

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, MARCH 26, 1903

NO. 13



*The American people have not gone to Canossa, but something certainly has happened that can scarcely be said to have ever happened before. . . . The transactions must increase the size of Rome in American affairs.*

—Springfield Republican, July, 1902.

*Against such legislation [the Sunday-closing legislation now pending in the Illinois legislature], all fair-minded men should protest. The State should not be used as a club by those in one branch of business to injure those in another equally lawful. If it is innocent to sell milk and bread six days in the week, it is no less so on the seventh.*

—The Law Register, Chicago, March 4.

*I believe that all strictly church property ought to be taxed. . . . I would have all strictly charitable institutions free. But I do not know why a Jew should be taxed to help support the Church of the Messiah; I do not know why I should be taxed to support the Cathedral; I do not know why the Catholics should be taxed to support the Brick Church. Let the people who believe, believe enough and care for their religious belief enough to pay for it, or else go without it. That seems to me to be the fundamental principle of justice and right in the whole matter.*

—Dr. Minot J. Savage, New York, March 8.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 11 West 20th St., New York City  
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA      SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA      KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Entered January 2, 1903, at New York, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879



# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States especially devoted to the maintenance 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.

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..... 1.50

### 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 Money 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

ONE subscriber says: "We have examined the copy of the March 12 SENTINEL which came yesterday, and like it very much."

If your subscription expired with the last March issue, have you renewed yet? If not, no more copies will be mailed you until renewal is received.

SEVERAL orders for 1,000 copies of the "Love of Power and Power of Love" number of the THE SENTINEL were received. The largest order came from Rutland, Vt., and was for 1,100 copies.

ABOUT one dozen of those sixty-seven Bibles recently advertised in THE SENTINEL is all that is left. If you have not received a copy and wish one you had better order right away. \$1.50 is the price.

LAST week's SENTINEL is what might be termed a supplement to our "Love of Power and Power of Love" number. A few extra copies were printed and any one desiring to use them can purchase a supply at the same rates as advertised for our March 12 number.

FOREIGN subscribers should watch their date label and renew without receiving a reminder from us, as we do not make a custom of sending expiration notifications to foreign subscribers. To avoid the possibility of missing any copies renewal should be sent at least one month before the subscription expires.

The articles now appearing in THE SENTINEL under the heading, "The Supremacy of the Papacy," should have a wide reading—very much wider than they will have if read only by the regular readers of the paper. Will you not assist to increase the number of the readers of the paper just now?



# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1903

No. 13

The nation which tries to find "its perfection in Catholic Christianity" will be very apt to find its ruin instead.



The Sunday law is well adapted for preparing people for the devil's service. It commands them to be idle; he does the rest.



A law which interdicts both useful labor and innocent recreation and amusement at the same time is not only an oppressive measure, but it is an utterly foolish one.



The Papacy must indeed be a "great secret of blessedness" for the nations, for all that have ever tried to find blessedness in her have invariably failed to find what they were seeking.



It is as much the duty of government to see that no person is interfered with in exercising the right to labor as it is to see that no person is interfered with in exercising the right to rest. And this is a duty from which government is not absolved on the first day of the week.



The pretense of social beneficence cannot always hide, though it may often serve to disguise, the real character of the cause of the Sunday agitator. When brought to the test it is demonstrated that that which lies nearest his heart is not the promotion of the welfare of the "toiling masses," but solely the "protection" and "preservation" of a religious institution.

The three-score years that have elapsed since they were written have strikingly demonstrated the wisdom of the observations by Macaulay that were given on our first page last week. Since they were written the progress of knowledge has perhaps been as immense as it was from the time of Queen Elizabeth to the time in which Macaulay wrote; and the growth and progress (in power and influence) of the Papacy has also been immense during this time. To-day, after all the immense progress in knowledge, the Papacy still remains, and she remains with such strength and vigor as even Macaulay himself could hardly have anticipated. When he wrote the members of the Roman Catholic communion were "certainly not fewer than a hundred and twenty millions"; to-day we are told that the members of that communion are certainly not fewer than two hundred and fifty millions! And this is by no means the only important item which bears out Macaulay's observations regarding the Papacy.



The *Christian Work and Evangelist* says that "a bill is pending in the assembly at Albany for which there is no demand and which, therefore, should be set aside at the earliest moment." It describes the bill and comments thus:

It legalizes Sunday golf and amateur baseball and football games where no admission fee is charged. The bill leaves in the pro-



hibited class shooting, hunting, fishing, playing, horse-racing, gaming, or other public sports, exercises or shows on Sunday, and all "noise disturbing the peace of the day." The act is to take effect September 1, 1903. But it won't take effect on the 1st of September next, nor on any other day, if the conscience of the people is aroused against the measure, as it should be. The pulpit and press should oppose this measure. Not only so, but petition and protest should go to Albany against this measure, and the churches should move in the matter.

We would hardly have expected this from the *Christian Work*, though of course it is just what might have been expected from any of that class of religious journals which assume as a matter of course that it is the business of the civil authorities to "uphold the Sabbath," to compel its observance, and to prevent its "desecration." We did not suppose that the *Christian Work* belonged exactly in this class. If there was no demand for the passage of such a measure it is not likely that it would be pending before the legislature. It is very strange that there should be such an urgent call for petition and protest against and opposition to a measure "for which there is no demand"! And why should "*the churches*," especially, "move in the matter"? Ah! upon that hangs the whole story. Only "the churches" can have any objection to this harmless measure against which the *Christian Work* would have "the conscience of the people" aroused.



"An Act to exempt the real estate of religious corporations in the City of New York, as now constituted, from assessments for public improvements," is the title of a bill that has been introduced in the assembly of the New York legislature and referred to the Committee on Affairs of Cities. The measure "shall take effect immediately" on its passage, and it provides that "the real estate owned

by any religious corporation actually dedicated and used by such corporation exclusively as a place of public worship" in New York City "shall be exempt from all assessments which are now levied and assessed against such real estate, or which may hereafter be levied and assessed against such real estate." This measure is eminently worthy of the treatment which the *Christian Work* accords and would have accorded to the bill which permits the playing of golf and amateur baseball and football on Sunday. But it will not get such treatment from the religious press. The very thing which moves them to oppose any modification of the law whereby Sunday observance is compelled will cause them to support this measure strenuously, at least to acquiesce quietly in its enactment. We do not know the origin and history of this measure. We supposed that all religious corporations in New York were now enjoying to a greater extent than is here specified, special favor and support from the State. The property of religious corporations should be taxed like any other property. There is no more reason why the State should donate to religious corporations the taxes which in justice to all the taxpayers should be assessed against their property, than that it should donate to them the property itself. There is no more reason why the State should remit the taxes on church buildings than that it should erect the buildings at public expense. Public worship is a good thing, but it is not the business of the State to support it. So far as the State is concerned, public worship is a private affair. If the people who wish to have public worship do not care enough for it to maintain it themselves, they should go without it. There should be no taxation by the State of the general public for the support of religion and worship; but that is exactly what the exemption of church property from taxation amounts to.



"Religious Freedom Proclaimed by the Czar," was the surprising announcement which greeted newspaper readers on the morning of March 13. An imperial manifesto or ukase had just been published in Russia in which the Czar, after saying that "on ascending the throne of our ancestors by the providence of God we made a solemn vow before the Almighty and our conscience sacredly to guard the centuries-old pillars of Russian power and to dedicate our life to the service of our beloved fatherland in indefatigable solicitude for our subjects," and referring to "the troubles agitating our country" which "hinder the general work of ameliorating the well-being of our people," declared—

we are irrevocably decided to satisfy the needs for which the state has become ripe, and have deemed it expedient to strengthen and decree the undeviating observance of the principles of tolerance laid down by the fundamental laws of the Russian Empire, which, recognizing the Orthodox Church as the ruling one, grant to all our subjects of other religions and to all foreign persuasions freedom of creed and worship in accordance with other rites; and we are further resolved to continue the active carrying out of measures for the improvement of the material position of the Orthodox rural clergy, while enabling them to take a larger share in intellectual and public life.

We suppose this purpose with regard to the Orthodox rural clergy, and the purpose stated further on in the decree, of bringing about "closer coöperation between the communal authorities and parochial trustees of the Orthodox churches," is a part of the general purpose to improve the conditions of village life and of the local nobility and peasantry, which is the other important feature of the decree. "Revision of the laws of the rural population" is promised, and "thorough reform is to be effected in the provincial governments and district administrations." "Means are to be found to

render it easier for the individual to sever connections with the community to which he belongs, if he so desires," and "without delay measures must be taken to release the peasants from the present burdensome liability of forced labor." At present there are regulations restricting peasants to the occupation in which they have been reared and to the commune in which they reside. For days after its publication the edict was the one subject of discussion in Russia, and everywhere it "joyfully excited the populace," causing "more widespread joy than any domestic political event since the emancipation of the serfs in 1861." But the general opinion throughout the world after thoughtful consideration seems to be that the edict, while very noteworthy, is by no means an epoch-marking one. "Practical observers see in it a general expression of kindly intention rather than a program of definite reforms, and do not look for sweeping changes to follow." A leading Russian paper says the manifesto itself shows that the Czar "is resolved to maintain intact the principles of absolute monarchy and of the Orthodox Church." Even if the Czar intended to immediately inaugurate radical reforms, it is not believed he would be allowed to do so by the bureaucracy by which the Empire is controlled. The edict is merely a declaration of "our intentions" on the part of the Czar, and its promulgation was evidently due to and intended to allay the revolutionary discontent which, in "the constant serious outbreaks by peasants, workmen and students," had "created a well-grounded fear that the troubles would increase until they got beyond control." Contrary to the first impression, the opinion seems to prevail now that the promulgation of the decree was not intended to effect any improvement in the condition of the Jews, who are no doubt the most oppressed class in the Empire.



# *The Supremacy of the Papacy*

*By Alonzo T. Jones*

## XIII

### *How the United States was Represented at the Vatican*

IN 1892 the Papacy announced in the United States that what she has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States; and this in order that in Europe the example may be followed, and so this be "the source of new life for Europeans," and of an "outpouring of light that will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, but of *all humanity*."

It was in 1893 that Satolli delivered the "salute" of Leo XIII. to "the great American Republic," and also Leo's "call upon the Catholics of America to go forward" and "bring your country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness"—the Papacy.

And it was in that same year that Prof. Thos. O'Gorman, of the Catholic University at Washington, represented Catholicism as the Christianity of America; claimed that America is Catholic "by right of discovery and possession dating back almost nine hundred years," and "an acquaintance between America and the Church in times when the only Christianity in existence was Catholic"; and declared that the United States is "a nation that shall find its perfection in Catholic Christianity."

In furtherance of these designs and sentiments the Papacy has been directly and industriously working these ten years; and not by any means in vain. The opening of the Spanish-American war was a great opportunity for her to crowd herself upon the government of the United States for recognition. And when Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines fell to the possession of the United States, these, being solidly Catholic, only enlarged her opportunity. And so lately

as only last summer the whole world saw a commission officially appointed by the United States government to visit the Vatican in negotiations with the Papacy, as the consequence of conditions in the Philippines. All the other nations looked on with intense interest, and nearly all with feelings of disappointment that this nation, which had set to the world the one splendid example of how a nation can get on prosperously absolutely without Rome, should now find her interests and her place in the presence of the Papacy in Rome.

What was the occasion? The government of the United States had succeeded to the place of the government of Spain in the Philippines. Spain had suffered insurrection of the Filipino people because of general and intense dissatisfaction created by the religious orders, or friars of the Catholic Church. The United States government found the same source of perpetual hindrance to peace and governmental order. The United States asked that the Papacy withdraw the friars. It was suggested that if only the matter could be talked over quietly by the Papacy and representatives of the United States in Rome, a satisfactory settlement of the matter could very easily be arrived at. This view was accepted, and a commission of three was appointed.

And how was the commission composed? Bear in mind that there was a matter in controversy—not necessarily an antagonistic controversy, but a difference of view that needed to be accommodated—between the Papacy and the United States government. The United States government was one party to the con-





*The United States Commission to the Vatican that was  
Two-thirds Papal\**

This picture shows the commission just after one of its audiences with the Pope during the stay in Rome. The man in uniform was the secretary to the commission, or rather to Governor Taft, Major Porter.

\* The United States appointed and sent to Rome a commission, or "mission," as it was called by some, of *three* persons, but it is a fact that it carried on the negotiations through only *one* of those persons. It was not a commission or "mission," not he *and his colleagues*, but Governor Taft alone to whom the American Secretary of War gave the official instructions and authorization with regard to the "business"; it was he alone who was presented and commended as the representative of the United States by the American Secretary of



trovery, or discussion; the Papacy was the other. The United States sends to the Vatican a commission of three persons to represent the United States in this controversy with the Papacy. And who were these three? *First*, United States Governor Taft of the Philippines. *Second*, Bishop Thos. O'Gorman of the Catholic Church, the same man who as Prof. Thos. O'Gorman of the Catholic University, in 1893, claimed America as Catholic by right of discovery and possession dating back almost nine hundred years, and declared that this nation shall find its perfection in Catholic Christianity! And *third*, Attorney James F. Smith, a Roman Catholic!

That is to say, the United States government sends a commission of three persons to represent the United States in a controversy with the Papacy, and two of these three are themselves of the Papacy! A two-thirds papal commission is sent to the Vatican by the United States government to represent the United States in a controversy with the Papacy! Is it possible that in the whole United States there is anybody so obtuse as not to be able to discern that the two papal members of that commission would represent the Papacy first of all, instead of the United States? Can any one suppose that in this golden opportunity

Bishop O'Gorman would allow anything whatever to detract from his declared design that this nation shall find its perfection in Catholic Christianity? Is it not on the very face of things that, instead of doing anything that might tend to make the Philippines any the less Catholic, he would do everything that might tend to make the United States more so!

And so, after much proposing and counter-proposing in Rome, the whole matter was transferred to the Philippines to be further considered on the ground by the papal delegate, Mgr. Guidi, and Governor Taft; in which arrangement "the Philippine government expressly recognizes the official character of Mgr. Guidi, and has pledged itself, over Mr. Taft's signature, to treat with him as a duly accredited representative of the Holy See." And this *The Tablet*, the papal organ of England, publishes as "a fact of capital importance" in proof that "the United States government has given official recognition to the Pope's temporal power."

And that is a fair illustration of how *the United States* was represented by its two-thirds papal commission to the Vatican in the summer of 1902, A. D. It is also a fair illustration of the progress that the Papacy is making in getting a firm hold upon the government of the

---

State in his note to the "Secretary of State to His Holiness"; and it was he alone who appeared as the representative of the United States in all the correspondence that passed during the negotiations. But this does not weaken at all the point made in the article accompanying this; on the contrary, it bears out and confirms the statement that the United States was represented by but one-third of its own commission. It seems to show that the Government itself recognized the fact that the United States had but one proper representative upon the commission. The thing simply shows that while the Government sent a commission to the Vatican that was two-thirds papal, it carried on the negotiations through the one-third that was not papal and that was really representative of it and not of the power with which it was negotiating. Was this a confession by the Government that the United States was in reality represented by only one person on the commission of three that had been appointed and sent? But whether it was such a confession or not, why did the Government select, appoint, and send to Rome with Governor Taft the other two members of the "mission," when Governor Taft himself was perfectly competent and able to attend to the business, and was to do so in fact? Why a "mission" instead of merely a representative, especially when so far as the actual business was concerned there was never anything more, and evidently never any intention or expectation that there would be anything more, than merely a representative? Ah! this brings us face to face with the great matter that is now being considered in these articles on "The Supremacy of the Papacy," and he who would understand this matter should study these articles carefully. — EDITOR SENTINEL.



United States, in order that she may do now for this nation what she has done for others in the past.

Yet this is only one item in the account

of that two-thirds papal commission from the United States government to the Vatican. There are others that tell even more than this in that same direction.

## *Not in the Interests of the Masses*

THE champions of Sunday enforcement, who are of course almost invariably clergymen, make great professions of solicitude for the "toiling masses." According to them the work of "saving the Sabbath" by law is a work in behalf of the "poor workingman," and they are moved to engage in it because of the great burden they have for his welfare. They would save him from "slavery," and afford him opportunity for rest and recreation after his six days of toil, and, above all, opportunity for the cultivation of his intellectual and moral faculties.

Now the truth is that this profession is in most instances the merest pretense. If their interest in the matter were indeed inspired by a genuine and sincere desire for the betterment of the condition of the masses, the clerical advocates of Sunday enforcement would jump at the chance of putting into effect in the cities such suggestions as the following, which were made through the press early last year, when the Sunday question was being agitated in New York, by the late Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton:

The laboring class seems to be the class that the majority of the people who are now talking on the Sunday laws propose to benefit. . . . My idea is to close the saloon on Sunday altogether. I would provide in its place an attraction greater than the saloon for the masses of the people. I would have concert halls, properly supervised, opened on Sunday, where the laboring man and his family might listen to good music and enjoy themselves in a rational way. I would have theatres of the better class, where moral plays are produced, opened on Sunday in a cosmopolitan city like New York. . . . As it is now, it is impossible for the poor man with a family to secure the proper recreation, and, of course, the sa-

loons profit accordingly. The laboring classes should have comfort and recreation, and their homes should be improved, and they should have more and better education. If they could be told the laws of life, then they would not be rushing to saloons as at the present time. We must give the people something else to divert their minds. If they went to the theatres, where everything was lighted up and beautiful in general, and to concerts where good music could be heard free, they would not go to saloons, to which they are now driven through the lack of other amusement, for the lack of education, for the lack of recreation, and for the lack of decent homes.

Another thing I would like to see done in New York and the other large cities of the country is the throwing open of the schoolhouses on Sunday for the education of the masses on an entirely new plan—a plan that would attract them and interest them. For this special purpose I would have learning simplified and adapted to the uneducated thousands who have had no opportunity to take even a common school course. I would enroll, for example, intelligent men and women as volunteer teachers, of the same type and with the same enthusiasm as those who now become missionaries to the heathen of the Old World. Having secured the schoolhouses and the teachers, I would invite the men, women and children from their gloomy homes in the slums of our large cities and gather them in these schools on Sunday afternoons and evenings, and in a simple and interesting way, illustrated with maps, charts, manikins, etc., impart information that could not help but interest and would surely elevate. The information would be conveyed on a scale adapted to the understanding of the audience. It would be a combination of education and entertainment. . . . There could probably also be introduced in these Sunday entertainments for the masses in our schoolhouses suitable musical features.

I think an excellent idea to help solve this Sunday question would be the bringing together of the great masses of the people of little means and the great free institutions of art, natural history, etc., provided by the cities



and generous philanthropists. In New York, for example, we have the beautiful Museum of Art and the great Museum of Natural History. But how many of the thousands of the poor on the East Side of New York can benefit from these great, free and elevating shows on Sunday? Take the ordinary resident of the East Side, with a wife and several children. How can he even dream of spending a dollar or more of car fare for his family's transportation to and from the Art Museum or other place of an elevating character? I think the owners of street railway systems in our large cities, or some far-seeing philanthropists, should be the means of bringing the masses and the free institutions together by, in the first case, carrying the people at a reduced rate to these institutions on Sunday.

The carrying out of these suggestions would be most certainly to the benefit of the "toiling masses" in the cities, and would in an excellent way be using Sunday for the very purpose for which the champions of Sunday legislation and enforcement claim to be working. But do the Sunday-enforcement clergymen jump at such suggestions? Yes, they jump to prevent their being carried into effect.

An illustration of this has been afforded recently in New York, where what may be called the mildest of Mrs. Stanton's suggestions has been partially carried out. The board of education has during the present winter instituted Sunday afternoon concerts in the public school buildings, or at least in one public school building. No sooner were these concerts begun than representatives of the New York Presbytery and of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union began an agitation against them, on the ground that "the tendency of the departure will be to secularize the Sabbath." They found a friend in Superintendent of Schools Maxwell, who "expressed himself as in agreement with the main contentions of the opponents," holding that "the opening of the schools on Sunday afternoon is an invasion into the field belonging to the church and Sunday

school," and that "the effect of these concerts will be to diminish attendance at the churches and Sunday schools." The attitude of the Superintendent was applauded on the ground that it was "in the conservation of morals and religion."

After a few weeks of agitation the opponents of the Sunday entertainments seemed to cease their opposition, at least the public heard nothing more from them. But evidently they were not idle with regard to the matter. About six weeks passed, and then on March 9, at its regular monthly meeting, the New York Presbytery discussed, and authorized its "Sabbath" representative, "Colonel A. P. Ketchum," to present to the Board of Education, "a memorial against the Sunday opening of the public schools for entertainments." And a few days later the papers published this news regarding the matter:

A committee of prominent ministers and laymen has been formed to oppose the action taken by the Board of Education in allowing the opening of public schools on Sunday for lectures or amusements. The Methodist and Baptist meetings, held yesterday, and the New York Presbytery, have endorsed the protest. The resolutions, which have been framed by the committee and which will be forwarded to the Board of Education next week, have already been signed by scores of pastors. The Rev. Dr. W. R. Huntington, rector of Grace Church, is the chairman of the committee. Other denominations are represented by the following ministers: the Rev. Dr. Israel Wistar Hathaway, Col. Alexander P. Ketchum and the Rev. Dr. David G. Wylie, Presbyterians; the Rev. J. D. Steele, Reform Presbyterian; the Rev. Dr. R. S. McArthur and the Rev. Dr. Campbell, Baptist; the Rev. Dr. A. B. Sanford, the Rev. Dr. J. O. Wilson and the Rev. Dr. W. F. Anderson, Methodist; the Rev. Dr. D. J. Burrell and the Rev. Dr. Fagg, Dutch Reform. The contention of the ministers is that the opening of the schools on Sunday is in defiance of the Sunday law. Dr. Burrell said yesterday that the general belief among the clergy was that the opening of the schools for lectures and instructive entertainments was merely a wedge to gain entrance there for amusements which were not



in strict accordance with the observance of the Sabbath laws.

"The tendency of the departure will be to *secularize the Sabbath*"; it "is an invasion into *the field belonging to the church and Sunday school*"; its effect "will be to *diminish attendance at the churches and Sunday schools*"; it promotes what is "not in strict accordance with the observance of the Sabbath laws"; opposition to it is "in the *conservation of morals and religion*." In these expressions is revealed the secret of the activity of the Sunday champion always and everywhere. His care is not for those who toil and those whose lot needs improvement, but for what he calls "the Sabbath." And so in this matter of Sunday lectures and entertainments in the public school buildings, the question with him is not as to what is "the tendency of the departure" with regard to the "toiling masses," for whom he is always professing great solicitude, but as to what is its tendency with regard to "the observance of the Sabbath laws." And when it appears that its tendency is to "*secularize the Sabbath*," then there must be none of it, never mind how much it may contribute to the physical and moral betterment of the masses. The question is not as to whether the departure is in the conservation of the interests of the masses, but as to whether it is "in the conservation of morals and religion." And if it is regarded as not being "in the conservation of morals and religion," then there must be none of it, never mind how much it may minister to the higher needs and to the improvement of the condition of the masses. Not a burden for the "toiling masses," but a burden for "the Sabbath" as a sacred and not a secular institution, and for what he deems "morals and religion," is the cause of the activity of the champion of Sunday observance

by law, wherever he may be found and whatever may be his professions.

Of course it is not pretended by these New York clergymen that the Board of Education has given or is going to give any entertainments in the school buildings that are objectionable in themselves. Their opposition and objection is not to the lectures and entertainments themselves, but to their being given *on Sunday — on "the Sabbath."* They are interested in the maintenance by public authority of a religious institution, and although they may and do profess very loudly (when it serves to help their cause) that their interest in the maintenance of Sunday observance by the public authorities is due almost entirely to their great desire for the welfare and betterment of the masses and the working people, they demonstrate very conclusively when brought to the test that the welfare of the masses counts for nothing with them when it involves any departure from the strict observance and maintenance of their religious institution. They insist that in the conduct of public institutions not the slightest departure shall be made from the observance of their religious institution, *even for the public good*. What right have they so to insist? What right have they, even if there was no special public benefit to enter into the consideration, to demand that public institutions shall be conducted absolutely in harmony with a religious observance to which they hold? What right have they to insist that the business of the *whole* people shall be made to conform to a religious observance that is held to and believed in by only a *part* of the people?

It remains to be seen whether the "friends of the Sabbath," who on occasion are such pronounced champions of the "toiling masses," will be able to have their way in this matter of Sunday entertainment and instruction for the masses



in New York. When the opposition first showed itself the *New York School Journal* remarked that in view of the fact that musical entertainments in the way of organ concerts and otherwise are given in many churches and in Y. M. C. A. halls on Sundays, "we fail to get the full force of the contentions raised by the opposing members of the New York Presbytery"; and the *Ethical Record* made this very sensible comment:

Mr. Jacob Riis has said that "the first day of the week in New York City was often not the Lord's Day, but the Devil's day." This statement he made to a number of ministers. It was a pity that these gentlemen did not catch the full significance of his meaning. It seems as if some of the clergymen of New York City do not yet appreciate the Sunday situation, since some of them have been opposing the opening of the schoolhouses for music on that afternoon. This, fortunately, is not true of all of them, for some have attended, and have expressed their approval of the concerts which are being given every Sunday afternoon at Public School No. 33.

In allowing this school to be opened, the board of education has made a beginning of the Sunday opening of the schools, which, if properly carried on, may make possible the Sunday closing of saloons. Until we have more such Sunday openings of places where refined pleasures may be enjoyed, it will never be possible to have a true sabbath, to create which is the earnest effort of those who are working for the betterment of New York City.

In setting forth in his eulogy on the Pope what "the patient statesmanship of Leo" has accomplished in the affairs of nations, the Jesuit orator at the celebration in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on March 3, "Father" Thos. J. Campbell, uttered these words that should be of special interest to Americans:

Finally, our own country has had its experience of his influence; for it was his gentle forbearance, that never uttered, nor permitted to be uttered, a word that would wound or offend, which has so *skillfully guarded diplomatic relations* with a proud and victorious people that the wild clamors of religious

Let us look facts in the face. People will not spend the day in church. The homes of the tenement-house people are such that they will not spend the time there. Where will they go? Here is the opportunity for father, mother, and children to spend at least a pleasant and quiet hour together in a well-warmed and well-lighted room, while they listen to pleasing music, which is often explained and commented upon by the performers.

Which is better—music, or saloons and gambling? Is secular music on Sunday an evil? About that there is a question. Are drunkenness and gambling evils? That is a matter about which there is no question. If the reverend gentlemen have time and effort to spend, let them attack the real evil. Is it not strange that we should find clergy in this day and age spending their time trying to stop a concert on Sunday, when drunkenness, gambling, and vice demand all the time and energy they have to spare.

But when and where has it ever been the case that theologians in seeking to conserve "morals and religion" by dictating to and compelling others, have addressed themselves to a real, genuine evil? It is a fact which testifies most strongly against it that every attempt by churchmen and theologians in the past to conserve morals and religion by law has been an attempt to prevent what was not evil and to enforce what was not good. It is high time that the world was seeing the last of all such attempts.

fanaticism have been quelled and the unworthy aims of designing politicians have been thwarted, while he, the great Father of Christendom, with absolute trust in the fearlessness and keen sense of justice of our great Chief Executive, as well as in the honor of our people, serenely legislates for the religious government of the new possessions, and gives an assurance that the Catholics of the Philippines shall be the most devoted supporters of the American Republic.

This utterance will bear considerable study, and the very best aid to be found anywhere in studying it are the articles by Alonzo T. Jones now appearing in THE SENTINEL.



## 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 elsewhere in the paper.*

Three small dealers were fined \$2 each in Trenton, N. J., on February 16, for "selling on Sunday."

A bill requiring the closing of barber shops on Sundays and holidays was introduced in the Arizona legislature late in February.

A young man living near Anderson, Ind., "pleaded guilty in Justice Lee's court to hunting on Sunday, and paid \$39.10 for his experience," on January 30.

At the request of the prosecuting attorney of the county the Bellefontaine Coal & Ice Co., of Bellefontaine, Ohio, was compelled recently by the sheriff to stop the hauling of ice on Sunday from a lake three miles distant from the city.

The city council of Grand Island, Neb., was recently petitioned by barbers of that place to pass an ordinance prohibiting the opening of barber shops on Sunday. The ordinance prepared by the barbers was referred to a committee, which, after consideration, reported against its passage.

At the request of a committee from the local W. C. T. U. the town board of Wakarusa, Ind., recently adopted resolutions instructing "the officers to strictly enforce the Sunday-closing law." The *Citizen* of that place says that as a result "we are compelled to buy on Saturday or go hungry on Sunday."

Two grocers of Duluth, Minn., were to have been tried in the municipal court

on March 5 "on the charge of violating the Sunday ordinance by keeping their stores open." They agreed, however, "to keep closed Sundays hereafter," and the cases against them were dismissed. The prosecution "was instigated by the grocers' union."

The W. C. T. U. of Council Bluffs, Iowa, having called upon the mayor of the city to prevent the giving of theatrical entertainments on Sunday evenings, it has been threatened by those favoring such entertainments that if the campaign against them is continued "a general Sunday-closing crusade will be commenced, involving saloons, drug stores, meat markets, grocery stores, barber shops, news-stands, and every business that is not conducted by necessity or charity on the Sabbath." The W. C. T. U. will no doubt be very much pleased with such opposition to their demand. The members of the W. C. T. U. "base their request for Sabbath observance at the theater upon the general State law on the subject."

On the evening of February 15 a patrolman in Chelsea, Mass., "discovered twelve Poles, eight men and four women, one of them being under sixteen years of age, in a house in Front Street enjoying themselves in dancing." He promptly arrested them for "violation of the Lord's day." At the trial the next day three of the men and three of the women "were charged with participating in dancing [on Sunday], and the other six were charged with being present. The six charged with dancing were fined \$3 each,



and five of the six charged with being present were fined \$2 each." The girl "was found not guilty and discharged." It is said that "the Poles were in an excited frame of mind, and did not hesitate to say that it was a shame for the policeman to arrest them when they were only having a little fun dancing." And it was a shame, too, if they were doing only that for which they would not have been molested on any other evening.

The New York *Provisioner*, of February 28, reported that "New York City grocers are seconding the butchers' efforts for the Sunday closing of stores," and in confirmation of this printed the following:

The provision and package people have caused the following Sunday-closing bill to be introduced in the legislature at Albany:

"Section 1. Section two hundred and sixty-seven of the penal code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Section 267. Public traffic.—All manner of public selling or offering for sale or delivery of any property on Sunday is prohibited, except (articles of food may be sold and supplied at any time before ten o'clock in the morning and except also) that meals may be sold to be eaten on the premises where sold or served elsewhere by caterers; and prepared tobacco, milk, ice and soda water may be sold in places other than where groceries, vegetables, spirituous or malt liquors or wines are kept or offered for sale, and except also that between the hours of five and eight in the evening, prepared meats and fish, salads and cheese may be sold. And except that between the period of June fifteenth and September fifteenth inclusive in each year butter, milk, lard and ice may be delivered up to ten o'clock in the morning. But nothing in said last sentence contained shall authorize the opening of the places of business to admit customers. Fruits, flowers, confections, newspapers, drugs, medicines and surgical appliances may be sold in a quiet and orderly manner at any time of the day; the provision of this section, however, shall not be construed to allow or permit the public sale or exposing for sale or delivery of uncooked flesh foods or meats, fresh or salt, at any hour or time of the day.

"Section 2. This act shall take effect September first, nineteen hundred and three."

We do not know exactly what changes this bill would accomplish in the present

law. The *Provisioner* says "the ten o'clock provision will kill the measure as a practical law," and declares: "Close tight or make no bluff at it."



Several weeks ago the butchers' union of St. Louis, Mo., had this communication sent to the police authorities of the city:

To the Honorable Police Commissioners, St. Louis, Mo.: Gentlemen—Acting under the instructions of the St. Louis Butchers' Union, an organization chartered by the laws of the State of Missouri, in 1886, your attention is respectfully called to the flagrant violation of the State Sunday law in St. Louis, Mo., where grocery stores, markets, saloons, theatres and concert halls are open and do regular business on the Sabbath day. Inasmuch as in 1904 it is proposed to have in St. Louis the greatest and most complete world's fair known to history, and as there will be visitors from all nations, it is important that they should receive a good impression of St. Louis and its people. As the United States Government has decreed that the World's Fair gates shall close on Sundays, would it not be eminently proper for the city of St. Louis to follow the example thus set at the fountain-head of the nation and enforce general Sunday closing of business? On you, gentlemen, as police commissioners of St. Louis, Mo., depends the enforcement of the State and city law, and as the State laws on Sunday closing of business are sufficient and explicit, you are respectfully requested to rigidly enforce their provisions. Respectfully submitted,

ST. LOUIS BUTCHERS' UNION.

Walter Pfeiffer, President.

John H. Schofield, Secretary.

When the butchers first began their agitation they "asked the coöperation of the clergy in an effort on their part to close their shops on Sunday, saying that they were desirous of doing so, but that their customers would not agree." The response of the clergymen showed that "the ministers of St. Louis are in favor of closing everything on Sunday but the churches."



**"Am Delighted With It"**

says the  
**SENATE POSTMASTER**

of a western State

Speaking of the—

**Webster Dictionary and  
Complete Vest-Pocket Library**

Five Books in One

- 1 **A Dictionary**
- 2 **A Gazetteer**
- 3 **A Parliamentary Manual**
- 4 **An Expert Calculator**
- 5 **Literary Guide**

**45,800 WORDS**

**PRICES:**

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

*PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,  
11 West 20th St., N. Y. City.*

**"ROYAL MUSKOKA"**

**HIGHLANDS OF ONTARIO**

The romantic and beautiful situation of the new "Royal Muskoka" hotel, located in the heart of the most magnificent summer resort district in America, inspires anticipations of the most pleasant sort. Every comfort and luxury that modern civilization has given us is found in this great hotel, which can accommodate 350 people. Public and private baths on each floor. All rooms are outside, single or en suite; hot and cold water in each room; electric light and bells; open fire places, etc. Sanitation arrangements most modern. Cuisine of the highest order of excellence. Among the amusements are a beautiful Bathing Beach, Tennis Grounds, Golf, Bowling Alley, Croquet, Bowling Green, Recreation and Billiard rooms, and many enjoyable water trips. Direct telegraph service with the hotel. About six hours journey north of Toronto—excellent transportation service.

Illustrated descriptive literature giving all particulars regarding routes and rates, etc., can be had on application to

**FRANK P. DWYER, E. P. Agent**  
Grand Trunk Railway System  
290 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

## DONT BE PREJUDICED

Against using E-Z Washing Tablets because you have been disappointed in other washing preparations. Ours is different. Try it.

This letter is reduced from one lately received from one of our many agents.

LIBERAL

TERMS

TO  
AGENTS

WRITE

US

*Enclosed find P.O. Order for another gross of Tablets which please ship me as soon as possible. I am afraid I shall be out again now before I can get them here, as these last ones have gone mostly to new customers, and should they do as others have done (call for more in a hurry) I should not have enough to supply them all. I never saw any thing like it. People who use them can't keep still about them and we keep having calls to supply new customers through the recommendation of the old ones. We sold over \$5.00 worth in a few hours one afternoon.*

ONCE

USED

ALWAYS

USED

TRY

IT

**EIGHT WASHINGS FOR 25 CENTS, stamps or silver.**

Address, **ALFRED MALLET, - - NYACK, N. Y.**



# An Endowment Fund



Union College, Nebraska.

is as  
necessary  
for a  
college  
as a  
faculty

## The Story of One Endowment

An author of many years' experience as a student of and writer on Biblical subjects was burdened with a desire to endow several small educational institutions located in different parts of the United States.

The MSS. of a book was prepared, the author donating all expense and royalties, and a fund was raised by popular subscription for the purchase of all materials entering into its make-up. The publishers agreed to donate every dollar that they would receive for work upon the book, from the time the first type was set until it was bound and packed ready for shipment, and all who sell any copies do so gratuitously.

The result: the colleges receive, not a small commission, but the entire proceeds from the sale of this beautiful and well written work, entitled

## Christ's Object Lessons

*or the*  
**Parables**  
*of*  
**Jesus**

The book contains 436 pages, is aptly and artistically illustrated so as to bring vividly before the reader the lessons of the Saviour, and is printed on a superior grade of paper.

**The price is but \$1.25, postpaid.**

You can aid this noble work—this great philanthropic undertaking—by purchasing a copy of "Christ's Object Lessons." Remember, you get value received for your money.

Address,



## The Pacific Press Publishing Company

11 W. 20th St., New York City

Kansas City, Mo.

Oakland, Calif.

Note. THE SENTINEL donates the space for this advertisement. Please mention THE SENTINEL when replying to this ad.