enforcement upon all classes of the people; and not only without any protest from them, but with their active approval, have seventh-day observers been prosecuted and punished in

Canada for not observing Sunday. Why is it that these clergymen take account only of the conscientious convictions of Sunday observers? Are not the conscientious convictions of other people entitled to equal consideration?



An Absurd Proposition

ONE of the principal arguments put forward in support of Sunday laws is that they are necessary in order that the workingman may be free to rest on Sunday. In other words, they are necessary in order that the workingman may have more liberty.

It is said that the "right of rest for one requires a law of rest for all"; and by this it is meant that the right of one person to rest on Sunday demands a law compelling rest on the part of all. In this way men are to be made "free" to enjoy the right to rest!

This is not the freedom that workingmen or any other class of men need. It is not real freedom at all. Rights are to be secured to people, not thrust forcibly upon them. A right is of no value to an individual when separated from personal freedom in the matter of its exercise. To attempt to force an individual to exercise a right which he does not choose to exercise is to make the right a curse to him instead of a blessing.

Every person has the right to rest on the first day of the week, but not every person wishes to exercise that right in practise. Many prefer to exercise some other right that is just as great and fundamental. A large number believe that another day is the proper day for the weekly rest, and that such rest on the first day is wholly improper. A still larger class believe in spending the day in any manner that may suit their tastes, whether it be working, or resting, or seeking amusement and pleasure.

To enforce Sunday rest upon these

classes is not to secure them in a right, but is to prevent them from exercising rights. It is an invasion, not an establishment, of their rightful liberty.

And what is true of these classes is true of all classes, for the rights of all are the same. The right to rest on Sunday is included in and necessarily rests upon the general right to do upon any day anything that is not an invasion of the liberty and rights of others. To prevent a person from working on Sunday, or from spending the day in other ways that are just as consistent with the rights of others as is the use of the day for rest, is to deny his fundamental right to use the day as he chooses, and is therefore to deny him the choice, and therefore the right, of resting on Sunday. When a person is *compelled* to rest he no longer has the *right* to rest.

And so, whether they are conscious of the fact or not, enforced Sunday rest is just as much of an invasion of the rights of those who rest on Sunday as it is of the rights of the classes we have mentioned, who prefer to exercise their right to the use of the day in other ways that are just as legitimate and just as consistent with equal rights and liberty for all as is resting.

Thus the assertion that "the right of rest for one requires a law of rest for all," is self-contradictory, since it is equivalent not only to saying that "the right of rest for one" denies the right of rest for another, but that "the right of rest for one" denies the right of rest *for all*. Such a proposition is, of course, an utter absurdity. And yet, as we have stated, this proposition is one of the principal arguments that is put forward to-day in behalf of Sunday legislation.

L. A. S.



It was reported recently from Bellefonte, Pa., that the clergymen of that place, "encouraged by their success" in a Sunday-enforcement campaign, had

decided "to take a hand in active politics" and would "organize a citizens' party for the purpose of putting in the field a full borough ticket for the coming borough election." Sunday-enforcement is well calculated to whet the appetite of clergymen for participation in "active politics."



Let There be Consideration for the Rights of All

IN the opinion of the *Chicago News* "the effort of the retail clerks of the State to secure the passage of a bill by the legislature closing stores on Sunday should have the support of all the citizens." The *News* says further:

New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Kentucky have passed laws that protect clerks and employers alike in their necessary rest from labor one day in the week. Illinois should not hesitate to show itself as willing as the other commonwealths to recognize the physical need of every person to lay aside labor one day in seven. There is no need for open stores on Sunday. The same volume of trade would be done in six days that is now done in seven if all stores in any community were closed uniformly on the weekly day of rest. In this age of consideration for the worker the appeal of the retail clerks that they be rescued from continual wage slavery should meet with a ready response from the legislators.

It is a far cry from *recognizing* "the physical need of every person to lay aside labor one day in seven" to *compelling* every person to lay aside labor, not only one day in seven, but on a certain specified day in every seven. There are other physical needs which every person has that are far more important than that of laying aside labor one day in seven, but no one is demanding, nor would think of demanding, that they be "recognized" by the State in the manner in which it is demanded that this alleged physical need of rest one day in seven shall be "recognized." How would it do for the State

to "recognize" the physical need of every person to eat good food, to take needful exercise, and to take sufficient and regular sleep, by prescribing for the people a dietary, a course of gymnastics or other exercise, and a schedule for retiring at night, and attempting to compel the people to follow out the prescription?

According to the principles which have been generally regarded as fundamental in American law such a thing even as the protection of "clerks and employers alike in their necessary rest from labor one day in the week" can hardly be made to include the forcing of any of them to rest, or to lay aside labor, who do not want to do so. As to whether or not there is need for open stores on Sunday, that is something that can probably best be determined by the conditions and needs of different localities, and no doubt in any locality different persons will hold different opinions. But as to whether or not a given store in any locality shall be open or closed on Sunday, there should be no difference of opinion anywhere that it is a matter regarding which the proprietor of the store has a better right to determine than any other person or persons.

The *News* would have the clerks "rescued from continual wage slavery." Why not have them "rescued" from "wage slavery" entirely? This is what many are demanding louder and louder for all workers. Is the *News* willing to urge "a ready response from the legislators" to the demand that "wage slavery" be abolished entirely? If it is not, it should be slow to give its approval to, and to urge "a ready response from the legislators" to, a demand for such legislation as is now being demanded by the Illinois Retail Clerks' Association.

We trust that this age will become far more than it is one "of consideration for the worker," but we are not desirous of

having it become an age in which consideration for the worker will be the only consideration, and in which the workers will be allowed to override the rights of all other classes. We prefer that it shall be an age in which the just rights of all classes and individuals are recognized and considered. There is too much of a disposition on the part of the working people as represented in trade-unions to think of nobody's rights but their own, and consequently to fall into the way of demanding as their rights what conflicts with the rights of others, and of recklessly overriding the rights of others in the effort to attain their ends. This disposition is beginning to manifest itself in the direction of Sunday legislation and enforcement. While working people should have every protection that the State can give them consistently with its duty to *all* its citizens, there is not one whit more justice in the demand of union organizations that all employers and non-unionists shall be prevented by law from engaging in any sort of business or of doing any sort of work on Sunday that is perfectly legitimate on other days, than there would be in a demand by unionists that the law should prevent employers from employing men and non-unionists from working when the unionists have declared a strike.

The aim in society should be equal justice, freedom and liberty for all; and that condition in which the just rights of some are invaded in the supposed interests of others, is an unhealthful, unrighteous and in the long run an intolerable condition. It will create trouble sooner or later. And to compel all persons to stop work and business of every kind on a specified day because some do not want to work on that day, is to bring about just that sort of a condition. It is to deprive some of their just rights in order that others may have *more* than their just rights.

The retired Episcopalian clergyman of Geneva, N. Y., who, it is reported, has begun an agitation which has for its object such a modification of the State Sunday law as will permit ball playing on Sunday, is credited with these sensible remarks:

The personal rights and liberty of individuals are too much infringed upon by the prevention of ball playing on Sunday for it to be consistent with the blessing of social freedom, which we have as a common heritage. The law does not give arbitrary rules to govern social conduct as long as it does not conflict with social order. . . . Among the reasons given by those who oppose Sunday baseball is that the noise will disturb Sunday repose. Crowds gather and loud, boisterous conduct follows. This is not an argument against the game itself, for unseemly actions are a mere passable condition or accident which may easily be remedied or prevented. *Disorderly conduct is wrong at any time, on Monday as well as on Sunday.* . . . The great number of employees who are occupied during the entire week, every day except Sunday, and whose only opportunity for outdoor exercise and recreation is on Sunday, think it but fair that they should have the selection of such pastimes and amusements as a proper inclination suggests. . . . There is also a moral side to this question. The very best Christian ministers agree that amusements, as long as they are without prejudice to the public, are excellent safeguards to morals.



About the middle of January it was reported that the Montana W. C. T. U. had already secured over 3,000 signatures to the petition calling for the enactment of a law prohibiting the opening of saloons on Sunday, which it is circulating throughout the State. The petition, with the names already secured attached to it, was presented in the lower house of the legislature on January 15. The document measured over twenty-seven feet in length. The State liquor dealers' association is preparing to defeat the bill when it comes up in the legislature.

The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

X

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.

John XXIII and the Council of Constance

THE Council of Constance met Nov. 1, 1414, and continued till April 22, 1418. The total number of the clergy alone present at the council, though perhaps not all of them all the time, was four patriarchs, twenty-nine cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, one hundred and fifty bishops, one hundred and thirty-four abbots, two hundred and fifty doctors, and lesser clergy, amounting to eighteen thousand. With the emperor and his train, kings, dukes, lords, and other nobles, the numbers were ordinarily fifty thousand. At certain periods of the conference there were as many as one hundred thousand present. Thirty thousand horses were fed, and thirty thousand beds were provided by the city.

The council was opened with John XXIII. presiding. Deputies were present from both Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. Gregory's deputies promptly declared, in behalf of their master, that he was ready to resign, upon condition that both the other popes should resign at the same time. They also presented to the emperor a petition asking that John XXIII. should not be allowed to preside at the council. To consider this subject there was appointed, apart from the council, a general assembly of the heads of the nations who were present. They reported a recommendation that the three popes should voluntarily resign. Pope John instantly agreed, and himself drew up a

form of resignation. But, as the assembly was not satisfied with it, he left it with them to frame.

To this assembly of the nations there was presented a memorial containing a long list of the crimes of the life of John XXIII., stating that these crimes could be proved by unexceptionable witnesses, if the council chose to hear them. As the crimes were notorious already, and undeniable, even by John, he proposed to the assembly that he should plead guilty before the council, reminding them of the generally received maxim that "a pope could not be deposed for any crime except that of heresy." But this proposition was refused by the assembly, on the ground that they could not think it decent that such heinous crimes should be laid publicly before the council, to be narrowly inquired into. They therefore advised that the memorial be suppressed, provided John would consent to the resignation which they would frame. To this John agreed. The assembly therefore drew up the form of the proposed resignation as follows:

I, Pope John XXIII., for the peace of the whole Christian world, declare, promise, vow, and swear to God, to His holy Church, and to this holy council, to give peace to the Church by the way of cession, or resignation of the pontificate, and to execute freely and spontaneously what I now promise, in case Peter de Luna and Angelus Corarius, called in their obediences, Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII.,

in like manner resign their pretended dignity; and also in case either of resignation, of death, or in any other, when my resignation may give peace to the Church of God, and extirpate the present schism.—*Bower.*

This form of resignation Pope John read the next day to the full council, and when, in the reading, he reached the words, "I vow, and swear," he rose from his throne and knelt before the altar, and, laying his hand upon his breast, said: "I promise thus to observe it." Then he resumed his seat upon the throne. The emperor laid off his crown, prostrated himself before John XXIII., "kissed his foot, and thanked him in the name of the whole council for his good resolutions. At the same time the council, the princes who were present, and the ambassadors of those who were absent, engaged to support him, to the utmost of their power, against his two competitors, if they followed not his example."—*Id.*

But it was very soon made plain to all that John had no intention whatever of resigning the papacy. For, when the emperor and the assembly requested him to carry out the agreement, he asked that it be put off awhile. When they insisted, then, by means of the duke of Austria, who was his ally, he fled to Schaffhausen. From there he wrote, the evening of the same day, and sent to the emperor a letter, asking him to excuse his flight, in which he addressed the emperor, saying:

My dear son, by the grace of Almighty God, I am arrived at Schaffhausen, where I enjoy my liberty, and air that agrees with my constitution. I came hither, unknown to my son, the duke of Austria, not to be exempted from keeping the promise I have made to abdicate for the peace of the holy Church of God, but, on the contrary, to do it freely, and without endangering my health.—*Id.*

John's purpose in all this was to break up the council, because he supposed that, in the absence of the pope, the council

would dissolve. But in this his calculations failed. The emperor Sigismund, attended by the marshal of the empire, rode through the city, with trumpets sounding before him, proclaiming that the council was not dissolved by the flight of the pope, but that he would defend the council to the last drop of his blood. The chancellor of the University of Paris presented an argument before the emperor and the assembly of the nations, to prove "that a general council is superior to the pope, and that its determinations hold good whether the pope be present or absent, whether he approve or disapprove of them." Accordingly, the council met in regular session and adopted the following articles:

I. That the council had been lawfully assembled in the city of Constance.

II. That it was not dissolved by the withdrawing of the pope and the cardinals.

III. That it should not be dissolved till the schism was removed and the Church reformed in its head and members.

IV. That the bishops should not depart, without a just cause approved by the deputies of the nation, till the council was ended; and if they obtained leave of the council to depart, they should appoint others to vote for them as their deputies or proxies.—*Id.*

The cardinals who were with John now returned to the council. The emperor discovered that the duke of Austria had aided John in his flight, and therefore put the duke under the ban of the empire, and sent troops to invade his dominions. Upon learning of this John forsook Schaffhausen and fled to Lauffenberg. In his note to the emperor John had declared that it was not from fear that he had left Constance. At Lauffenberg he secured a notary, and, in the presence of witnesses, certified that everything he had agreed to at Constance was because of his fear, and that his pledges there being made under duress, he was not obliged to keep his oath.

The council met again in regular ses-

sion, and made the following declaration:

The present council lawfully assembled in the city of Constance, and representing the whole Church militant, holds its power immediately of Jesus Christ, and all persons of whatsoever state or dignity (the papal not excepted) are bound to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extirpation of the schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and members.—*Id.*

The council sent messengers to John, notifying him that there was no violence intended him, and giving the emperor's assurance that none should be offered him. Therefore, if he refused to return, or to appoint deputies to effect in due form his resignation for him, then the council would proceed against him as guilty of perjury and the author of the schism. The messengers found John at Brisac. He promised them an audience the next day. But, in the interval thus gained, he fled again. The messengers followed, and overtook him at Friburg. They made sure that he should not again have a chance to escape by putting them off: they invaded his bedchamber, and delivered their message to him as they found him in bed.

To the messengers John replied that he was ready to perform his promise to resign the papacy "upon the following conditions, and no other":

I. That the emperor should grant him a safe-conduct in due form, such as he himself should dictate.

II. That a decree should be issued by the council granting him entire freedom and security, and exempting him from being molested upon any account whatever.

III. That a stop should be put to the war against the duke of Austria.

IV. That after his resignation he should be appointed perpetual legate over all Italy, or enjoy, during life, the Bolognese and the county of Avignon, with a yearly pension of

thirty thousand florins of gold; and that he should hold of no person whatever, nor be obliged to give an account to any person of what he had done or might henceforth do.—*Id.*

Meanwhile the council met in fifth regular session, in which it confirmed all the transactions of the previous sessions, especially that which related to the superiority of the council to the pope. In this session it was further decided that the pope was obliged to obey the decrees of the council, and to stand to its decisions; that if he refused to resign the faithful would all withdraw their obedience from him, and he should be held as actually deposed; that his flight from Constance was unlawful and prejudicial to the unity of the Church; that if he would return a most ample safe-conduct would be granted to him; and that if he fulfilled his promise to resign he should be provided for during life in such a manner as should be arranged by four persons named by him and four by the council.

At the next session the council adopted the form of renunciation of the papacy which the assembly of the nations had framed, which John had read to the council, and to which he had agreed. At the next session the pope was officially summoned to appear at the council to justify his flight from Constance, and to clear himself of the crimes of heresy, schism, simony, etc., laid to his charge. Other matters occupied the council at the next two sessions, except that John was officially summoned again. But as John paid no attention to any of the overtures of the council, and the emperor's forces were raiding the dominions of the duke of Austria, the duke made his peace with the emperor, and two archbishops, with three hundred troops, arrested Pope John at Friburg, and confined him in a castle about ten miles from Constance.

There is not, and there never was, on this earth a work of human policy so

well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church.—*Macaulay.*

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.

An item last week mentioned the fact that a delegation of clergymen and labor leaders interested in Sunday enforcement in Canada had waited upon the ministers of the different departments of the government at Ottawa. The following account of the matter, which appeared in the *Toronto Globe* of January 12, is worth presenting entire as showing the length to which the activity of the champions of Sunday observance by governmental authority can be and is being carried in Canada, and also as showing that in Canada, as in this country, the clerical defenders of the "Lord's day" are securing the co-operation of labor leaders in this matter:

Representatives of the Lord's Day Alliance and of the Dominion Trades Congress had a field-day Saturday interviewing leading members of the Government with a view to promoting a stricter observance of the Sabbath in various branches of work under Federal control. The deputation consisted of Rev. J. G. Shearer, Secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of Canada; Rev. F. G. Lett, Rev. J. W. H. Milne, Rev. D. M. Ramsay, Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue and Mr. P. M. Draper, Secretary of the Dominion Trades Congress. The deputation began their tour of the departments shortly before noon, when they called upon Hon. Wm. Paterson and thanked him for the orders issued to customs officers not to attend upon steamers which were engaged in making Sunday excursions. The Minister of Customs was informed that, owing to these orders, Sunday steamship excursions had been stopped, and he was now asked to prohibit the importation of newspapers from the United States on Sunday. Mr. Paterson was told that the sale of Sunday newspapers in the border towns of Canada had become a great nuisance and outraged the feelings of people who believed in a quiet Sabbath. The minister received the deputation in a sympathetic manner and promised to give the matter consideration.

Hon. James Sutherland was the next minister seen. The deputation said to him that they had no complaints to make in regard to Sunday labor against the Public Works Department since he assumed control. They pointed out, however, that some instances had occurred in the department at an earlier date, and they desired that he should use his influence to prevent Sunday labor being performed on Government works. The deputation urged that in order to secure this result a special provision should be inserted in the contracts, and that even in particular instances the minister should be very jealous about granting permission for Sunday labor. Mr. Sutherland stated that he was very glad to have had the representations made to him. Personally he was strongly in favor of maintaining the integrity of our national rest day, and the deputation could rely upon his doing all in his power in the direction of meeting their desires.

Proceeding to the Militia Department the deputation interviewed Sir Frederick Borden and brought to his attention a number of instances of what might be called using the Sunday for drill purposes. They cited the case of the 43d Duke of Cornwall's Regiment striking camp at Britannia-on-the-Bay last spring and marching into Ottawa on the Sabbath, also the fact that rifle practise had been carried on at Kaslo, B. C., on Sunday, and in certain parts of Quebec. A number of cases were also mentioned where the militia had used Sunday either to journey to camp or to break up camp and travel to their homes by steamship or railway, thus causing trainmen or sailors to lose their day of rest and seriously disturbing the quiet of the communities affected. The deputation alluded to the tremendous influence that the militia had upon public opinion, owing to the pride which Canadians took in the force, and pointed out that such as had been alluded to were offensive to the great mass of Christian people. Moreover, the deputation said, members of the militia were expected to obey orders, even in cases of Sunday outings, and, many of them being Christian men, it resulted in the latter having to choose between violating their conscientious convictions and disobeying the orders of their military superiors. Sir Frederick Borden, who

received the deputation in a very kindly manner, expressed surprise at learning of some things reported by them, his attention not having been drawn to them before. He avowed his sympathy with the Lord's Day Alliance and the labor people in their efforts to preserve the integrity of the Sabbath, and his conviction that members of the militia should not be compelled to violate their conscientious convictions in yielding obedience to military orders in such matters as outings, parades, or in going to and from camps. He felt that unless exceptional reasons existed why it should be otherwise, the militia should avoid travelling to and from camps on Sunday. Sir Frederick said he would look carefully into all the matter's brought to his notice, and do all in his power to meet the wishes of the deputation.

The last minister called upon was Sir William Mulock. The Postmaster-General was informed that a very large number of complaints had been received by the Lord's Day Alliance in regard to postoffices being kept open on Sunday in various parts of the country; that there was a marked tendency for this kind of thing to grow; that the Alliance saw no reason in most of the instances why the postoffice should be opened on Sunday; and that if Toronto and Ottawa could get along with a closed postoffice, there was no apparent reason why Fort William and Brandon could not do likewise. The deputation took the ground that the effect of such opening was not only an evil from an educational point of view, but resulted in a good deal of unnecessary business being done on Sunday, and involved labor on the part of postoffice employees in the distribution of mails coming in late on Saturday night or early on Sunday. The labor representatives pressed upon Sir William's attention the fact that he was not only Postmaster-General but Minister of Labor, and this seemed a special reason why he should be careful not to allow the workingman's day of rest to be invaded. The labor delegates also took occasion to express their very great appreciation of the consideration for the interests of workingmen that had been shown by Sir William in the management of his department. Sir William expressed gratification at the reasonable spirit manifested by the delegation, and said that the policy of his department was that all postoffices should be closed on Sunday, unless there were exceptional circumstances which rendered it necessary to depart from the practise. He asked to have furnished him specific cases from all parts of the Dominion,

and promised that they would be dealt with on their merits. He added that he would be glad to do anything in his power to prevent unnecessary encroachment on the Sabbath.

To-morrow the deputation will interview the Hon. A. G. Blair on the question of Sunday labor on the Government railways and the canals, and if possible will wait upon the Prime Minister in regard to the general question of Sabbath observance.

The following resolution has been adopted by the Dominion Trades Congress on motion of Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue:

"That, inasmuch as organized labor is unalterably opposed to long working hours and is in favor of a Saturday half-holiday, be it resolved that this congress is opposed to and condemns all Sunday excursions by steamer or rail, as well as all unnecessary servile work on Sunday."

When the deputation waited upon the Minister of Railways two days later "a strong protest was made against Sunday traffic on the Intercolonial Railway." "Rev. Mr. Shearer said that freight trains were run from both ends of the line on Sunday, and also special freights, and that there was unnecessary yard work done at Truro and Halifax on the seventh day. The complaints will be investigated." Evidently the officials of the Canadian government do not question the idea that it is their proper duty to prevent "encroachments upon the Sabbath," and that it was perfectly proper for clergymen to assume general supervision of the whole matter and see that the officials do their duty in that respect.



Pursuant to instructions from the State's attorney's office police officials of Bismarck, N. Dak., visited the stores and business places of that city on January 17 and informed the proprietors "that the Sunday law must be obeyed, and all stores must be closed on that day." "Drug stores were not included in the order." It is said that "Attorney Register has always been a rigid observer of

Sunday himself, and is now giving his fellow-citizens an opportunity to travel along the same path." The *Bismarck Palladium* observes that "North Dakota has some very drastic laws on her statute books," and says that if the Sunday law is enforced impartially "the newsboy must go, the milkman must get around earlier, the electric-light plant and the telephone system must close, the livery barns must shut their doors, the hacks must lay off and rest on the Sabbath day, and barber shops and bath-rooms close at midnight on Saturday." In proof of this it points out that according to the penal code "Sabbath-breaking embraces the following pursuits":

1. Servile labor.
2. Public sports.
3. Trades, manufactures, and mechanical employments.
4. Public traffic.
5. Serving process.

And in order that it might be clearly understood how much "Sabbath-breaking" embraced in the matter of public traffic, this section of the code was quoted:

All manner of public selling, or offering or exposing for sale publicly, of any commodities on the first day of the week, is prohibited, except that meats, milk and fish may be sold at any time before nine o'clock in the morning, and except that food may be sold to be eaten upon the premises where sold, and drugs and medicines and surgical appliances may be sold at any time of the day.

This is the law which the State's attorney has now set about to enforce in Bismarck. With the Sunday-enforcement order went one against gambling, and especially ordering the removal from groceries, hotels, cigar stores and other places where they were installed, nickel and penny slot machines. This is a step that public sentiment may well endorse, for it seems that these devices teach children to gamble. The *Palladium* unfeelingly but truthfully remarks that if the

order against gambling is strictly carried out it "will be a blow to church societies where raffling and chances have heretofore been considered a legitimate source of income."

It is reported that the Illinois Retail Clerks' Association is to make every effort to secure the enactment at the present session of the State legislature of a bill prohibiting the opening of stores on Sunday. The bill has been drafted for some weeks, and was prepared, it is said, by Attorney Clarence S. Darrow of Chicago, who is attorney for the union miners' organization before the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission. The bill is "aimed principally at dealers who keep open their stores on Sunday in Chicago." This further information regarding the bill is given in the papers:

It also is directed against the pawnbrokers of the State. A year or more ago a warfare was inaugurated against the pawnbrokers: The latter fought the issue, and the courts decided that under the law they could keep open their places the same as drug stores, barber shops and cigar stores; that the pawnbrokers could not be discriminated against.

There is no doubt that the bill will be opposed by all the pawnbrokers in the State. The Hebrews claim that the Gentiles' Sabbath is not their Sabbath. Under the form in which the bill is said to be drawn it does not cover the closing of drug stores, cigar stores and barber shops.

A barber of Findlay, Ohio, was arrested on January 14 "on a warrant charging him with working at his trade on Sunday, contrary to the State law prohibiting common labor on the Sabbath day." The arrest was made on complaint of the president of the local barbers' union.

An "anti-Sunday theatre crusade," in which "the ministerial association" was taking a prominent part, was recently reported to be in progress in Council Bluffs, Iowa.

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.

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

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

TO OUR PATRONS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

11 West 20th Street, New York City

A POSTAL request will bring you a copy of the index for the 1902 SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY.

ONE of the best friends which THE SENTINEL has writes us as follows: "I am very glad that THE SENTINEL has been changed from a monthly to a weekly. It was too long to wait a whole month for its wholesome reading."

ONE good way to show your appreciation of THE SENTINEL is to get some one else to become a permanent reader. Sample copies will be furnished upon application to any one who is willing to try to obtain some new subscriptions.

THE article entitled, "Is the Government an Adjunct of the 'Reform Bureau'?" found on page 39 of the issue of Jan. 15, will bear a second reading. Then after you have read it see what you can do to place the SENTINEL in the hands of others so they will learn the true principles of religious liberty, and what the "Reform Bureau" is really doing.

DID YOU GET YOUR CLUB?

AFTER last mailing day ten copies of THE SENTINEL were returned to us from the post-office. These evidently were in a club which in some way got broken open and separated from its wrapper. If the one who did not receive his SENTINEL's dated Jan. 22, 1903, will drop us a line we will take pleasure in forwarding the copies.

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 60 cents alone. Send to day, C. L. PARTER MUSIC Co., 5 E. 14th St., N. Y. City.

FIVE WONDERFUL BOOKS.

The GREATEST SET of BOOKS EVER WRITTEN on the GREATEST SUBJECTS EVER WRITTEN ABOUT.

How We Know Evolution and Higher Criticism are the World's Greatest Fables.

"**Patriarchs and Prophets**" tells of the creation and fall of man; of the antediluvian and patriarchal ages; reveals the providence of God in creation, the flood, and the exodus of Israel; traces the great controversy between good and evil from creation down to the last days of King David—a period of three thousand years; and shows that the higher criticism and evolution of all ages has been the world's great mistake.

How We Know that the Bible is God's Eternal Words of Truth.

"**Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation.**" This work displays at once the most overwhelming evidences of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures, as seen in the rise and fall of nations during the last three thousand years in direct fulfillment of its great prophecies. Millions of Christians live and die without knowing how to prove to a certainty that the Bible is God's word. Children ask the question, "How do we know that the Bible is true?" and embrace infidelity for want of the proper answer to this question. Before the great themes of this mighty volume of everlasting truth infidelity is as helpless as a child.

How We Know that the Life of Christ was Different from that of Any Other Man and that He was the Messiah of Israel.

"**The Desire of Ages.**" This book contains the greatest history ever written on the life of Christ and illustrates in an entirely new way the principles He came to establish in the lives of men. His life in prophetic history; His life as a youth; His life as a carpenter; His life as the great teacher of Galilee; His life for the salvation of the world, and last but not least, His life in glory with the redeemed, are all brought out in this great book.

How We Know the Difference Between True and Apostate Christianity.

"**The Great Controversy**" vividly portrays the difference between true and apostate Christianity as illustrated in the history of the last eighteen hundred years, and the grand final triumph of the right. All such questions as, "Are we approaching the Millennium?" "Is the good time coming?" "Is the world growing better every day?" etc., are fully and clearly answered by this book.

What Mean the Wonderful Activities and Developments of the Last Century?

"**Heralds of the Morning**" tells what the modern wonders of this world mean and the great lessons which they are designed to teach. This book alone is worth the price of the whole set.

Every volume is well illustrated. The price of the set of five volumes is \$10.50 in full cloth, marbled edge, and \$12.50 in full cloth, gilt edge. The paper, type, and illustrations are the same in either binding.

Sold by subscription, but will be sent prepaid at above price where we have no agent.

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